

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

EIGHTH EMERGENCY SPECIAL SESSION

Official Records



**9th  
PLENARY MEETING**

Thursday, 10 September 1981,  
at 3.20 p.m.

NEW YORK

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

AGENDA ITEM 5

Question of Namibia (*continued*)

1. Mr. GAUCI (Malta): Mr. President, I am as happy to see you preside over this emergency special session as I am sorry to learn of your impending departure. I compliment you on your efforts over the past year and I extend to you my very best wishes for your success in the future.
2. It is not my intention today to repeat the case in favour of the legitimate demands of the Namibian people for self-determination and of the consequent need for the practical attainment of Namibia's territorial integrity and independence.
3. There can be no question that the agony of the people of Namibia cries out for redress. However, their burden will not be lightened, nor will their colonial mantle be made easier to bear, by endless repetition of their case in these halls. In any case, we feel, the fervent pleas of the African States for justice for Namibia should remain the hallmark of our debate.
4. The facts are clear: viewed from any vantage point, whether legal, moral, social, humanitarian or political, the Namibian cause is a just one. It enjoys universal support and hence demands effective universal co-operation.
5. The settlement plan proposed by the Western contact group and endorsed by Security Council resolution 435 (1978) remains the only equitable and well-grounded foundation for progress on which much effort has already been expended.
6. South Africa realizes this, but facing the likelihood that its collaborators in Namibia would not win in free and fair United Nations-supervised elections, it has unceremoniously scuttled the pre-implementation talks, held at Geneva from 7 to 14 January 1981. Subsequently, as a convenient guise under which to flaunt international opinion, once more it resorted to unfounded and unconvincing—not to say hypocritical—claims of United Nations bias towards the South West Africa People's Organization [SWAPO].
7. The African nations have already correctly emphasized the tremendous reservoir of patience they have displayed towards South Africa, despite the shameless way the latter has distorted its sacred trust by its prevarications over the Namibian question.
8. It should surprise no one that patience has now run out. Surely, the waiting game has gone on long enough to the detriment of the Namibian people but to the clear advantage of the racist economic interests of South Africa. I say this with great feeling, because Malta is unfortunately only too familiar with the advantages that other neighbouring countries can derive from delaying tactics to thwart indigenous progress.
9. In this case, further stalling devices will serve only to undermine the survival prospects of the plan endorsed by Council resolution 435 (1978). Any hesitation, reconsideration or retrogression by members of the international community on this issue will furnish South Africa with yet another route to escape from fulfilling its Namibian obligations. All nations should therefore now act in concert to show the South African authorities that they stand alone. This emergency special session provides us with a timely opportunity to do so. No one should stand aloof this time. A unanimously adopted resolution would provide the clear signal required from this session.
10. There can be no doubt that Namibia is a United Nations responsibility. Genuine independence and self-determination for Namibia can be attained equitably only under the aegis of the Organization. Malta should not become a party to some form of tainted independence, which in effect leaves Namibia as a South African protectorate or denies SWAPO its rightful place in the electoral process.
11. It is universally recognized that a just and constructive solution to this festering problem must be achieved without further delay. Leaving aside South Africa's vested interest in prevarication, it is not upon the principle that there is divided opinion, but upon the best practical means to achieve this solution. In our view, it would be irresponsible to dismiss all the accumulated results of past efforts in this long drawn-out saga. What is now essential is a positive, unemotional and democratic decision with the full backing of the international community.
12. My country has always supported negotiations as the best means of achieving independence for Namibia and of ending the ongoing armed conflict. We cannot but express concern at the prospect of an escalation of this conflict; its toll in human lives is already ominously high and mounting.
13. We must therefore—all of us—emphasize our determined support for the provisions contained in Security Council resolution 435 (1978). Further efforts should be made within the framework of that resolution to meet and deal with genuine remaining obstacles, if indeed there are any. But it must be made clear to South Africa that it will not be allowed to disregard lightly the legitimate provisions that it professed to accept in principle more than two years ago.

14. Last year I expressed the hope that the positive example of Zimbabwe would serve as an inspiration and a spur to accelerated progress on the Namibian question. Many speakers have in fact highlighted the similarities between the two situations. Despite all setbacks, this hope must endure. It must not only endure, however, it must succeed, in the primary interests of the people most directly concerned, as well as in the interest of preserving regional peace. For its part, Malta, as it has done in the past, continues to pledge its full contribution within its modest means to attain this objective.
15. Mr. MUÑOZ LEDO (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. President, I should like to express the respect that the Mexican delegation feels for you in guiding the course of almost a year's work of the General Assembly. Conscientious efficiency and loyalty to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations have characterized your endeavours, to which we all pay tribute, particularly today when you are nearing the end of your term of office.
16. This emergency special session provides an opportunity to reiterate the political will of the international community in favour of the self-determination of the people of Namibia. One again we have come to this rostrum to add our voice to the many others expressing the world's conscience, its indignation at the oppressors and its solidarity with the oppressed.
17. In respect of Namibia, the United Nations has demonstrated firmness as regards principles, but also helplessness when it comes to practical solutions.
18. Given the impossibility of proceeding to the immediate decolonization of the Territory of Namibia, the United Nations assumed direct responsibility for administering it until its complete independence is achieved. Unfortunately, both purposes have been brought to naught. We have not been able to implement the mandate of the United Nations Council for Namibia and the illegal occupation has continued, since the organ authorized to adopt mandatory decisions has frequently been paralyzed by the veto of some Powers.
19. The Security Council, in its resolution 435 (1978), endorsed a negotiating plan for Namibia. And yet, after prolonged efforts, the pre-implementation meeting held at Geneva in January brought to light the fact that, as long as South African intransigence persists and South Africa continues to enjoy a protected impunity, peaceful means for the solution of the conflict will remain obstructed.
20. Since 1966, when we terminated South Africa's Mandate, the people of Namibia, the front-line States and all those of us who support their cause have given ample proof of patience—which is not to be confused with tolerance, and far less with hesitation.
21. The problem of southern Africa is, no doubt, complex, but the substantive issue being debated is obvious and does not allow for eclecticism. The prolongation of colonial domination, acts of aggression against neighbouring States, and the *apartheid* régime are three different manifestations of the same phenomenon; namely, the obduracy of maintaining the privileges of a minority, maintained by force and under the cover of an unacceptable external complicity.
22. That attempt is based on a profound racial prejudice and is sustained by means of considerable economic and military superiority, the ramifications of which extend to other continents. Without any doubt, South Africa is an enclave for certain interests of the industrialized West.
23. Southern Africa is suffering, in a flagrant and concentrated manner, the injustices which still prevail in contemporary international society. The problem that we are considering reflects and reveals, as none other, the obstinate survival of imperial strategies and the renaissance of regressive ideologies.
24. Thus, the battle of Namibia has become a decisive chapter in the vast and many-sided struggle being waged by the United Nations for a lasting and just peace through the liberation of mankind and the transformation of society.
25. The obstinate denial by Pretoria of independence for Namibia is governed by a deliberate policy designed to liquidate SWAPO; what is sought is to destroy the national liberation movement so as to disarm the Namibian people politically and thus deprive its possible future independence of any content. An attempt is being made to replace a genuine process of self-determination by a formal autonomy which would only cover-up the prolongation of colonial domination.
26. Namibia will not be truly independent unless it wins its sovereignty and its cultural and political identity at the same time, and unless it acquires sufficient strength to resist the might of its racist neighbour. Namibia will not be ultimately liberated unless we can contain the excesses of Pretoria and destroy its deep root, which is the *apartheid* régime.
27. We have often repeated from this rostrum that the defiant attitude of South Africa is possible because of the network of alliances which sustains it and which, regrettably, is not only an anachronism but also a symptom and a portent.
28. The complicity that South Africa enjoys reflects a rebirth of strategies of political and military domination which refuse to disappear from certain modern societies and even attempt to prevail. We must be on guard against the establishment of subregional Powers, endowed with a high aggressive capacity, which sow terror and impose their law on weaker countries.
29. Those bastions of conservatism wage ideological crusades, on their own behalf or on behalf of others, hiding behind extraordinary justifications such as pre-emptive attack and the alleged legitimacy of repression, which perpetuates oligarchical régimes and eliminates expectations of social change.
30. Theses and propaganda which attempt to reduce revolutionary movements in the third world to mere conspiracies or mechanical reflections of the confrontation between super-Powers are therefore inadmissible. Each people has its own history, its own political tradition, its own reasons to fight and its own means to alter its form of government and social organization. To deny this would be tantamount to claiming absurdly that history is standing still.
31. The defence against invasions from Pretoria in southern Africa deserves the solidarity of all free peoples. To that extent all those of us who adhere in

good faith to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations are morally front-line States.

32. In the case of Namibia neutrality is impossible. To act as though the parties to the conflict were equals is absurd, since one is an aggressive Power and the other is a repressed community. The only course compatible with reason and justice is the one embodied in various resolutions of this Organization, namely, unrestricted support by the international community, including military assistance for SWAPO and the States of the region, so as to make them capable of defending their sovereignty and territorial integrity.

33. Mexico, together with a clear majority of States members of the Security Council, has voted and will continue to vote in favour of draft resolutions which, in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter, prescribe political, economic and military sanctions against the obdurate Pretoria régime.

34. This emergency special session is of particular importance in that it represents a reaction from the international community against the systematic blocking practised by a small minority of its members. It represents a supreme effort to make the system democratic and to replace, by means of collective action and in accordance with the letter and the spirit of the Charter of the United Nations, the enforcement measures which the Security Council has found itself unable to adopt. In this as in no other case it is legitimate for the General Assembly to exercise its mandate for the maintenance of international peace and security.

35. In southern Africa, in the Middle East and in Central America the immediate future of human freedom is at stake. The options are clear: on the one hand, open or covert intervention by the Powers which is prolonging conditions of subjection, and, on the other, the struggle of insurgent peoples who are seeking, by various means, a future of justice and independence.

36. We must prevent, because it is contrary to our fundamental principles, the export and spread of an arms race aimed at countering the struggle for social change in southern Africa, in the Middle East and in Central America.

37. We must reject the imposition of hegemonic solutions that ignore the interests and aspirations of the peoples in southern Africa, in the Middle East and in Central America.

38. We must prevent a resurgent bipolarism from spreading to the developing countries and ultimately undermining their sovereignty for the sake of a global dispute which would distort their internal struggles. On the contrary, we must safeguard the principles of the Charter and of non-alignment, in southern Africa, in the Middle East and in central America.

39. We must find rational and just solutions to the ever more critical problems of our time, analysing their true nature, their historical causes and their true dimensions so as to find in each case the way to a negotiated solution in southern Africa, in the Middle East and in Central America.

40. Aware of its responsibility as a member of the international community, Mexico is committed to seeking political means based on justice, which would

avoid any kind of intervention and allow peoples to determine by themselves their destiny and their place in history.

41. Mr. KAMANDA WA KAMANDA (Zaire) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, on behalf of the delegation of Zaire and on my own behalf, I should like to tell you how satisfied and pleased I am to see you presiding over this eighth emergency special session of the General Assembly, devoted to the question of Namibia.

42. The statesmanlike qualities and those of a seasoned diplomat, which you displayed during the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly, and particularly during the consultations in connection with the initiation of global negotiations, and the interest which you and your country have displayed in the legitimate concerns of the third world give us every reason to believe that the work of this session will be guided and led with equal measures of lucidity and wisdom, sureness of touch and firmness, experience and competence, first of all, of course, to serve the interests of Namibia and, secondly, to maintain a climate of trust in international relations.

43. I should also like to take this opportunity to convey to Mr. Kurt Waldheim, the Secretary-General of the United Nations our deep appreciation for the noteworthy efforts which he has constantly made in the service of the Namibian cause in particular and that of decolonization in general. Likewise, I should like to pay a tribute to the United Nations Council for Namibia and particularly to Mr. Paul Lusaka for the useful work which he has performed in order to promote the independence of Namibia.

44. Everyone is aware that the memorandum submitted as an annex to document A/ES-8/3, dated 2 September 1981 is a valuable contribution to familiarizing oneself with the complex background of the question of Namibia.

45. We have come together today to deal with the question of Namibia. Yes, indeed, that question will be the subject discussed at this emergency special session of the General Assembly because the Security Council, or rather, some of its permanent members, during the debate from 21 to 30 April 1981, were not persuaded, or did not see fit to admit the following points. First, that the situation created by South Africa in Namibia deriving from the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa, the denial of the inalienable and fundamental rights of the Namibian people, the savage repression of the African populations and the repeated acts of aggression against neighbouring States in that region, threatens international peace and security. Secondly, that the imposition of mandatory sanctions, particularly those specified in Chapter VII of the Charter, were justified or that they were the most appropriate course to take. Thirdly, that Security Council resolution 435 (1978), endorsing a plan for the settlement of the Namibian issue, was the only valid basis for a negotiated settlement of the Namibian question which would be internationally acceptable.

46. It was thus that the Security Council, faced with the triple veto cast by certain permanent members, was not in a position fully to shoulder its responsibilities in accordance with the unanimous request of the non-aligned and African countries.

47. The urgent nature of this problem, which fully warrants the holding of this emergency special session, is underscored because the impasse in the Security Council has caused the international community to wonder what should be done specifically in view of the increased tension in southern Africa.

48. The International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa, held in Paris from 20 to 27 May 1981, which was attended by all categories of vital forces throughout the world, produced a unanimous international consensus on the four following points: first, the universal condemnation of *apartheid* as a crime against mankind, human dignity and moral conscience, and the illegal occupation of Namibia; secondly, the conviction that the situation created by South Africa in southern Africa threatens international peace and security and causes instability in that region; thirdly, the conviction that the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa, the denial of the rights of the people of Namibia, the repeated acts of aggression from occupied Namibia against neighbouring States, the persistence and the expansion of the policy of *apartheid* can only prevent the development of harmonious relations, both inside and outside South Africa and Namibia; fourthly and finally, the need for mandatory sanctions to be universally applied against South Africa, in view of its illegal occupation of Namibia and its blind and stubborn desire to perpetuate and extend the policy of *apartheid*, and given the serious consequences involved in the situation created by South African aggression against neighbouring States in southern Africa, in other words, in view of the insolent and persistent defiance of the United Nations and the international community.

49. May I recall that in resolution 290 (IV), which deals with the essentials of peace, the General Assembly:

“1. *Declares* that the Charter of the United Nations, the most solemn pact of peace in history, lays down basic principles necessary for an enduring peace; that disregard of these principles is primarily responsible for the continuance of international tension; and that it is urgently necessary for all Members to act in accordance with these principles in the spirit of co-operation on which the United Nations was founded;

“*Calls upon every nation*

“2. *To refrain* from threatening or using force contrary to the Charter;

“3. *To refrain* from any threats or acts, direct or indirect, aimed at impairing the freedom, independence or integrity of any State, or at... subverting the will of the people in any State;

“4. *To carry out* in good faith its international agreements;

“*Calls upon every Member*

“9. *To participate* fully in all the work of the United Nations;

“*Calls upon every nation*

“11. ... to co-operate in supporting United Nations efforts to resolve outstanding problems;

“...”.

None of this is in any way respected by the racist, minority, illegal régime in Pretoria.

50. In resolution 377 A (V), the General Assembly recognizes that the first two stated purposes of the United Nations enunciated in the Charter are as follows:

“To maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace”, and

“To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace”.

51. All of the actions of the racist Pretoria régime in South Africa, in Namibia and in southern Africa, run counter to those proclaimed purposes of the Charter of the United Nations.

52. In its resolution 380 (V), the General Assembly

“1. *Solemnly* reaffirms that, whatever the weapons used, any aggression, whether committed openly, or by fomenting civil strife in the interest of a foreign Power, or otherwise, is the gravest of all crimes against peace and security throughout the world;”.

53. The Pretoria régime has openly and deliberately violated and continues to violate all the provisions of the resolutions to which I have just referred, and all the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, in southern Africa, in South Africa itself, and in Namibia.

54. Under the circumstances, what else is needed to convince those who are sceptical that a threat to international peace and security is inherent in the situation created by South Africa in Namibia and southern Africa?

55. As is implicitly and properly recognized in the statement made by the spokesman of the 10 countries of the European Community [4th meeting], South Africa is becoming further and further removed from the positions of the United Nations and the international community on Namibia.

56. It is true that, after having contributed to the failure of the talks in Geneva by reopening the issue of what appeared to be its original adherence to Security Council resolution 435 (1978), South Africa and its Administrator General, within the Territory of Namibia itself, according to the spokesman of the 10 countries of the European Community, took negative and retrograde steps such as conscription, the recent expansion of the powers of the so-called Council of Ministers and the two-tier elections, which are not covered by United Nations resolutions.

57. The spokesman of the Community went on to recognize that those steps helped to foster division, increasing tension within the Territory, and were not

in keeping with the process of finding an internationally acceptable solution to the question of Namibia.

58. Everything therefore goes to show that, instead of growing closer to the international community and the United Nations, South Africa intends to continue its acts of defiance and to hold itself aloof from any contribution to the implementation of the pertinent resolutions of the United Nations on Namibia.

59. It is time for all the nations of the world to draw the logical and practical conclusions from the universal condemnation of the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa, because South Africa's Mandate over Namibia was ended in 1966 and, since then, the Security Council has confirmed the illegality of Namibia's occupation by South Africa. We should therefore draw the logical conclusions from the universal condemnation of the illegal exploitation and pillage of the resources of Namibia as well as from the universal condemnation of *apartheid* as a crime against humanity and the dignity of the human person. That is why we place this eighth emergency special session under the symbol of union for peace: peace in Namibia, through the recognition of the sacred right of the Namibian people to freedom, self-determination and independence, the withdrawal of the South African forces of occupation and the organization of free and democratic elections under the control of the United Nations; peace in southern Africa, through the termination of South Africa's unjustified aggression against neighbouring States; and peace in the world, through the rigorous application without modification or impediment of Security Council resolution 435 (1978)—that is, by having all parties, including South Africa and its sympathizers, adhere to the spirit and letter of that important resolution, the initiative for which, moreover, was not African.

60. It is important to understand that, whatever stage we have reached in the negotiations on settlement of the Namibian question, the imposition of conditions that would be tantamount to legitimizing the illegal occupation of Namibia, that would seem to ask Africans and Africa—the victims of the Pretoria régime—to acquiesce in humiliating concessions to South Africa, the aggressor Power and illegal occupier, is redolent of a policy not aimed at an effective outcome and is doomed to failure because it would be ill-inspired.

61. Approaches that give the definite impression that we are trying to accommodate South Africa in the hope that it will result in the end of the illegal occupation of Namibia, the withdrawal of South African troops, the swift achievement of independence by the Territory, and, undoubtedly, very shortly, the abolition of *apartheid* are hardly convincing. Such approaches are responsible for South Africa's intransigence and the developments that it causes. We reject any approach that would tend to give a privileged place to South Africa in the negotiations on a settlement of the Namibian question by introducing factors and elements not germane to the issue that might distort the substance and nature of the problem, which is the accession of the people of Namibia to independence in accordance with the relevant resolutions and principles of the United Nations and the withdrawal of the occupying troops and the illegal South African administration.

62. No one can harbour any illusions that such approaches are fraught with very undesirable consequences for southern Africa. The honour and dignity of Africa are gravely compromised by the desire for supremacy inherent in the humiliating policy of *apartheid* of South Africa, the illegal occupation of Namibia by the white racists of Pretoria, and the hesitation and tergiversation of those who are in a position to exercise effective pressure on the Pretoria régime because of the enormous influence they have on that régime.

63. To promote legitimately conditions conducive to a negotiated settlement of this problem, which we are all devoted to, does not mean that, on the pretext of accommodation, we should pamper a régime whose policy has been universally condemned.

64. We are convinced that the five members of the Western contact group need, or can learn a great deal from, the firm attitude of the international community in order to improve if not strengthen their own position in negotiations with South Africa. The problem is to create conditions conducive to the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) for the rapid accession of Namibia to independence, while respecting its territorial integrity, and not to strengthen that resolution.

65. The delegation of Zaire considers that this emergency special session must reaffirm the United Nations responsibility for Namibia and the validity of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) as the sole basis for a negotiated settlement of the Namibian question. It should call upon all Member States to demonstrate adequate political will for the implementation of that resolution, invite the international community to apply effective sanctions against South Africa and give new guidelines on the best way to deal with the snags and obstacles that have been placed in the way of the implementation of the United Nations' plan for Namibia in order to speed up the accession of the Territory to independence. The credit and authority of the United Nations are at stake.

66. Undoubtedly, it would be timely here to remind the permanent members of the Security Council of the terms of paragraph 10 of General Assembly resolution 290 (IV), which calls upon them to exercise restraint in the use of the veto in order to make the Security Council a more effective instrument for maintaining peace.

67. By hoping to silence the patriots of SWAPO who are struggling for the independence of their country and, by refusing the dialogue which was proposed by the United Nations and which should, as was the case in Zimbabwe, lead the peoples of Namibia to self-determination and provide a sound political basis that would guarantee peace, understanding, progress and harmony in the country, the South African racists are making a miscalculation that may well lead them where they themselves do not wish to venture and where in any case we do not wish to follow.

68. That is why the international community should vigorously condemn the stubbornness of the South African racists and help the African nationalists who are fighting under the SWAPO banner and the African States in that region to rebuff the repeated assaults of the South African forces.

69. To that end the Republic of Zaire, which is gravely concerned by the situation at present prevailing in the People's Republic of Angola as a result of the South African aggression, has condemned and continues to condemn vehemently the barbaric acts of violence and terrorism of South Africa, which bases its arrogance on the support it continues to enjoy from certain States Members of the United Nations for which such a flagrant violation of the principles of non-aggression and respect for the territorial integrity of a sovereign State cannot have gone unnoticed.

70. Not content with illegally occupying Namibian territory and employing force to perpetuate its domination over that Territory, thus trampling underfoot all the pertinent resolutions of the United Nations, the retrograde régime of Pretoria has made itself notorious for some time as a result of its savage acts of aggression perpetrated against front-line countries such as Angola, Mozambique, Zambia and Botswana.

71. The Republic of Zaire calls on world public opinion and particularly those who sympathize with the racist régime of Pretoria to request the latter to put an end to its massacres and to evacuate immediately the Angolan territory which it occupies.

72. The Republic of Zaire considers the aggression to be a further delaying tactic on the part of South Africa, aimed at thwarting the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), and reiterates its support for the United Nations plan for settlement of the Namibian question.

73. Dedicated as it is to the right of peoples to self-determination and independence, Zaire reaffirms its total support for and complete solidarity with the Namibian people organized under the banner of SWAPO, as well as with all our brother States in that region who have been victims of the criminal acts of the anachronistic régime of Pretoria, and it rejects the so-called internal settlement of the Namibian question.

74. It should be recalled that, according to paragraph I of resolution 377 A (V), the General Assembly resolved that.

“if the Security Council, because of lack of unanimity of the permanent members, fails to exercise its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security in any case where there appears to be a threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression, 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”.

75. In order to respond to the expectations of millions of human beings who have placed such great hopes in this session, it is my hope that this eighth emergency special session will recommend Member States to take effective and comprehensive measures to ensure the complete isolation of South Africa and to force that country to withdraw from Namibia, pursuant to the pertinent resolutions of the United Nations.

76. Mr. PIZA ESCALANTE (Costa Rica) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. President, when you visited my country last July, a reporter asked you whether the University for Peace did not sound utopian to you. You replied that what may seem utopian today could be and frequently is tangible reality tomorrow. When referring to the present utopia of peace, you recalled the recent utopia of the United Nations which, not long ago, only a few visionaries dared to foresee, and the old utopia of decolonization which has, however, in a few years, become a reality—precarious perhaps but full of promise for almost two thirds of the present Members of the Organization.

77. What is interesting, and that is why I am mentioning it, is that decolonization came into being, not through the destructive force of arms, but through the creative power of words; millions of words are uttered here, and for many people they are wasted, but they have done more to change the course of history in a few years than the countless wars and petty manoeuvres of many centuries of misunderstood international politics. Therefore it is not superfluous for us to hold this emergency special session and for us to raise our voice once again to give support and hope to the heroic people of Namibia who are suffering under the most inhuman and absurd type of colonialism, to repudiate and warn the South African régime which imposes it and profits from it, and to demand that those, particularly among the members of the Security Council, who have in their hands the legal and material means to put an end to it to do so, on behalf not only of the sacred right of people to independence and freedom or the sacred right of men to basic freedoms and rights, but also on behalf of peace, the only true peace, which is not the peace of the dead, founded on oppression, but the peace of the living, founded on freedom and justice.

78. My small country, which has committed itself for ever to uphold and fight for peace, freedom and justice, cannot—nor does it wish to—stand aloof from the effort being made by the international community for peace, freedom and justice for the people of Namibia, that corner of Africa whose tragedy has become the conscience of mankind.

79. Costa Rica, lacking other means, offers the people of Namibia the support of its voice and of its vote. For that very reason, my delegation regrets the decision—mistaken, in our opinion—whereby a majority of members of the Assembly rejected the credentials of the representatives of the Government of South Africa. We regret that decision because the imposition on one of the States Members of the United Nations of a sanction for which there is no provision, through the subterfuge of credentials, invalidates any substantive resolutions that may be adopted. We also regret the decision because, by denying the Government responsible for the situation its right to be heard and defend itself, the value and prestige of impartiality are diminished. But we regret it, above all, because the exclusion of the party directly to blame for the situation detracts from the efficacy of our own condemnation. My delegation respects that decision, although we regret that it has prevented us from seeing seated here, and listening to our rejection and demands, the representatives of that régime which not only has been constantly trampling

underfoot the most sacred rights of a people and of each of the human beings who constitute it, but has betrayed the confidence of the international community that once granted it a simple Mandate of administration over Namibia, and which, later, when that international community revoked the Mandate, turned into a wayward rebel, appropriating to itself a right it never had, by means of blackmail, the most execrable of crimes because it does not even involve the courage of taking a risk as criminals normally do.

80. In any case, my delegation wishes to place on record that, without prejudice to the value which statements made here and in other international forums may have, it considers it more than high time for the United Nations, and especially its most powerful Members—those who have the legal and material means to do so—to impose more concrete and effective measures on the Government of South Africa to compel it to comply with the reiterated decisions of the General Assembly, the Security Council and the International Court of Justice itself, which very clearly established the right of the people of Namibia to its independence and self-determination by means of free elections under United Nations supervision, as well as the illegality of South Africa's occupation of that Territory and Pretoria's obligation to put an end to that occupation, which includes Walvis Bay.

81. The purpose of our appeal to the powerful States, especially to the permanent members of the Security Council, is twofold: first, to request that the Security Council itself adopt the clear resolutions needed for the effective application and completion of Council resolution 435 (1978), and to implement the many General Assembly resolutions—the general ones such as the classic Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples [*resolution 1514 (XV)*] as well as the ones relating specifically to the question of Namibia—without interposing reticent objections which only tend unwarrantedly to restrain United Nations action, or vetoes, which, under whatever pretext, only paralyse any effective action and hamper achievement of the fundamental purpose on which all States Members affirm their agreement.

82. My delegation reiterates its position that whatever measures the Security Council might take could and should include the collective use of force, with the understanding that collective action in matters such as these, which are outside the sphere of internal affairs of States and which are clearly provided for under the Charter of the United Nations, do not constitute interference.

83. The other purpose of our appeal is to call on those powerful States and on all States Members of the United Nations not to continue incurring, whether by omission or commission, the very grave responsibility of undermining the initiatives of the organized international community by maintaining, economic, social, cultural or political relations with the Pretoria régime and thus endorsing—if not directly, by implication—the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa, with all its consequences of imposing a racist and criminal régime on the Namibian people, and even of serving as a basis and pretext for acts of aggression against other States, the most recent of which was the

invasion of Angola, condemned by the entire international community but, regrettably, tolerated by the Security Council when it was paralyzed by the inexcusable exercise of a veto.

84. In 1978 the ninth special session of the General Assembly was devoted to Namibia; that same year, the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia was endorsed in Security Council resolution 435 (1978). There were reasons for a glimmer of hope that at last South Africa had realized that it could not continue to defy the overwhelming opinion of the international community—which had stressed the impossibility of South Africa's continued illegal occupation of the Territory of Namibia—and that its senior officials, as well as the representatives of the United Nations Council for Namibia, OAU and SWAPO, had accepted the proposals of the five Western members of the Security Council, subsequently to be called the Western contact group, whose initiatives had been formulated into a viable and fair plan in order for Namibia finally to obtain its independence peacefully by expressing its self-determination in free elections under United Nations supervision.

85. There was then some optimism that at last, on the date indicated in the United Nations plan, Namibia would become a free, independent and sovereign State whose people would exercise those attributes of self-determination and sovereignty over their entire territory, including Walvis Bay and the off-shore islands which belong to Namibia under international law.

86. It was with disappointment and concern that we saw how the African States, through the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of OAU which was held at Nairobi in June, were forced to request the convening of this emergency special session. Costa Rica expressly supported that request.

87. My delegation wishes to place clearly on record once again that the independence and self-determination of Namibia, by right, are the sole concern of the United Nations, through the authority of the United Nations Council for Namibia, the General Assembly, the Security Council, as well as OAU, SWAPO and, of course, the Namibian people itself, which is entitled freely to elect its own political, economic and social system, with due respect, naturally, for the Charter of the United Nations, international law, human rights and the principles of the democratic system.

88. Costa Rica considers it high time for law, reason and justice to prevail in Namibia.

89. More than three and a half years ago, when I became the Permanent Representative of Costa Rica to the United Nations, I set myself the duty of not offering congratulations to anyone because it only seemed a waste of precious time. Since we used to congratulate everybody—even before we knew whether or not a President would be a good one or not—in the end we did not congratulate anybody sincerely. However, since this is not the first but the last opportunity for me to address the Assembly under your presidency, Sir, I believe I am not violating the spirit of my crusade against congratulations when I express today my complete satisfaction with the way

you have discharged your duties as President of the General Assembly, my sincere respect for your ability and the masterful way in which you have been guiding our work for a year, and my profound gratitude for your friendship to me personally and to my country, which you honoured with a visit of a few days that were memorable for all Costa Ricans, who, furthermore, have indissoluble ties with your country.

90. Mr. CONTEH (Sierra Leone): Mr. President, decidedly, there is a certain significance and symbolism in the fact that you are presiding over this particular session of the General Assembly. You represent a country which experienced the traumas and devastation of wars and emerged from that experience to become a positive architect for peace today in our troubled world. Also, your country is a sponsor of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), embodying the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, which, regrettably, is beset today by deliberate and ill-advised moves from certain quarters to undermine it.

91. Above all, Sir, your personal qualities of leadership, which ensure the success of the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly, and your tireless efforts in the cause of peace, equity and justice—all combine to imbue us with confidence that you will guide the deliberations of this session to a successful conclusion.

92. For the eighth time the General Assembly is meeting in an emergency special session, again, as in the past, to consider a matter of grave consequence to international peace and security.

93. Such an emergency special session is—if a reminder were needed—a device which was arrived at some 30 years ago in the seminal resolution 377 (V), adopted by the Assembly on 3 November 1950, commonly known as the “Uniting for peace” resolution. That resolution represents a bold, imaginative and constructive exercise to uphold and assert the relevance, vitality and, indeed, efficacy of the United Nations in the sphere of the maintenance of international peace and security when, as is the case in the present instance, the Security Council cannot, because of lack of unanimity among its permanent members, rise to the occasion in order to execute its primary, but not exclusive, responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security.

94. This time an emergency special session of the Assembly has been convened to consider the question of Namibia, in particular, the South African régime’s policies, practices and positions in relation to that Territory, and, above all, what measures the international community can take in view of those policies, practices and positions which have been adjudged by various organs and bodies of the United Nations, including its political and judicial organs, to be not only illegal and impermissible but also a clear and manifest threat to international peace and security and which, in fact, constitute in several particular aspects distinct breaches of the peace and acts of aggression.

95. It is the view of the Sierra Leone delegation that the circumstances which gave birth to the “Uniting for peace” resolution formula in 1950 are, in relation to South Africa in Namibia today, present in all their poignancy and are even more pressing.

96. Without doubt, the South African régime’s relationship with Namibia today not only poses a grave threat to international peace and security, which has in fact in several instances resulted in breaches of international peace and acts of naked and wanton aggression, but, above all, constitutes a calculated and continuing defiant challenge to the United Nations.

97. Today the entire region of southern Africa is beset by tension and insecurity created by the illegal occupation of Namibia by the South African régime, which has mounted and sustained a campaign of armed aggression and State terrorism not only against the Territory and inhabitants of Namibia, under the authentic leadership of SWAPO, but also against neighbouring territories, the latest victim of which is Angola.

98. For even as I speak here today, the South African régime’s terrorist forces operating from illegally occupied Namibia are wreaking carnage and destruction on human life and property deep inside Angolan territory. Even as we are gathered here, the South African régime is using massive force against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of a State Member of the Organization in clear and evident violation of the Charter, in indefensible violation of international law and, indeed, in despicable violation of all accepted norms of international behaviour and propriety.

99. The South African régime’s invasion of Angola is indeed a logical extension of its illegal presence and policies in occupied Namibia, inasmuch as that régime’s use of military force against the Namibian people, under the leadership of SWAPO, is tantamount to, and is in fact, an act of aggression against a foreign Territory and its people.

100. It is against this background that this session of the General Assembly should rise up to uphold and assert the paramountcy of the purpose of the United Nations, as stated in Article 1, paragraph 1, of the Charter of the United Nations:

“To maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace...”

101. According to the Charter scheme of things, paramount responsibility for achieving that cardinal purpose of the United Nations was vested in the Security Council. That responsibility, which is not exclusive, was predicated on unanimity among the permanent members of the Security Council, but today it has, regrettably, in practice become a sacrificial lamb on the altar of cold-war and power-bloc politics, resulting, to the dishonour of the United Nations and the chagrin of peace-loving peoples of the world, in passivity and inactivity on the part of the Security Council.

102. Also we are today witnessing again the emergence of this ugly spectre of overweening cold-war considerations, manifested recently in the exercise of the triple veto in the Security Council during its consideration of the Namibian question in April this year. That spectacle was nothing short of a shameful



abdication of the responsibility which the Charter vests in the Security Council and, in particular, in the permanent members thereof.

103. Indeed, to the consternation and shock of many, that progressive abdication of responsibility was more lately, in fact only a few weeks ago, given a new twist and an ominous thrust when, in the face of a clear, manifest and incontestable breach of international peace and security, in an inexcusable act of aggression by the terrorist forces of the South African régime against the People's Republic of Angola, the rather capricious use of the veto by a certain member of the Security Council prevented even a mere condemnation of that dastardly act.

104. That was a shameful abdication of responsibility. Without doubt, that act, in conjunction with recent pronouncements from certain quarters, has given comfort and succour to the South African régime and has boosted its morale in its impetuous defiance of the international community. Fortunately, however, that callous and whimsical failure, caused by certain members of the Security Council, to discharge its responsibility, does not relieve Member States of their obligations or the United Nations of its responsibility and, in particular, does not deprive the General Assembly of its right or relieve it of its responsibility under the Charter.

105. That, we submit, is the *raison d'être* of this eighth emergency special session of the General Assembly, which invests it with particular significance.

106. Today at this session, the United Nations is at a veritable crossroads: whether the General Assembly can, in the face of the passivity and inactivity of the Security Council, born of meretricious arguments and extraneous considerations espoused by certain of its members, allow the South African régime to hold the rest of the international community to ransom by its persistent, stubborn and unreasonable refusal to co-operate in the implementation of the United Nations plan for independence for Namibia, or whether it will rise up to proclaim and assert the paramountcy of the purpose of the United Nations to maintain international peace and security.

107. In the view of the Government of Sierra Leone, the choice is clear and unmistakable: this session of the General Assembly not only must take the necessary measures to vindicate the relevance, vitality and integrity of the United Nations but must also act unequivocally and decisively to restore confidence in the international process and system and, above all, must act to uphold international peace and security; for the South African régime's continued illegal presence and policies in Namibia and its depredations in adjacent countries severely jeopardize international peace and security.

108. Mr. ABDULGHAFAR (Bahrain) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The Namibian question has acquired new dimensions on the international scene since the failure of the Geneva pre-implementation talks, held in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which provide for a specific plan for Namibia's accession to independence. World public opinion was convinced that the racist régime of South Africa was not serious in agreeing to negotiate with the interested parties in Geneva, because at that time

it had adopted a position characterized by arrogance, intransigence and a lack of seriousness. That behaviour on the part of the Pretoria racist régime gives us reason to reflect on the reasons why the racists are going back on a commitment that they had accepted under the settlement plan set forth in the aforesaid Security Council resolution. We think that the following are the most important reasons.

109. First, the bad faith of the Pretoria racist régime regarding the solution of the Namibian problem. In fact that régime consistently refuses to place the Territory of Namibia under the administration of the United Nations. Hence, in 1966, it was necessary for the General Assembly to adopt a decision placing Namibia under direct United Nations control.

110. Secondly, the absence of any political will on the part of certain Western countries allied to South Africa to settle the Namibian problem, since those countries exercised their right of veto in the Security Council in order to oppose all the resolutions designed to impose mandatory sanctions on South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter.

111. Thirdly, the attempt made by certain Western countries, in particular the United States, to link the solution of the Namibian problem with its political and military strategy in the region of southern Africa.

112. Lastly, reference has been made to the attempts made by certain parties to modify the settlement plan endorsed by Security Council resolution 435 (1978). If this is true, we must thwart those attempts and nip them in the bud so that that minority allied with the racist Pretoria régime realizes that the will of the international community is unanimous and irreversible, because the people of the world consider that the continued South African presence in Namibia is illegal, as the International Court of Justice stated in its advisory opinion on the subject handed down on 25 June 1971.<sup>1</sup>

113. The international community is concerned over the illegal practices of the Pretoria régime in the Territory of Namibia. That régime is manoeuvring to split that Territory into ethnic and tribal subdivisions, which is likely to generate suspicion and discord among the Namibian patriots who are united in their opposition to the conspiracy of South Africa. The racists are trying to impose the so-called "internal settlement plan" whereby power would be transferred to illegal elements that in no way represent the hopes and aspirations of the Namibian people—in defiance of the international community, which recognizes SWAPO as the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people.

114. We wish to emphasize the importance of the territorial unity of Namibia, because annexation by South Africa of any part of the Territory or of islands which are geographically part of it would also be an illegal act. We consider Walvis Bay to be an integral part of Namibia, in accordance with the resolutions of the United Nations, especially General Assembly resolution S-9/2 of 3 May 1978 and Security Council resolution 432 (1978) of 27 July 1978.

115. South African administration of Namibia does not confine itself to annexing the Territory by subdividing it on the basis of ethnic considerations into bantustans. It goes so far as to commit crimes against

patriots who resist the occupation of their country and the plunder of their country's wealth and natural resources by the white minority occupying forces. Such practices and others similar used by Israel in the occupied Arab territories show us that the conduct of these two racist régimes is identical in its aim of suppressing the struggling peoples of Palestine and Namibia. There is no doubt that those illegal practices confirm the undeclared concerns of the two racist régimes which subconsciously realize that they have been set up in usurped territories that do not belong to them. Thus we are not surprised when one of the two racist régimes commits an act of aggression against a neighbouring State, bombing unarmed civilians, destroying schools and hospitals on the pretext of putting an end to terrorism. Terrorism has become an epithet which is deceitfully applied to liberation movements which are struggling to liberate their homeland from the occupiers. The racist Pretoria régime, when it launched its aggression against Angola approximately two weeks ago, invoked the same arguments and the same pretexts as a means of deceiving world public opinion which can no longer be deceived by such manoeuvres. Yet certain States, allies of the two racist régimes: Pretoria and Tel Aviv, in particular the United States speak of a need to put an end to terrorism, whereas it is those very States which supply the two régimes with the most deadly weapons which they use in their repeated death-dealing acts of aggression against neighbouring countries. It is these States which object to United Nations decisions calling for the withdrawal of those two régimes from Namibia and the occupied Arab territories.

116. The Namibian question can be solved only by the withdrawal of the occupying South African administration, so that Namibia can accede to total independence. We hope for the success of the concerted efforts of the international community in connection with the settlement plan endorsed by the resolutions of the Security Council, in particular, resolution 435 (1978).

117. Mr. ANDERSON (Australia): Since this may be my last opportunity to do so, let me at the outset, Sir, pay a tribute to the wisdom, skill and impartiality with which you as our President have guided our endeavours throughout the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly.

118. It is a clear measure of the mounting frustration and concern which the international community feels at the lack of progress on Namibia that we are now considering the question in an emergency special session.

119. There is no denying that the way towards the solution of specific international problems is often complex and laborious. In international politics, quick and easy solutions are rare and seldom lasting.

120. To build the foundations of a genuine, peaceful and lasting solution of the problems in Namibia, there must be perseverance as well as a real sense of co-operation, understanding and negotiating in good faith. These are qualities which the front-line and other African States and the Western contact group have demonstrated in dealing with the question of Namibia. I would pay a tribute here also to the clear assurances

given by SWAPO of its readiness to co-operate fully in the implementation of the United Nations plan.

121. Regrettably, however, the Government of South Africa has not displayed the same spirit of co-operation. At every turn, when there has seemed to be the prospect of a breakthrough, the South African Government has thrown up road-blocks. It has prevaricated, offering flimsy pretexts for evading the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). It is no wonder that South Africa's international isolation has increased and that its statements are almost universally regarded with deep distrust.

122. Although the international community has condemned the illegal presence of South Africa in Namibia and has on numerous occasions denounced South Africa's unilateral measures towards a so-called internal settlement in the Territory, South Africa has remained obdurate and inflexible.

123. Without rehearsing the many frustrations which have been encountered in trying to arrive at a lasting solution, we must recognize that, despite all the efforts which have been devoted to that task and despite hopes that the Western contact group may in the near future be able to announce a further initiative, no immediate resolution of the situation appears to be in prospect.

124. The statements we have thus far heard in this debate, many of them delivered by African Foreign Ministers, serve to underscore the depth of international concern on Namibia and the rising sense of anger at the continuing refusal of South Africa to enter serious negotiations. If South Africa persists in putting up barriers, it will only fuel the growing tensions in southern Africa. If it continues to reject the path to peace offered by resolution 435 (1978), it will face a growing tide of violence and bloodshed throughout the region.

125. Only when the illegal occupation in Namibia is brought to an end can southern Africa hope to experience peace and stability. The recent invasion of Angola is only the latest illustration of the continuing defiance by South Africa of international opinion. Australia rejects the claims of the South African Government that its incursions into Angola can be justified on the ground that it was engaged in pursuing SWAPO forces. We deplore and condemn this action, involving as it has the invasion and occupation of the sovereign territory of another State. For this there is not and cannot be any justification. We join with all those countries which have called for the immediate and total withdrawal of South African forces from Angola. Beyond this, we have noted and we deplore the increased military activity of South Africa against the front-line States in general. We urge the South African Government not to persist in such actions if it is serious about its professed desire for "peaceful coexistence" with neighbouring States in southern Africa.

126. Despite the many frustrations encountered in the efforts to bring about its implementation, Australia remains fully committed to the fundamental principles contained in Security Council resolution 435 (1978). Indeed, we have underlined that commitment through our participation in the United Nations Council for Namibia and 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, as well as by our undertaking to provide a contribution to the United Nations Transition Assistance Group. Many difficulties have been encountered in bringing about the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), but we must not allow South African defiance or South African evasion to divert us from the peaceful solution that is offered by the United Nations plan. Above all, we should not provide the South African Government with any pretext for breaking off negotiations altogether. To do so would only prolong the processes for achieving independence in Namibia. It would also mean an even longer and more destructive struggle for independence, with all the hardship and suffering that that would entail for the people of Namibia.

127. In the recent discussions centring on Namibia, both in the United Nations and elsewhere, much criticism has been levelled at the members of the Western contact group as though they, rather than South Africa, had walked away from Council resolution 435 (1978). Let us be clear about the facts. The commitment of the Western contact group to achieving a genuine and lasting independence in Namibia has not weakened. As was stated during the Ottawa Summit Meeting in July, the five Western countries of the contact group remain committed to resolution 435 (1978) and will continue to work purposefully towards its implementation. It is strange indeed that the five should be singled out for criticism because the intransigence of South Africa has prevented the implementation of resolution 435 (1978).

128. In brief, we have given full support to the efforts of the Western contact group and our support will continue. At the same time we have emphasized, not only in the United Nations but also in our bilateral contacts with the five, our commitment to resolution 435 (1978) and our opposition to any moves to impose an "internal settlement" on Namibia.

129. If the way forward is to be peaceful, then South Africa must agree to a timetable for implementation. It must not be allowed to evade this step any longer if the region is not to suffer further tension and violence. We commend the willingness of SWAPO, despite all the difficulties it has encountered, to support resolution 435 (1978). We say that because, even though we do not recognize the exclusive status which the General Assembly accords to SWAPO, we do recognize the vital role of SWAPO in Namibia and the importance of its undertaking to abide by freely contested elections there.

130. In conclusion, my delegation believes that the need for a solution to the Namibia problem is not only of the highest importance but also of the utmost urgency. It is our hope that the deliberations of the Assembly will make a major contribution to that end. At the end of this month there will be a meeting at Melbourne of the heads of Government of the Commonwealth. If by that time insufficient progress has been made towards a solution, it is also our hope that the Commonwealth Heads of Government may be able to support, encourage and supplement the efforts of this Assembly and of the Western contact group towards the achievement of a United Nations settlement, a settlement firmly and clearly based on Security

Council resolution 435 (1978), that will bring peace and stability to southern Africa.

131. Mr. OYONO (United Republic of Cameroon) (*interpretation from French*): First of all, I wish to state how pleased my delegation is at seeing you, Sir, presiding over the work of this eighth emergency special session of the General Assembly dedicated to the question of Namibia.

132. Your experience and the authority and wisdom with which you guided the work of the thirty-fifth session of the Assembly confirm this feeling. These great qualities that distinguish you will be of great help at this time when we are meeting to consider ways and means to enable the Namibian people finally and freely to exercise its right to self-determination and independence, and thus to put an end to the immense suffering imposed on its by South African colonialism and racism at a time when the aggravation of the situation in southern Africa and the power play create uncertainty regarding the very future of the Namibian people.

133. It is a pleasure for us to avail ourselves of this opportunity to reiterate our gratitude and admiration to the Secretary General, Mr. Kurt Waldheim, for his untiring activities and efforts to ensure the success of a peaceful settlement of the Namibian problem.

134. This emergency special session, as we know, is the result of the determination of the African States and the vast majority of the members of the international community to find a way of extricating the Namibian problem from the dangerous deadlock to which the racist Pretoria régime seeks to confine it by multiplying the pretexts and demands which become steadily more extravagant in order to avoid the best way in which to settle this question, namely, the international settlement that has been advocated.

135. However aberrant such conduct may appear in respect of the principles and practices of the United Nations and international law, it is disappointing that it is now given attention, and not the least attention at that, within this Organization. It follows that South Africa, benefiting from the lassitude in the Security Council on the part of certain Powers associated with it in the illegal exploitation of the natural resources of Namibia, is today more than ever determined to persevere in its policy of alienation of the fundamental aspirations of the Namibian people and of aggression against the front-line African States.

136. This sudden change, which has created concern in Africa and among the members of the Western contact group, at present constitutes, in Cameroon's opinion, the major obstacle to the implementation of the peaceful settlement plan for the Namibian problem decided on by the United Nations.

137. In our opinion, the triple veto cast during the series of Security Council meetings held last April on the question of this international Territory—meetings which were intended only to adopt enforcement measures to compel South Africa to cooperate with the United Nations in implementing Security Council resolution 435 (1978)—is an illustration of the attempts to confuse the issue of Namibia.

138. The problem of decolonization should be examined within the context of General Assembly

resolution 1514 (XV). However, for some today, this question has lost its objectivity and has become a key piece in the world political chess game, dominated by an East-West rivalry in which Africa in general and southern Africa in particular have become the prize.

139. This is a most dangerous development and the United Nations, which has primary responsibility for maintaining international peace and security as well as for safeguarding the sacred right of peoples to self-determination, should reverse the trend so as to preserve the credibility of the Organization.

140. In this respect, if it is true, as it has been recently affirmed, that the situation in southern Africa could become crucial in the definition of a code of conduct in international relations, then it seems to us that we should give priority consideration to the manner in which the Security Council, which has primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, is discharging this duty in the light of the provisions of the Charter.

141. It is fitting to wonder whether the exercise of the right of veto, as we now see it being practised by certain Powers, is not governed by reasons other than the maintenance of peace and harmony among nations and whether it is not, rather, intended to promote and consolidate the geo-strategic interests of the great Powers.

142. If the right of veto, conferred on the great Powers to serve the cause of peace and international security, is now perverted for purposes contrary to the essential mission of the Security Council, any attempt to define a code of conduct between States would be jeopardized. The evolution of the question of Namibia is particularly enlightening in that respect.

143. Here is a Territory which the General Assembly decided in 1966 to place under the direct authority of the United Nations and that decision has been confirmed repeatedly by the Security Council and the International Court of Justice and unanimously accepted by all nations, with the sole exception, of course, of the minority and racist Pretoria régime, which seeks to and does perpetuate its domination and its system of oppression.

144. The illegal presence of the South African administration in Namibia, despite the will to independence of the Namibian people and in defiance of many United Nations resolutions, is in itself a constant source of tension and violence in that region and a grave threat to international peace and security.

145. This situation is further aggravated by the designs of the disciples of *apartheid* to extend their brutal domination throughout all of southern Africa. That is why they are seeking to destabilize the African States of the region, against which they periodically organize terrorist raids, causing innumerable losses in human lives and gravely jeopardizing the sovereignty and economic development of those States.

146. Quite recently, with the impunity conferred on it by its geo-strategic position and its powerful alliances in a world now dominated by the cold war, South Africa even went so far as to send its army of mercenaries against Angola and to massacre civilians.

147. Cameroon firmly condemns that operation, the purpose of which is to destabilize Angola and divert the

vigilant attention of the international community from the rapid settlement of the Namibian problem. Our Assembly should not therefore allow itself to be distracted by such sinister manoeuvres but must rather call on South Africa immediately to withdraw its troops from Angola and Namibia, and it should not lose sight that the problem of Namibia must be considered in the context of a people subject to the barbarous oppression of a racist régime which calls for aid and assistance from the Organization, as have been promised for two decades.

148. Here we must once again emphasize our admiration for the courage, sense of responsibility and openness to dialogue which that people has shown in the struggle for the liberation of Namibia, waged under the leadership of SWAPO, its sole and authentic representative.

149. It is because of the desire for peace and the spirit of conciliation of SWAPO that the Western contact group was able in 1978 to take the initiative of inducing all the parties concerned to agree to a plan for the peaceful settlement of that conflict.

150. Despite the shortcomings and the ambiguities of that plan, which gave South Africa a vital role in the process of the decolonization of Namibia, even though its presence had been declared illegal, we finally accepted Security Council resolution 435 (1978) as a last resort, placing our trust in the status of its sponsors and the influence of their relations with South Africa.

151. It is surprising that its rejection by Pretoria was sufficient to make those same Powers, which had worked unstintingly to obtain support from the entire international community for resolution 435 (1978), suddenly realize that there had been an escalation in Pretoria's demands.

152. That euphemism actually shows the desire of the Western contact group to amend its own settlement plan and to adapt it to the liking of the racist Pretoria régime. That is an unfortunate precedent for the Organization, a breach in the mutual trust which should be the basis of international relations, and a violation of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV).

153. Our perception of self-determination, as defined in resolution 1514 (XV), implies that every people is able freely to choose its own system of Government and its institutions. We know, because we have received a guarantee from SWAPO, that the Namibian people will exercise its right to independence in compliance with these purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations which are already inspiring their national liberation struggle.

154. The Namibian cause, which is primarily the decisive battle being waged by an entire people to be free from one of the most archaic, most brutal and most perverse forms of oppression, fits the context of the purposes and principles of the Charter. That is why that cause is a just one and why the United Nations have espoused it since its creation, and justifies the efforts unceasingly made by the world community to enable the Namibian people freely to exercise its right to self-determination and independence.

155. All those efforts would be to no avail if the great Powers failed resolutely to support and co-operate

fully in the implementation of the settlement plan for Namibia as defined and endorsed by Security Council resolution 435 (1978). That is why we are reiterating here the urgent appeal recently made by Mr. Ahmadou Ahidjo, the President of the United Republic of Cameroon, to the great Powers members of the contact group, that they ensure the success of the plan for which they have special responsibilities.

156. At the present stage, support for Security Council resolution 435 (1978) must be made specific not only by declarations of principle but also by the adoption of enforcement measures, particularly those advocated in the Charter, so as to compel South Africa finally to co-operate with the United Nations in a peaceful and internationally acceptable settlement of the Namibian question.

157. Mr. SALIM (United Republic of Tanzania): Mr. President, my delegation and I are very gratified to see you presiding over this important emergency special session of the General Assembly dealing with an issue which is so vital to the peace and security of our region. We know of your remarkable talents, which have been amply displayed since you assumed the presidency of the thirty-fifth session of the Assembly. Above all, we are very conscious of your country's commitment in search of a negotiated solution to the problem of Namibia and of your own demonstrated personal commitment in support of the efforts towards bringing to an end South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia and assuring the exercise by the Namibian people of their inalienable right to self-determination and independence.

158. In this connection, I recall the clear and unequivocal statement which you made in my country's capital, Dar-es-Salaam, last month when we had the pleasure and the honour of receiving you as our guest. We were indeed inspired by your unambiguous call for the scrupulous implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) on Namibia, as we were no less inspired by your visit to our country. We have every reason to believe that under your wise and able stewardship the Assembly will assume its responsibilities as regards this question.

159. It is very difficult to add to the clear and eloquent contributions that have been made in the course of this debate by many of my outstanding colleagues, both African and non-African, who have preceded me. Their statements have clearly confirmed the global consensus which exists on the part of the international community in the pursuit of freedom and justice for the Namibian people. The current Chairman of the Council of Ministers of OAU, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Kenya, my colleague and brother, Mr. Robert Ouko, when opening the debate on this item [*3rd meeting*], made Africa's position crystal-clear. The other African Ministers and African representatives who have followed him have reinforced our collective position. I wish to echo the positions that have been stated by those personalities. It would therefore be pointless for me to belabour the points to which they have already succinctly alluded. If, therefore, I am speaking at this juncture, it is only to underscore our concern at, and preoccupation with, what is undeniably a deteriorating situation in southern Africa brought about by South Africa's intransigence and calculated defiance of this Organi-

zation as well as by the systematic flouting of the will of the Namibian people.

160. I have referred to the global consensus on this question. What are the elements which have combined to make that consensus possible and which have in turn necessitated the convening of this emergency special session of the General Assembly. I submit that the following are incontrovertible facts.

161. First, 15 years after the termination of South Africa's Mandate over Namibia by the United Nations; 10 years after the International Court of Justice clearly proclaimed that South Africa's occupation of the Territory was illegal; five years after the adoption of Security Council resolution 385 (1976), calling for the withdrawal of South Africa from Namibia and the holding of free and fair elections under United Nations supervision and control; and three years after the adoption of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), South Africa has continued to occupy Namibia.

162. Secondly, the people of Namibia, under the leadership of its sole and authentic representative, SWAPO, have consistently struggled for the liberation of their country. They have done so against formidable odds considering the powerful repressive military machine that the South African régime has utilized in order to maintain its illegal occupation. In the process the people of Namibia have made and continue to make innumerable sacrifices for the cause of freedom and human dignity.

163. Thirdly, unable to stem completely the tide of liberation within Namibia, the South African racist régime has sought to internationalize the conflict through systematic acts of aggression against independent African States, and in particular against the People's Republic of Angola and the Republic of Zambia, using Namibia as a springboard for mounting its acts of aggression.

164. Fourthly, neither South Africa's acts of repression within Namibia nor its acts of aggression against African States have been able to eliminate the resistance of the Namibian people against the oppressors.

165. Fifthly, notwithstanding the acts of aggression, harassment and outright provocation which have now come to form an essential part of South Africa's policies and actions, SWAPO and the African States have never failed to pursue the path of negotiation, whenever and wherever possible, in order to find a peaceful solution to the problem of Namibia.

166. The world community as represented by the Organization is fully aware of those facts. That is why the support for SWAPO in its legitimate struggle is so universal—indeed as universal as the condemnation by the world community of South Africa's illegal occupation.

167. Yet mere condemnations of South Africa or mere expressions of support for the legitimacy of the struggle of the Namibian people under the leadership of SWAPO are not enough to bring about the desired change for Namibia. What has been lacking is concerted collective international action. And it is in pursuit of that objective in the wake of the unfortunate failure of the Security Council fully to assume its responsibilities as a guardian of international peace and security that the African States, supported by the

overwhelming majority of Members of the Organization have called for the convening of this emergency special session of the General Assembly.

168. Our hope—indeed our confident hope—is that the Assembly will take action geared to promote the cause of peace and justice in Namibia and southern Africa as a whole. In the consideration of those measures it is our hope that the General Assembly will take into account the following factors and their implications for international peace and security.

169. First, that even at this eleventh hour it is still possible to bring about the independence of Namibia through a negotiated solution, and that negotiation is not a one-way exercise but rather an undertaking that requires a commitment on the part of all concerned. In this connection, the commitment in support of a negotiated solution has been clearly forthcoming on the part of SWAPO, supported by independent Africa, but it has been clearly lacking on the part of the South African régime as manifested through its actions and policies. The road to negotiation therefore *a priori* requires that South Africa must be made to implement at the very least its own international undertakings. In this respect, it should not be forgotten that Security Council resolution 435 (1978) was not an arbitrary exercise. It was a product of prolonged negotiations in which the South African régime was consulted and its consent sought at every single step of the negotiations.

170. Secondly, that any prevarication with respect to the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) serves only to strengthen South Africa's intransigence and defiance.

171. Thirdly, failure on the part of the Organization and, in particular, on the part of those members of the Western contact group who, it should be stressed, were the authors of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), to exert the necessary pressure on South Africa only leads to further suffering, bloodshed and instability in southern Africa.

172. Fourthly, the immobilization of the Security Council when it is called upon to take measures commensurate with the requirements of the situation serves further to strengthen South Africa's defiance. Recent experience has clearly testified to that. Thus, the triple vetoes cast in the Council deliberations on the question of Namibia in April this year have unfortunately been interpreted by South Africa as a signal that it can continue to defy the will of the international community in the expectation that it will not be confronted with the option of punitive measures.

173. Fifthly, the world community, and in particular the five Western countries, have a solemn responsibility to impress upon South Africa, through their policies and actions, that its consistent aggression against independent African States will not be tolerated. Failure to do so can only have the worst repercussions for peace and security in the area, with international implications. In that respect, it is most unfortunate that in the light of a clear and unprovoked act of aggression committed by the South African régime against the People's Republic of Angola, an act of aggression which is still continuing, the Security Council was prevented from even con-

demning that régime because of the negative vote of the United States.

174. The members of the Assembly have an unprecedented opportunity to speak with one collective voice in favour of Namibian independence through scrupulous implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). We have the opportunity to make it clear to the South Africans that their defiance cannot be tolerated, that their acts of aggression against African States cannot be condoned and that collectively we are determined to see that freedom for Namibia is ensured, thus creating conditions conducive to peace, security and stability in southern Africa. We appeal in particular to the five Western countries to join the rest of the world community in support of those efforts.

175. In launching this appeal we wish in the first place to remind them, as we did in the Security Council, that Council resolution 435 (1978) is essentially a product of their own collective initiatives which SWAPO, supported by free Africa, has fully supported, making, in the process, a number of concessions in the interests of promoting a negotiated solution. We should also like to remind them of the history of the negotiating process in which the South African régime has tended to escalate its demands whenever a break through was considered imminent. Against the backdrop of reports concerning the need to strengthen Council resolution 435 (1978), it is pertinent to bear in mind the wise remarks made by the Permanent Representative of Sweden when he addressed the Assembly on 9 September. Mr. Thunborg had stated *inter alia*:

“The bottom line of South Africa's demands and conditions—which the Western contact group has tried in vain to determine in the course of three years of negotiations—plainly does not seem to exist. In the meantime, South Africa has evidently used the negotiation process for its own purposes, to cast doubts on the feasibility of the United Nations plan as adopted and to gain time for the reinforcement of its repressive grip on the Territory of Namibia as well as for attempts to destabilize Namibia's neighbours.” [6th meeting, para. 32.]

176. I should like to add only one or two remarks concerning those lucid observations, namely, that experience has clearly demonstrated that the South African régime has been consolidating its illegal occupation of the Territory and creating one *fait accompli* after another, in contravention of decisions of the Security Council and resolutions of the General Assembly. Furthermore, that the campaign for the destabilization of the front-line States has reached a new high as clearly manifested in the continuing aggression against the People's Republic of Angola, coming in the wake of further aggression committed against the People's Republic of Mozambique. Faced with those obstacles, SWAPO and the African States have no option but to intensify the struggle against South Africa's illegal occupation and to strive energetically for the defence of the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of the independent African States that are under constant attack.

177. In the meantime the Assembly, through its actions, can make a difference. We can help to put an end to the deteriorating situation in Namibia and

in southern Africa. We can act to put an end to South Africa's criminal acts of aggression against Angola. We can act, individually and collectively, to bring effective pressure to bear on the South African régime so that the will of this Organization is scrupulously adhered to.

178. Many of my colleagues who have preceded me have already pin-pointed the various measures which ought to be taken in order to secure our collective objective. We must continue to urge the Security Council to invoke the enforcement measures envisaged under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations. At the same time, however, individually and collectively, the States Members of the Organization can and should proceed with the imposition of those measures. To that end, the International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa, organized by the United Nations in Co-operation with OAU, which was held in Paris in May this year and over which I had the honour to preside, offers particular guidelines. As we therefore confront the challenges before us, it is the earnest hope of the Tanzanian delegation that Member States will pay special attention to those guidelines. In any case, for us in Africa our responsibilities are clear. We shall continue to support energetically the struggle of the heroic people of Namibia, under the leadership of the national liberation movement SWAPO.

179. Mrs. DORSET (Trinidad and Tobago): Mr. President, my delegation wishes to congratulate you on the excellent manner in which you have presided and continue to preside over the deliberations of the Assembly.

180. It is tragic that the General Assembly is meeting in this eighth emergency special session to testify to the fact that South Africa is an embarrassment to those who support it in the face of the opposition displayed by the majority of the international community.

181. I say this because Security Council resolution 435 (1978) embodies the proposals of the Western contact group for a peaceful plan leading to the independence of Namibia. Those proposals were considered to be the only internationally acceptable proposals, with both SWAPO and South Africa recognizing them as such. Since that plan was accepted by the international community, the world has been witness to the manoeuvres of the South African Government to delay implementation of the proposals and to keep the States Members of the United Nations talking while it attempts to consolidate its illegal presence in the Territory of Namibia.

182. Let me say this: the United Nations has been described by many cynics as a mere "talk shop" which achieves nothing. That view contributes to the Pretoria régime's behaving as though it can for ever continue to ignore the decisions of the Security Council and of the General Assembly.

183. However, my delegation dares to say that the Pretoria régime does so at its own peril. Pretoria would do well not to ignore this forum, which continues to offer a peaceful solution to the question of Namibia. It is clear that South Africa is not prepared to learn from history—not even the recent history of southern Africa, where the independent nation of Zimbabwe

testifies to the futility of ignoring the will of the majority of States Members of the United Nations.

184. The list of events surrounding this question from 1946 to the present time is well documented, and has been eloquently articulated in this and other forums. Consequently, there is no need for my delegation to rehearse what is already well known. It is our duty, however, to emphasize once again our total support for Security Council resolution 435 (1978). Continued failure by South Africa to implement the provisions of that resolution must lead to the full and effective application of measures under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations. It is the view of my delegation that the General Assembly must resist most vigorously any attempt to derogate from the terms of resolution 435 (1978) and reject any new pre-conditions for the holding of elections which South Africa may seek to impose through its agents, the puppet administration in Windhoek.

185. As is well known, the recent effort of the Security Council to condemn the aggression of South Africa against an independent neighbouring State was thwarted by the veto of a single permanent member of the Council. Much has been said about this turn of events, and Trinidad and Tobago can hardly find new descriptions of this action which would inspire the international community to hitherto untried methods of approach. Let me say clearly, for those who refuse to accept the fact, that independence for Namibia is inevitable.

186. The recent incursions into Angola by the South African forces are an international scandal. The territorial integrity of a sovereign nation has been violated, and a condemnation of that attack has been denied. Not too long ago, the Assembly voted overwhelmingly to condemn similar action elsewhere. Why the double standard, we ask. It is being said that there must be evenhandedness in this matter, but the events over the past year have clearly demonstrated that the United Nations is not dealing with a régime which has produced evidence of trustworthiness. Further, we ought not to be viewing the Namibian question purely and simply as an ideological struggle. Such a view would merely underscore a refusal to recognize the existence of a classic colonial situation and total insensitivity to the plight of the Namibian people, who are being denied their right to self-determination and independence. In any event, if global strategic considerations are paramount, it is very clear to the humblest observer that the strategies being employed to contain a so-called negative situation are the very ones that are likely to advance it. In other words, if I may be permitted a term more apt in other places, Western protagonists may very well score goals against themselves.

187. Attempts have been made to convince the world that SWAPO, the sole legitimate representative of the Namibian people, lacks support within Namibia. This is not a fact, and the United Nations must continue to recognize that organization as the legitimate representative of the people. On the other hand, the puppet régime in Windhoek has already begun to show signs of collapse and this will continue to be the case. Even now the cry for independence continues to be raised more stridently from within the borders of Namibia, while the South African régime mounts an army of

60,000 men through its controversial conscript law, in a serious act of genocide. As we have done in the past, my delegation wishes to point to the senseless wastage of human resources in southern Africa which the continued lunatic arrogance and obduracy of a white minority is perpetuating. Let us be reminded that the burden of caring for refugees imposed on the front-line States continues to have a dilatory effect on the development of those States, whose inhabitants, moreover, are denied their right to live in peace.

188. The opinion is being expressed increasingly in the mass media that the United Nations refuses to listen to South Africa or to threaten the Administration in that country fairly. What is more, the impartiality of the United Nations has been called into question because the majority of its Members refuse to condone the behaviour of South Africa, including the system of *apartheid* which is being imposed on the colonial Territory of Namibia. Perhaps we need to make the public more aware that South Africa's presence in Namibia is illegal. On 27 October 1966 the General Assembly, by its resolution 2145 (XXI) terminated the League of Nations Mandate previously exercised by South Africa over Namibia, and South West Africa came under the direct responsibility of the United Nations. On 19 May 1967 the General Assembly established the United Nations Council for Namibia [resolution 2248 (S-V)] with a mandate to administer the Territory until independence. The sole legal administering Power of the Territory is the United Nations Council for Namibia. Resolution 2145 (XXI) declared that South Africa had failed to fulfil its obligations in respect of the administration of the Mandated Territory and to ensure the moral and material well-being and security of the indigenous inhabitants of South West Africa. Today, under the illegal administration set up in Namibia, South Africa does not and cannot provide for the moral and material well-being and security of the Namibian people. The following excerpt from the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice concerning South Africa's presence in Namibia is clear. The Court has declared that

“the continued presence of South Africa in Namibia being illegal, South Africa is under obligation to withdraw its administration from Namibia immediately and thus put an end to its occupation in the Territory”.<sup>2</sup>

The Court also declared that

“the General Assembly of the United Nations is legally qualified to exercise the supervisory functions previously exercised by the League of Nations with regard to the administration of the Territory, and that the Union of South Africa is under an obligation to submit to supervision and control of the General Assembly and to render annual reports to it.”<sup>3</sup>

The former opinion was handed down 10 years ago, and up to today South Africa has not withdrawn its administration.

189. The illegal nature of South Africa's presence in Namibia cannot be overstressed and it is in this context that United Nations contacts with South Africa must be understood.

190. In the light of these facts, where must States Members of the United Nations stand on the issue? In my delegation's opinion, it behoves us all to stand unequivocally against South Africa's continued intransigence. Not only must our statements register this position, but no action should be taken by any member of this respectable community to indicate approval, tacit or otherwise, of South Africa's behaviour. The Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries has made its position clear on the question of Namibia. Trinidad and Tobago stands firmly with the Non-Aligned Movement on this matter and is confident that every member of our Movement recognizes the importance of tangible support for and solidarity with Namibia and the neighbouring States of Africa. It is not my delegation's intent to encourage confrontation in this body; nevertheless, we should like to state that we would consider it unfriendly for some, while professing abhorrence of the system of racism and *apartheid*, to continue to treat South Africa as a respectable trading partner.

191. South Africa continues to engage in armed attacks against neighbouring independent States. The United Nations, as the architect of peace, must continue to respond with all the weapons at its disposal. We view the Paris Declaration on Sanctions against South Africa<sup>4</sup> of May 1981 as a significant achievement on the route to eventual success of our endeavours. Meanwhile, we bear in mind the familiar words already recorded in history: “all men are created equal,” and we lend our efforts to the realization of this equality by the oppressed in Namibia. We recall also that not much more than 200 years ago this magnificent country in which the Organization is located and in which we are meeting today won its right to stand as a sovereign nation in the world community after its courageous war of independence. The people of Namibia are in pursuit of the same goal. None of those who have travelled this route should deny the struggling people of Namibia their support, as it lies within their capacity to provide the solution to the problems which persist. The provisions of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), to which the Western Powers gave paternity, must be implemented without prevarication.

192. In closing, my delegation wishes to reiterate its support for the untiring efforts of the Secretary-General, for the United Nations Council for Namibia, under the able leadership of Mr. Paul Lusaka, and for SWAPO, the sole legitimate representative of the Namibian people.

*Mr. Carias (Honduras), Vice-President, took the Chair.*

193. Mr. COUMBASSA (Guinea) (*interpretation from French*): I should like to begin by congratulating the President once again on the brilliant manner in which he has at all times guided the work of the General Assembly. Our delegation hopes that under the presidency of such an eminent diplomat this emergency special session on Namibia will adopt bold and constructive decisions whose implementation will lead the people of Namibia to full national sovereignty without any impediment.

194. The convening of this emergency special session devoted to the decolonization of Namibia



comes at a particularly grave time, when one considers the tragic situation in which the Namibians find themselves because of the refusal of the racist South African Government to comply with the decisions of the international community. This situation creates dangerous instability in southern Africa and is a constant threat to international peace and security.

195. The latest events relating to the question of Namibia confer a particular importance and an obvious urgency on this debate. They reveal to the international community that the time has come for it to re-examine its means of action so as to direct them towards more effective measures to hasten the accession of the Namibian people to genuine independence.

196. Indeed, the threshold of tolerance, even for the unconditional allies of South Africa, has now been passed. Trampling underfoot resolutions of both the Security Council and the General Assembly, the South African racist and terrorist Government is still illegally occupying Namibia and plundering and subjugating the Namibian people.

197. During the Security Council debate on the question of Namibia in April 1981, the delegation of Guinea, like many other speakers which preceded it, recalled that the persistence of the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa was a challenge which the international community had to take up.

198. Regrettably, during that session it was those who proclaim that they are in favour of democracy, human rights and humanism who openly gave the international community proof that they were the most faithful allies of the most blood-thirsty régime of our times by vetoing the draft resolution, which had been introduced by Africa and supported overwhelmingly by States Members of the Organization, calling for the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa.

199. Haven't the Western Powers, the allies of South Africa, by vetoing the adoption of the draft resolutions on comprehensive mandatory sanctions, thus chosen the Government of *apartheid* against all of Africa?

200. That triple veto was but the continuation of the pressures and the deals with led to the failure of the Geneva meeting, in addition to the customary perfidy of the Pretoria racists.

201. Today it is up to the international community to shoulder its responsibilities during this session. That is why we venture to hope that countries genuinely supporting the liberation struggle of African peoples will not fail to give their backing to the adoption and strict application of mandatory economic sanctions against the racist Government of Pretoria.

202. Having learned the hard way from the successive failures of the Geneva meeting and of the Security Council on the question of Namibia, the African countries, at the eighteenth ordinary session of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of OAU, held at Nairobi in June, called for the convening of this emergency special session of the General Assembly, despite the delaying tactics of South Africa and its allies, so that the will of the vast majority of the international community might once again be clearly and solemnly expressed, even if this were to

displease those who had mobilized their infernal machines for diversion so as to lessen its impact.

203. The question of Namibia, of which the United Nations has been seized for 35 years, is well known to all. We simply wish to recall some of the events in the lengthy process set in motion to seek a just and lasting solution to this painful problem which still torments our continent.

204. Indeed, during this long period both the Security Council and the General Assembly, as well as the International Court of Justice, have repeatedly pronounced themselves on this question. Since the adoption of General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966, the positions taken by the main organs of the Organization are of particular significance, because, legally, the international community has put an end to the South African Mandate over Namibia and has transferred the administration of the Territory to the United Nations Council for Namibia. The rejection of this decision and the blatant scorn of Pretoria for all subsequent resolutions have placed the South African Government in a state of permanent rebellion and defiance in respect of the international community.

205. In order to find solutions for the Namibian question, the international community has taken the following decisions, among others.

206. First, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960 the inalienable right of the Namibian people to self-determination, freedom and national independence has been recognized and endorsed. Nevertheless, South Africa has opposed the exercise of that inalienable right in Namibia.

207. Secondly, since the adoption of resolution 2145 (XXI), to which we have already referred, Namibia and its inhabitants have been the direct responsibility of the United Nations. Accordingly, the administration of the Territory has been entrusted to the United Nations Council for Namibia until independence. South Africa has rejected that decision and has continued with impunity to occupy the Territory of Namibia, which it utilizes to perpetrate barbaric acts of aggression against neighbouring States.

208. Thirdly, Security Council resolution 385 (1976) states in paragraph 7 that, in order to enable the people of Namibia freely to determine their own future:

“it is imperative that free elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations be held for the whole of Namibia as one political entity;”.

Again it is the racist Pretoria authorities that have prevented the normal development of that constitutional process.

209. Fourthly, the Western countries, particularly the countries of the contact group, have always maintained that it is necessary to establish and continue a dialogue with the Pretoria régime for the peaceful settlement of the Namibian problem. In this respect, the settlement plan embodied in Security Council resolution 435 (1978) offers broad possibilities for a peaceful solution which would be internationally accepted. In our opinion, the best instrument for the peaceful settlement of the Namibian problem is Council resolution 435 (1978).

210. Pretoria's continued defiance, its bad faith, its arrogance and its perfidy have blocked all negotiations on the question of Namibia. What remains to be done to persuade South Africa which is increasingly intransigent and has rejected even the settlement plan presented by its allies?

211. There is no longer time for hesitation or for verbal condemnations. The question of Namibia has existed for too long. We must act and all the more firmly since the international community no longer has any choice but to decree the imposition of mandatory economic sanctions. Those sanctions must include the strengthening of the embargo on all forms of trade with that country.

212. Africa is fully aware of the weight of strategic, economic and other interests which oppose the legitimate aspirations of the Namibian people and its inalienable right to self-determination and national independence. To be convinced of this, it is enough to recall the profound contempt with which some nations, more concerned with their military forces than with the justice of the causes they defend, treat the questions of southern Africa.

213. It is more than certain that divergent interests weaken the actions of the United Nations and risk making the international Organization fragile and inoperative.

214. How else can one explain the attitude of certain Western countries of the contact group in seeking at all costs to have the selfish interests of the white racist minority of southern Africa prevail, to the detriment of the freedom and dignity of the Namibian people? How else can one explain the veto cast by a permanent member of the Security Council, which, moreover, is a member of the Western contact group, opposing condemnation of the unprovoked aggression by South Africa against the People's Republic of Angola and thus deliberately confounding, with talk of terrorist provocations, the just liberation struggle of the people of Namibia under its only authentic representative, SWAPO?

215. South Africa is the only country in the world where racism is institutionalized. Its régime is based on repression and violence and on the systematic denial of human rights to its people. The abject South African régime has been repeatedly condemned by the General Assembly, by the Security Council and by the international community for committing crimes against all mankind.

216. That is why our concern and our disquiet are motivated not only by the violation by South Africa of all the resolutions adopted by the international community calling on it to withdraw from the Namibian territory it is illegally occupying but also, and above all, by the breach of the peace which would occur if the international community were to find it impossible to decree a range of enforcement measures to compel South Africa to withdraw from the Territory. Accordingly, we urgently appeal to the Western countries which operate directly or indirectly through transnational corporations in South Africa and Namibia to join the international community in adopting and giving firm practical support to these measures.

217. In reaffirming total support for the liberation movements in southern Africa, my delegation remains convinced that the valiant people of Namibia—under the courageous leadership of its only authentic representative, SWAPO, and enjoying the unconditional support of all peoples who cherish freedom, peace and justice—will triumph in its just struggle for national liberation.

218. Mr. MOUMIN (Comoros): Here we are gathered in emergency special session to discuss once again the question of Namibia, a question with which we are all very familiar. The Organization has been seized of the question of Namibia since 1947 and, in spite of numerous decisions by the Organization, as well as an opinion handed down by the International Court of Justice, it has not proved possible to this day to resolve the illegality of the régime in Namibia and to proceed to an internationally accepted solution of this extremely important problem.

219. Since 1947 this question has been thoroughly discussed on various occasions here at the United Nations, in OAU, at meetings of non-aligned countries and in many other forums. During the course of this year alone, the question has been discussed six times: in New Delhi, in Addis Ababa, in Geneva, in Algiers, here in the Security Council, and in Nairobi. If we are meeting here at this time of year in emergency special session, it is because now, more than ever, an immediate solution of this question is vital if peace and security are to be safeguarded in southern Africa.

220. We did decide on 27 October 1966 here, by Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI), to make the question of Namibia a United Nations responsibility; hence we must all act collectively and with speed to see to it that an immediate end is brought to the illegal occupation of that Territory by the racist régime in South Africa.

221. It is now abundantly clear, after the Geneva meeting, at which South Africa during the course of the debate raised innumerable objections and tried to inject extraneous issues into the negotiation—the so-called issue of impartiality being the latest in this long chain of unreasonable demands—that that racist régime is not prepared to abide by the United Nations plan of action on Namibia as stipulated by the Security Council in its resolution 435 (1978).

222. Ever since the Mandate over Namibia was revoked by the Organization in 1966 by Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI), the racist illegal régime in Pretoria has constantly shown disregard for the demands of the international community that it end its illegal occupation of Namibia by peaceful means. How much longer is this body going to tolerate that a Member State frustrate the decisions of the Organization?

223. As members who have joined the Organization of our own free will, we must respect and maintain the credibility of the Organization in so far as its fundamental principles are concerned; and the only way to uphold the credibility of this Organization is to dispel the layman's belief that the General Assembly is a coffee shop, or at best a debating society, and to prove to the outside world that this is an organization of responsible nations that have joined together in order

to avert the scourge of war that has afflicted past generations and to maintain peace and security in the world.

224. The best way to do this will be for us to take a firm decision at this session that will force South Africa to implement, without any further delay, Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and grant immediate and unconditional independence to Namibia.

225. Namibia being a United Nations responsibility, we as Members of that Organization must all work for an immediate termination of the illegal occupation by South Africa of that Territory.

226. We should cast aside our ideological differences and confrontations and adopt such measures as are necessary to isolate South Africa politically, economically, militarily and culturally, with a view to compelling it to implement the decisions taken by the Assembly.

227. The obduracy and intransigence of the racist illegal occupation régime of South Africa has caused justifiable frustration and impatience in our midst, and our overwhelming sentiment is that it is high time that Namibia accedes to independence without further delay.

228. My delegation firmly believes that the régime in South Africa can be forced to withdraw from Namibia if greater pressure is mounted by all concerned, and in particular by the five Western countries which initiated the process resulting in the adoption of Council resolution 435 (1978). Those five countries have the obligation and must bear the responsibility of seeing to it that South Africa complies with the decision of the United Nations and that it implements resolution 435 (1978) without any dilution, modification or qualification. This is a resolution that was arrived at by tortuous negotiations in which SWAPO, the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people, made significant concessions in order to accommodate South Africa.

229. The failure of the Security Council, caused by the triple veto, to take punitive measures against the racist régime in South Africa following the latter's virtual rejection of the United Nations plan for Namibia at the Geneva pre-implementation talks came as a great disappointment to the international community. We had expected that by now all States Members would be aware of the great consequences of the continued defiance of the resolutions of the United Nations by South Africa and, therefore, that there should have been no doubt as to what measures should be taken against the recalcitrant régime of Pretoria.

230. My delegation is further disturbed at the fact that this failure to act on the part of the Security Council is due to the triple veto of those members which had themselves taken the initiative to negotiate for the independence of Namibia. Those vetoes were cast not to facilitate the independence of Namibia, but to strengthen the hand of the illegal occupying Power, thus deepening further the agony of the oppressed people of Namibia. The negative votes in the Council only gave comfort to the forces that have flouted every resolution of the Organization.

231. The delegation of Comoros would like to tell those that cast negative votes in April that it is not too late for them to reappraise their policies and to rectify the wrong done to the people of Namibia. They should join forces with us in this emergency special session so that we can all together adopt measures that will leave no alternative to the régime in Pretoria but to grant an immediate independence to Namibia. And to those countries which treat the question of Namibia in terms of an ideological confrontation and which are unwilling to join forces with us in order to force South Africa to see reason because they see a communist influence in SWAPO, we should like to say that any further procrastination on the independence of Namibia will only increase the dependence of SWAPO on the communist bloc and thus further increase the possibility of greater communist influence in that organization. SWAPO is a liberation movement that needs arms to wage its war of independence and liberation, and a needy man does not choose his friends. If Western Powers wish to avert communist influence in southern Africa, they have to act with speed and apply pressure on South Africa to implement Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

232. My delegation is disturbed by what appears to be a deliberate intention by certain Powers to tie the solution of the Namibian question to some unrelated issues not germane to the letter and spirit of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia. This idea is reflected in the efforts exerted to amend resolution 435 (1978) in the name of strengthening it. This trend of thinking has undoubtedly encouraged the illegal occupation régime of South Africa further to delay the implementation of the plan of action for Namibia.

233. The delegation of the Islamic Federal Republic of the Comoros remains committed to the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), unmodified and without prevarication, because it is the product of a compromise and because it is clear in its purpose. We do not believe it needs any strengthening. We reject the scheme to strengthen it which includes a proposal that will give South Africa powers to write a constitution for the independence of Namibia before the United Nations plan of action is implemented.

234. The right to draw up a Namibian constitution belongs to the people of that Territory, represented by SWAPO, and to no one else. It is a right that no one can take away from the people of Namibia.

235. I cannot conclude my statement without condemning in the strongest terms the premeditated, unprovoked massive armed aggression against the People's Republic of Angola, causing destruction of life and property. The invasion was mounted with a massive force of two South African motorized columns using 32 tanks, 28 armoured vehicles and 8 jet bombers which penetrated deep into Angolan territory in flagrant violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Angola.

236. It is sad to note that the Security Council, which has the direct responsibility for maintaining peace and security, was incapacitated by the veto of one of its permanent members and could not utter even a word of condemnation of the dastardly, wanton act of aggression against Angola. The same permanent member

has sought to give the impression that Angola might not be entirely blameless. Considering the scope, and duration of the 23 August invasion and the scale of destruction resulting therefrom, we most certainly do not need any further evidence that the Namibian problem harbours serious threats to international peace and security.

237. To avert those threats to security and peace, it is the view of my delegation that in its conclusions this emergency special session should renew the call of last April to the Security Council to impose mandatory economic sanctions against South Africa and to take a decision to the effect that the States Members should cease forthwith all dealings with South Africa with a view to isolating it politically, militarily, economically and culturally.

238. Mr. SOURINHO (Lao People's Democratic Republic) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation would like to extend to Mr. von Wechmar its warm congratulations on his election to the presidency of the eighth emergency special session of the General Assembly, devoted to Namibia. His great talent as a diplomat and his proven devotion to the cause of independence for the Namibian people give us great hope that the results of our deliberations will help to clear the path that will lead to the total liberation of the peoples of southern Africa.

239. This is the third time that the General Assembly has been convened in special session to consider the question of Namibia, and this demonstrates clearly the degree of importance and urgency that the international community attaches to the Namibian people's right to self-determination and independence, a right that has been solemnly enshrined in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) and in several other United Nations declarations and decisions which have acquired a consistent legal value governing relations between States.

240. But, if we are compelled to meet in special session once again today to consider the question of Namibia, it is not so much because the case of Namibia is particularly complex compared to other decolonization cases which the United Nations has had to consider, but because South Africa, which is illegally occupying Namibia, has adopted an unparalleled attitude of intransigence and defiance with respect to the pertinent decisions of the world Organization on Namibia and the fundamental principles of international law. In other words, South Africa—which for many years has practised the policy of *apartheid* and has elevated terrorism to the level of State policy, both within and beyond its frontiers, and with incredible impunity owing to the protection of its Western friends—has thus clearly shown by its acts, as well as by its criminal conduct, that it has never seriously sought and will never seek of its own accord to grant true independence to Namibia in keeping with international requirements.

241. In this regard, it will be recalled with a great deal of bitterness and frustration that 15 years have passed since the adoption by the General Assembly of resolution 2145 (XXI) terminating South Africa's Mandate over Namibia. But, despite the tireless efforts of the United Nations, in particular the United Nations Council for Namibia—to which we should

like to pay a tribute—the situation in Namibia, far from having moved along the lines we would have wished, has clearly made a completely opposite turn as a result of the insincere and treacherous manoeuvring of the racist régime of Pretoria, which enjoys the constant support of Western countries, particularly the three permanent members of the Security Council which have used their right of veto to oppose independence for Namibia and total liberation of the entire African continent.

242. So that today, more than in 1966, the situation in Namibia and the surrounding area carries with it a grave danger of generalized conflagration jeopardizing in a serious way not only peace and stability in southern Africa but also international peace and stability.

243. In other words, this eighth emergency special session has the extremely important and urgent task of adopting measures to eliminate the fearsome danger besetting southern Africa which indisputably results from the continuation of the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa.

244. It also means that the delegation of the Lao People's Democratic Republic has come to this session not to carry out a ritual act but to support in a very firm way the struggle and just demands of the Namibian people which, like all other peoples, possesses natural and inalienable rights to self-determination and independence. We have come to this session to call on the United Nations, which has direct responsibility for Namibia until its total independence, to live up to its commitment to the Namibian people, the victim of the worst retrograde colonial system that the world has ever known. Finally, we have come to this session to express, without any ambiguity, our deep indignation at the revolting attitude adopted by the trading partners of South Africa, primarily the three Western Powers of the so-called contact group which are permanent members of the Security Council. Last April those Powers opposed the adoption by the Council of measures earnestly called for by various highly representative organs of the international community, such as the thirty-sixth ordinary session of OAU, the Co-ordinating Committee for the Liberation of Africa, the thirty-sixth ordinary session of the Council of Ministers of OAU, the Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries, the resumed thirty-fifth session of the United Nations General Assembly, and the Extraordinary Ministerial Meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of Non-Aligned Countries; measures aimed at imposing on South Africa comprehensive mandatory sanctions, as a matter of urgency, as provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations in order to compel South Africa to comply with the resolutions and decisions of the United Nations concerning Namibia.

245. The triple veto of the Western Powers has not only prolonged and strengthened the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa; it has also strongly encouraged the Fascist leaders in Pretoria to intensify their bloody repression against the Namibian patriots and to embark on criminal, horrendous and gratuitous acts of aggression against the front-line States, particularly against the People's Republic of Angola several of whose southern provinces are still under occupation by the racist South African armed forces.

246. The Lao People's Democratic Republic would like to take this solemn occasion to reiterate its firm condemnation of the massive invasion of Angola and to denounce those who refuse to condemn in clear terms that barbarous invasion. My country supports the just position of the People's Republic of Angola which has, in accordance with Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, the indisputable right to call on all friendly countries for assistance to defend the sovereignty and territorial integrity of its people. We also strongly support the call issued to the international community to grant to Angola and other front-line countries the necessary means to counter effectively the acts of aggression by the racist régime of South Africa.

247. The series of tragic events which have taken place in Namibia and beyond its borders since the refusal of the three Western Powers last April to vote for the imposition of sanctions against South Africa have destroyed all credibility of the arguments stubbornly and unreasonably put forward by those same countries, according to which the use of sanctions would only jeopardize the chance for a peaceful settlement of the Namibian question. It is quite clear now that it is rather the persistent refusal to apply sanctions which has jeopardized that chance.

248. We fervently hope that at this session we shall see a change in the attitude of those Western Powers, if they truly desire, and not only by words, a peaceful settlement of the question of Namibia. Any further hesitation on their part would only increase the dangerous confrontation on a broader scale. On the other hand, experience has irrefutably proved that sanctions, even on a limited scale, have played a considerable role, as they did in the collapse in the racist and illegal régime of Southern Rhodesia, even though that was primarily due to the victory of the obstinate armed struggle of the people of Zimbabwe. In that respect, the International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa, held last May in Paris, forcefully reaffirmed that

“the sanctions provided under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter, universally applied, are the most appropriate and effective means to ensure South Africa's compliance with the decisions of the United Nations”.<sup>5</sup>

249. In these circumstances, it is difficult not to see the persistent refusal to apply sanctions as a last effort to defend the selfish interests of colonialists and transnational corporations, which continue outrageously to pillage the natural resources of Namibia in flagrant violation of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia,<sup>6</sup> enacted by the United Nations Council for Namibia. Moreover, the attempt being made at this time to effect what is euphemistically called a strengthening of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) must be viewed against this background. It is to be feared that, if this attempt should prove successful, a new series of calls for strengthening would follow, only to lead to Council resolution 435 (1978) deprived of all substance.

250. My delegation firmly advocates the accession to independence of Namibia in accordance with the process set forth in Council resolution 435 (1978), without any change whatsoever.

251. As for the negotiations that have been proposed in order to persuade South Africa to implement the United Nations plan, in view of the flagrant manoeuvres by which the Pretoria racists contrived to sabotage the pre-implementation talks in Geneva last January, it is necessary, if those negotiations are to have the least chance of success, that international pressure be strongly brought to bear on South Africa from now on. Negotiations that would give the racist régime another respite, enabling it to promote and consolidate its so-called internal settlement by setting up in power the Turnhalle puppets would have grievous consequences for peace and stability in southern Africa and in the rest of the world.

252. The policy of stalling that has marked the last 15 years of dialogue with South Africa in bringing about the accession by Namibia to total independence has proved to be futile and, even worse, has proved to be very detrimental to the United Nations, whose authority has been constantly and flagrantly flouted by the racist South African régime, which, to all available indications, has to date shown no sign of repenting.

253. In these circumstances it is absurd, if not ridiculous, to continue to grant any credit to that régime, which has so perverted the Charter of the United Nations and the elementary principles of international law, or to the five Western Powers of the so-called “contact group” themselves. It is still more absurd to criticize the anger and frustration expressed by the international community, particularly by SWAPO, the leader of the Namibian people, which, in its invincible struggle to lead its people to full independence, has, thanks to its lofty sense of responsibility and moderation, won the admiration and respect of all.

254. We are deeply shocked at the assertions that SWAPO is only a tool in the service of one or more Powers outside the area. There is no need to emphasize that that type of accusation is aimed only at justifying the shameful attempt to distort the essence of the struggle of the Namibian people, which is basically a struggle to obtain freedom from the yoke of colonialist oppression and repression.

255. Making an ideological issue of this question is a sorry farce intended to divert international opinion from the just, legitimate struggle of the heroic people of Namibia and should therefore be strongly rejected.

256. We are also deeply incensed by the signs of alarming rapprochement between Washington and Pretoria appearing at the very time when the international community is intensifying its efforts to isolate as far as possible the *apartheid* régime. That change in the American policy, along with efforts to repeal the Clark amendment so as to provide open military assistance to a treacherous band in the pay of South Africa against the People's Republic of Angola, illustrates the consistent policy of subversion and destabilization pursued by the United States in southern Africa.

257. This is in fact a case of the blind who do not wish to see and of people who have deliberately chosen a policy of systematically sowing confusion everywhere, so as to be able to fish in troubled waters. Such tactics neither serve the interests of peace and

stability within the African continent nor in any other part of the world; on the contrary, they only serve the dark designs of colonialism and imperialism.

258. In the present context, where the support of international imperialism for the minority racist régime of South Africa is more and more clear and the intransigent attitude of South Africa is becoming more and more provocative, the international community is in duty bound to give and step up aid of various types to SWAPO so that it can victoriously fulfil its historical duty towards the Namibian people, which is to lead it to total independence by obtaining the national unity and the territorial integrity of its country, including Walvis Bay and all the off-shore islands.

259. The delegation of the Lao People's Democratic Republic fully supports any action by the Assembly to attain those objectives, in particular a decision, under Chapter VII of the Charter, to impose comprehensive, binding sanctions upon the racist régime of Pretoria. We are fully convinced that whatever outrageous manoeuvres South Africa dreams up, the Namibian people under the leadership of SWAPO, its sole legitimate and authentic representative, will attain final victory, thanks to its own courage and the unwavering support of the progressive international community and all peoples that cherish freedom and justice.

260. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): Before calling upon the next speaker in the debate, I invite the representative of Algeria to introduce a draft resolution on the question of Namibia.

261. Mr. BEDJAOUI (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): On behalf of the Member States sponsors, I have the honour of introducing draft resolution A/ES-8/L.1.

262. I should like at the outset to draw attention to some changes that are now being typed and should be distributed in a few minutes, or at all events later this evening.

263. As it stands, the third preambular paragraph reads as follows:

*"Noting with regret and concern that the Security Council failed to exercise its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security when draft resolutions proposing comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations were vetoed by France, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America on 30 April 1981,"*

We would replace that paragraph with the following:

*"Noting with regret and concern that the Security Council failed to exercise its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security when draft resolutions proposing comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations were vetoed by the three Western permanent members of the Council on 30 April 1981,"*

264. Operative paragraph 12 would be amended to read as follows:

*"12. Strongly urges all states, in view of the threat to international peace and security posed by South Africa, to impose immediately against that country the comprehensive mandatory sanctions provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter,"*

265. Operative paragraph 13 would be changed to read as follows:

*"13. Also strongly urges States to cease forthwith, individually and collectively, all dealings with South Africa in order totally to isolate it politically, economically, militarily and culturally,"*

266. After operative paragraph 14, a new operative paragraph 15, reading as follows, would be inserted:

*"15. Requests the United Nations Council for Namibia to study the modalities for monitoring this boycott of South Africa and to report to the General Assembly at its thirty-sixth session on the arrangements which may be required;"*

The last operative paragraph would be renumbered accordingly.

267. Those are the changes we wish to make to the text.

268. This draft resolution is destined to conclude the fruitful debate we have had at this eighth emergency special session. The debate has made it possible for us once again to stress the extreme seriousness of the situation prevailing in southern Africa and the urgent need for energetic international action to deal with the activities of racist Pretoria.

269. We think that the text before the Assembly faithfully reflects the concern of the international community, given the persistence of the illegal occupation of Namibia and the proliferation of acts of aggression against the front-line States. In addition we believe that it reflects the legitimate sense of frustration that is widely felt at the inability of the Security Council fully to exercise the prerogatives it enjoys under the Charter in the case of breaches of the peace.

270. That is why the sponsors feel that the United Nations cannot shirk its duty just because of the blocking of the Security Council. It is in that spirit that we reaffirm principles in the text that have been the subject of universal consensus for years now, such as the right of the Namibian people to self-determination, freedom and independence, the legitimacy of their struggle under the leadership of SWAPO, their sole legitimate representative, and the illegality of South Africa's presence in Namibia.

271. Similarly, after echoing the international community's unanimous condemnation of South Africa for its constant defiance, the draft resolution lists specific measures aimed at intensifying the indispensable international pressure upon Pretoria's racist régime.

272. First, the international community would strengthen the material, financial and military and other forms of assistance to SWAPO to allow it to step up its national liberation struggle and would urgently expand its aid and assistance, including military aid, to the front-line States to help them in their legitimate defense of their sovereignty and territorial integrity.

273. This would also give force to the long-awaited reaction of the international community so as to make

South Africa respect the injunctions of the United Nations. Basing ourselves on the experience of recent years, we feel that what is necessary are the comprehensive mandatory sanctions provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter. In that respect, the General Assembly is requested, by its draft resolution, strongly to urge States, individually and collectively, to impose such sanctions on South Africa and to break off all relations with it in order to isolate it politically, economically, militarily and culturally.

274. In recommending such measures, the sponsors were not seeking to make them an end in themselves. In proposing to conclude our debate with a resolution that represents a valid response to the immense current of solidarity with a just cause, the sponsors are attempting to work towards the triumph of legality and respect for United Nations decisions. That is why the draft resolution strongly reaffirms that the United plan approved in Security Council resolution 435 (1978) constitutes the sole basis for the peaceful settlement of the question of Namibia and should lead to genuine independence for that Territory.

275. The scrupulous implementation of that plan in its entirety and without any alteration is urgently needed and that is why December 1981 has been laid down in the draft resolution before the Assembly as a deadline.

276. The draft resolution the main elements of which I have just outlined is clearly a balanced one, entirely geared towards effectiveness. It is also a responsible text, as its sponsors were motivated by a concern to restore the credibility of the United Nations by ensuring that it meets its commitments to the Namibian people.

277. The intensive consultations that we held have allowed us to note that our concern was broadly shared. It would thus only be natural for the draft resolution to gain the support of all. That is the appeal; that is the wish of the sponsors whom I represent.

278. Mr. NVONO NCA MENENE (Equatorial Guinea) (*interpretation from Spanish*): On behalf of my Government and the people of Equatorial Guinea and on my own behalf, I am pleased to have this opportunity once again to congratulate Mr. von Wechmar on his assumption of the presidency of the General Assembly at its eighth emergency special session. The outstanding way in which he discharged his responsibilities during the thirty-fifth session strengthens our confidence in his diplomatic ability and impartial leadership qualities which will enable this session to achieve the results we desire.

279. On this occasion I should like to express my great appreciation to Mr. Kurt Waldheim, the Secretary-General of the United Nations, for the selfless efforts he has been making to bring about a constructive relationship between the non-aligned countries and the Western contact group and for his preparatory work prior to this session.

280. The problem of Namibia has existed without interruption for nearly a century, beginning with the initial colonization by the West in 1884. As a result of the defeat of that Western colonial empire in the First World War, optimism and hope sprang up among the people of Namibia for a speedy restoration of their

fundamental rights. However, those hopes were swiftly dashed when the League of Nations decided, under its Mandate system, to replace German colonial occupation with the even worse and more harmful South African occupation.

281. Instead of applying the Trusteeship System and the principle of Article 22 of the Covenant of the League of Nations which stated that "the well-being and development of such peoples forms a sacred trust of civilization", and instead of seeking a peaceful settlement to the problem, South Africa has concentrated, throughout that time, on activities aimed at dismembering the Territory, destroying its national and territorial integrity, upsetting its natural demographic composition, annexing Walvis Bay, claiming sovereignty over various islands which constitute an integral part of Namibian Territory and systematically and ruthlessly exploiting the natural resources of the Territory in clear and manifest violation of the relevant resolutions of the United Nations and Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia,<sup>6</sup> enacted by the United Nations Council for Namibia.

282. Despite that Decree, South Africa and other foreign interests have monopolized the commercial sectors of the Namibian economy for years for their own benefit and to the detriment of the African population. In exchange for the chance to obtain considerable profits for themselves and their shareholders, particularly through the exploitation of the vast mineral reserves of the Territory, those foreign interests have been supporting the illegal occupation of the Territory by South Africa, both politically and financially, and they have participated in the practice of *apartheid* and have benefited from it.

283. South Africa, for its part, has been taxing foreign mining companies operating in Namibia at a lower rate than that in force in South Africa itself, thereby permitting the amortization of capital expenditures by means of current gross profits, allowing the unrestricted production of minerals and exercising no pressure on mining companies to process those minerals locally.

284. Despite the general prosperity of the Namibian economy, the extension and application of South Africa's *apartheid* policy to the Territory has meant that Africans continue to be deprived of any significant participation in the wealth generated. The Namibian Africans continue to be regarded merely as a pool of cheap manpower with no rights to benefits deriving from the economic system. The great majority of the Africans are denied any kind of employment in the commercial sector; some of them depend on agriculture for their subsistence, while those employed in the mining, commercial farming and fishing sectors are reduced to performing lowly tasks with meagre salaries.

285. With the demise of the League of Nations and the advent of the United Nations, Namibia placed its hopes in this new Organization. But those hopes were likewise shortly to be dashed; for South Africa, despite adhering to the Charter of the United Nations, refused to place Namibia under the new Trusteeship System.

286. After the failure of the attempts to persuade South Africa to fulfil the purposes of the Charter in

connection with Namibia, the General Assembly and the Security Council adopted various resolutions placing Namibia under the sole responsibility of the United Nations, legally terminating South Africa's Mandate and calling upon that country to withdraw from Namibia. Then came the proposed settlement presented by the five Western Countries which provided for a cease-fire, elections supervised by the United Nations and the establishment of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group.

287. It is inexplicable that, despite its acceptance of the Western plan, South Africa, should have changed course, increasingly employing a whole range of artifices never known before in the history of colonialism, to prevent the implementation of the plan. The Geneva meeting demonstrated once again, beyond any doubt, the intransigence of that régime and its refusal to implement United Nations resolutions—particularly Security Council resolution 435 (1978)—despite the moderation shown by SWAPO leaders in offering to sign a cease-fire agreement and accept the holding of United Nations-supervised elections.

288. Security Council resolution 435 (1978) came in response to an initiative by Western countries—one which we accepted reluctantly but in good faith, on the understanding that the five Western countries would bring pressure to bear on South Africa to carry out the plan. However, to our deep regret, the lesson of Geneva and the last incredible veto in the Security Council show that absolutely nothing has been done by certain Western countries to help. Quite the contrary, the arrogance and intransigence of South Africa have been increasingly buttressed by the statements made by certain Western countries during the debate in the unsuccessful meetings of the Security Council on the question.

289. It was inevitable that the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa, the betrayal by that country of the sacred trust placed in it to promote the national and moral well-being of the Namibian people, its introduction of the abominable system of *apartheid* into the Territory, its ruthless repression of the African inhabitants and its refusal to recognize their right to self-determination would call forth a legitimate political and military response of the Namibian people in the form of resistance to obtain their national liberation, their efforts being currently channelled through SWAPO. For this and many other reasons, OAU has for years been constantly and staunchly supporting SWAPO as the sole, authentic representative of the people of Namibia—a position endorsed by resolutions of the various bodies of the United Nations.

290. This emergency special session is of vital importance, since it is taking place only weeks after the unprovoked South African attacks against the People's Republic of Angola. That attack was not only a flagrant violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Angola, a State Member of the United Nations, but also a grave threat to peace in Africa, and particularly to peace in that region. The Government of the Supreme Military Council of Equatorial Guinea vigorously condemns that savage attack by South Africa against the valiant sovereign State of Angola. The South African régime must refrain from any new attack against the heroic sister peoples of Africa. Indeed, we consider that this practice of undermining

and lashing out at neighbours opposed to its racist and aggressive policy must not be allowed to halt the triumphant march of southern Africa towards total freedom.

291. South Africa, in a new and aggressive imperialist strategy aimed at consolidating its control over Namibia and intimidating neighbouring African States which, because of their geographical proximity and out of humanitarian considerations have been giving refuge to thousands of Namibian women, children and old people who have constantly been fleeing from its reign of military terror in Namibia, has turned that Territory into a springboard for launching ceaseless armed attacks and constant acts of aggression against Angola, Botswana, Mozambique and Zimbabwe. These repeated aggressive acts, typified by the recent large-scale invasion of Angola, constitute not only a manifest violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of those States but also a clear violation and flouting of the Charter of the United Nations and of the principles of international law governing the conduct of relations among the States of the world.

292. The Government of Equatorial Guinea thus condemns the occupation of Namibia by the South African racist régime and, similarly, the acts of aggression that régime has perpetrated against independent and sovereign African States.

293. We reiterate our recognition and support of SWAPO as the sole, legitimate representative of the people of Namibia and express our conviction that the armed struggle it is waging will receive full effective support in order to speed up the liberation of its country.

294. The resolution crowning our deliberations on this subject must lead to clear acceptance by those Western countries of the desire of the Namibian people—namely, for total independence this year. We hope that all members of the Western contact group will show understanding so that, instead of vetoing the desire of the overwhelming majority, they will support the wishes of the United Nations for genuine independence in Namibia.

295. In conclusion, my delegation would like to pay a tribute to the United Nations Council for Namibia and to its members for their effective devotion to the Namibian cause and for the arduous and tireless work they achieved this year, which deserves the appreciation and support of us all.

296. Mr. CHAN YOURAN (Democratic Kampuchea) (*interpretation from French*): The delegation of Democratic Kampuchea is pleased to extend to Mr. von Wechmar its sincere congratulations on his assumption to preside over the deliberations of this important session. Under his skilful guidance and thanks to his personal experience with the question of Namibia and to the efforts of all, it is our conviction that this session will mark a turning point in the history of decolonization and of the struggle of the Namibian people.

297. My delegation also wishes to pay a tribute to the activities of the United Nations Council for Namibia and its President, Mr. Paul Lusaka, in support of the Namibian cause.



298. On this solemn occasion, may I be allowed, to reaffirm, on behalf of the people and Government of Democratic Kampuchea, our total solidarity with the just struggle waged by the valiant Namibian people, under the leadership of SWAPO, for the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Namibia.

299. We wish also on this occasion to reaffirm our total solidarity with all African States, in particular the front-line States, which are acting as one in the just cause of the Namibian people and are today facing the last bastion of colonialism and racism in Africa, represented by the Pretoria régime.

300. The holding of this present emergency special session devoted to Namibia on the eve of the thirty-sixth regular session underscores the gravity of the situation currently prevailing in southern Africa, particularly in Namibia, and, above all, the imperative need to adopt measures to put an end to that situation before it deteriorates into a major conflagration. It is of the utmost urgency to put an end to the war under way in Namibia, where the Namibian people has for decades been subjected to the yoke of the colonialist and racist Pretoria régime and has seen its fundamental rights to independence and freedom in national unity trampled underfoot by the fascist and annexationist white minority South African régime. Born of the policy of *apartheid* and colonial expansion of the Pretoria régime, this situation continues to mock the honour and dignity of an entire race, of an entire continent—Africa—as well as the very conscience of mankind. It is clear that it cannot go on any longer if the dignity of Africa and that of the United Nations itself are to be preserved. In this case, the United Nations, as the legal Administering Authority of Namibia, has the historic responsibility for leading this Territory and its people to self-determination and genuine independence, within the framework of a united Namibia. The Organization cannot tolerate the constant snubbing of its authority by the powers that be in Pretoria.

301. Today everyone believes that the struggle of the people of Namibia for its freedom and independence is an integral part of the struggle of other peoples of the world to defend the sacred principles of the Charter of the United Nations, as well as international peace and security, which are seriously jeopardized by Pretoria's racist and colonialist policies and its repeated acts of aggression against the sovereignty of the front-line States. It is for that reason that the United Nations, in the many resolutions it has adopted, has spared no effort to support the just cause of the Namibian people and to induce the Pretoria régime to abandon its illegal occupation of Namibia, so that the Namibian people can in full sovereignty decide on its future without any outside interference.

302. Negotiations led to the establishment of the plan of action for Namibia, a plan endorsed by the Security Council on 29 September 1978 in its resolution 435 (1978). This plan, providing, *inter alia*, for a cease-fire and free elections under United Nations supervision, was to serve as the basis for the political settlement of the Namibian question. However, as might have been expected, at the pre-implementation meeting held at the beginning of this year in Geneva, the Pretoria authorities deliberately sabotaged that

plan for the independence of Namibia. They refused to implement it or to comply with resolution 435 (1978). That is irrefutable proof of Pretoria's determination not to abandon its policy of occupation and illegal annexation of Namibia by any means. Pretoria has given proof of its obstinacy in continuing its policy of *apartheid*, bantustanization of Namibia and barbarous repression of its population and, at the same time, its attempts to impose by force or by trickery a puppet administration on the Namibian people. Concurrently with this policy, the South African authorities have stepped up their acts of aggression and terrorism against the front-line States with a view to intimidating them, destabilizing them and preventing them from lending their support to the just struggle of the Namibian people. The barbarous acts of aggression of which the people of Angola is today the victim fall under this policy of destabilization as applied by the Pretoria authorities against the front-line States.

303. In once again firmly condemning the *apartheid* régime of South Africa for its policy of illegal occupation of Namibia and its acts of aggression against the front-line States, the delegation of Democratic Kampuchea feels it must reiterate the position of the Government of Democratic Kampuchea. We demand that an immediate end be put to the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa. All forces of the Fascist and racist régime must be withdrawn from the Territory of Namibia. The Namibian people must be able to exercise without delay its right to national independence with the full territorial integrity of Namibia. The South African authorities must cease all acts of provocation and aggression against the front-line States.

304. The situation in Namibia and in southern Africa should remind us of the one prevailing in South-East Asia since the invasion and occupation of Kampuchea by a foreign army and administration composed of 300,000 men who are supported and financed by the expansionist super-Power. In both cases, the annexationist and expansionist aggressors refuse with impunity to implement resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and the regional organizations concerned, which call for the total withdrawal of the occupation troops and the organization of free elections under United Nations supervision, so as to allow the victims in full sovereignty to decide on their own future. In both cases, the occupation forces are feverishly seeking to consolidate a puppet régime in their pay by various methods, in particular by massacres, torture and arrests of patriots and the installation of their own settlers, and by the exploitation of national resources, the arrogant contempt of international law and the use of force and the law of the jungle. In both cases, the occupation troops are forcing the peoples to seek refuge in neighbouring countries and using any pretext to invade those countries.

305. However, history has taught us that no foreign force, however, powerful and determined it may be, will ever be able to subdue oppressed peoples that are determined to live in freedom and independence. Recently, the people of Zimbabwe by its relentless struggle gave striking proof of this. Similarly, in the near future, other peoples of southern Africa will not fail to regain their independence and their dignity. The

total liberation of the African continent is inevitable and cannot be put off much longer.

306. In conclusion, my delegation feels that the time has come for the United Nations and for this emergency special session on Namibia to adopt the necessary measures to enable the Namibian people to exercise forthwith its rights to independence and freedom like all other peoples of the world. Only a settlement in keeping with Security Council resolution 435 (1978) will make it possible to reach this goal and to eliminate a grave hot-bed of tension in Africa and in the world. Beginning now we must impose against the authorities in Pretoria the sanctions provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations. Any delay in imposing such sanctions would only unjustly prolong the tremendous suffering of the Namibian people and the insolent defiance of the international community by Pretoria.

307. Mr. CINÉAS (Haiti) (*interpretation from French*): We are meeting in this emergency special session to discuss once again the question of Namibia, that is to say, the situation of a Territory that has been illegally occupied and transformed into a sheer hell for its inhabitants, whose daily lot is oppression, humiliation and racism imposed by a régime which has for too long defied the will of the international community. Thus this régime is openly in defiance of the Organization, which nevertheless remains the best universally accepted instrument for the realization of the aspirations of peoples to the right to live in freedom with respect and dignity.

308. Since 1946, patient and arduous negotiations have led to the adoption of many resolutions aimed at solving the question of Namibia, the most successful being the one which won the support of all, including South Africa. Indeed, in the eyes of all Member States, Security Council resolution 435 (1978) constitutes the surest basis for leading the Namibian people to self-determination by peaceful means. With it the prospect of a new age of liberty and dignity for Namibians was emerging, when the international community ran up against the hardened attitude of South Africa, which represents an insult to our Organization and to its efforts to realize the dream so cherished by all justice-loving peoples, the dream of a free and independent Namibia.

309. Is there any need to recall the many decisions of our Organization or the principles of the Charter which South Africa has constantly violated? That country's Mandate was terminated in 1966, and the highest judicial organ of the Organization, the International Court of Justice, declared in its advisory opinion of 21 June 1971<sup>1</sup> that the presence of South Africa in Namibia was illegal and that it should withdraw from the occupied territories. Its refusal to comply is a direct violation not only of the authority but also of the prestige of the Organization, which through the United Nations Council for Namibia is entrusted with administering that Territory until its accession to independence.

310. Therefore the Pretoria régime must abandon its defiant attitude, and to compel it to do so the United Nations has no choice but to discharge fully its responsibilities under the Charter, in particular Chapter VII dealing with mandatory sanctions. For we are

convinced, in view of previous failures, that only an effective imposition of mandatory sanctions would make South Africa's presence in Namibia untenable and turn it from its warlike policy, to which only yesterday the brotherly people of Angola fell victim.

311. We must act with all the more speed since the latest aggression against Angola and other acts of aggression committed against the front-line States have transformed the area into an explosive one, jeopardizing the peace there and throughout the entire world. Furthermore, the deadly incursions into the territories of the front-line States are more disturbing every day; the world should be alarmed about the actions which the victims might decide to undertake out of a desire to safeguard and defend their territorial integrity in the spirit of the Charter. By finding a lasting solution to the Namibian problem, our Organization would certainly meet the hopes of humanity but it would also put off the risk of a conflagration that all fear.

312. That is why we appeal especially to the Western contact group of five countries, which was at the origin of the adoption of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), to show political will so as to ensure the complete and total implementation of that resolution. The most elementary dialectics will show, moreover, that the independence of Namibia is inevitable; then, the Namibian people will judge the other States of the international community according to the assistance they have provided it in its struggle for national liberation. By hastening the independence of Namibia, the Western countries will thus have cut short the sequence of suffering and humiliation which has victimized the people of that country daily.

313. This eighth emergency special session should not be merely added to the list of previous initiatives of our Organization which were unfortunately unfruitful. With the active determination of all, this session must culminate in the unconditional departure of the occupation troops. All Member States must contribute to that end; for, whatever continent we belong to, whatever ideology we profess, we are all involved in the problem of Namibia. Any attitude of neutrality, any indifference, any stonewalling would be reprehensible. For its part, the Republic of Haiti, true to its historical traditions, while hoping for the immediate and unconditional implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), reaffirms its commitment to the valiant peoples of Namibia for the triumph of its noble and just cause.

314. Mr. SEWRAJSING (Suriname): We are gathered here to consider, in emergency special session, the most frustrating decolonization question the United Nations has ever dealt with and to voice the deep concern of the international community in view of the deteriorating situation in Namibia, and in southern Africa as a whole, resulting from the continued illegal and brutal occupation by South Africa of that United Nations Territory.

315. It is not a coincidence that the efforts of the United Nations to bring about the independence of Namibia have led to so much disillusionment. This question is clearly embedded in the most repugnant phenomenon of our time, the policy of State-practised

racism pursued by the Pretoria minority régime based on white minority supremacy.

316. Pretoria has in fact never abandoned its determination to impose this abhorrent system on the people of Namibia as well and to maintain control over that Territory as a buffer State and a springboard for open aggression against the neighbouring countries that oppose its colonialist and racist policies.

317. Moreover, the illegal occupation of Namibia has become highly profitable for the Pretoria régime through the plundering of the natural resources of the Namibian people. It is disheartening to note that South Africa, in spite of the illegality of these activities, continues to enjoy the collaboration of Western multinationals in the plundering of the mineral wealth of the Namibian people. These are, among others, the major causes that have impeded the independence of Namibia. Therefore, there is no reason to expect the South African racists to withdraw from Namibia without punitive measures on the part of the international community.

318. From time to time, South Africa, under mounting international pressure and through deceptive tactics, has created the impression that it is willing to comply with the demands of the United Nations. The most recent example of its deception of the international community has been its apparent acceptance of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

319. Early in 1981, however, South Africa deliberately sabotaged the pre-implementation meeting in Geneva when it sensed changes in the international political climate that it considered favourable to prolonging its illegal presence in Namibia, and, as events have proved during recent months, South Africa has not been disappointed in its assumption. Pretoria has since then ruthlessly stepped up its suppression of the struggle for independence of the people of Namibia under the leadership of its sole and legitimate representative, SWAPO. The Territory has been totally militarized by regular South African troops and bands of mercenaries to intimidate and terrorize its people.

320. The immobility to which the Security Council was reduced by those States which bear special responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security and which moreover initiated the plan for the independence of Namibia has certainly encouraged the hardening of the position of the Pretoria racists.

321. Once more the international community was asked for more time and patience and this while South Africa has made no secret of its intention of imposing a so-called internal settlement on the people of Namibia and has continued to strengthen the position of its hand-picked puppets. The bantustanization of the Territory by the illegal South African administration is just further proof of Pretoria's real intentions. Strengthened by the signals of support it receives from its friends, South Africa has recently embarked on massive military operations to liquidate the brave sons and daughters of Namibia struggling for their inalienable right to self-determination and genuine independence. The acts of open aggression committed by South Africa against the People's Republic of Angola were just further attempts to destabilize the

region in order to justify the illegal occupation of Namibia.

322. Namibia is a United Nations Territory for which the Organization bears full responsibility. It is therefore appropriate for the General Assembly at this session to reaffirm its commitment to the speedy achievement of independence for the Territory on the basis of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

323. Resolution 435 (1978) was adopted by the Security Council after painstaking negotiations by all parties concerned, including South Africa. During those negotiations, SWAPO has displayed admirable flexibility and statesmanship, for which it deserves our praise and continued support. The adopted plan for the independence of Namibia can therefore not be further weakened. To concede to new demands posed by South Africa would be tantamount to ensuring its continued domination of the people of Namibia.

324. It is my Government's view that the independence of Namibia cannot be held hostage to unrelated issues of super-Power rivalry. Decisions by sovereign States of Africa with regard to their own territory cannot be used to delay further the independence of Namibia.

325. It is therefore essential for this emergency special session to restate unambiguously the demands of the international community and call upon the members of the Western contact group to undertake important and decisive steps in order to ensure, within a given time-frame, the implementation of the plan for the independence of Namibia as embodied in Council resolution 435 (1978).

326. The independence of Namibia is long overdue, and the international community cannot allow racist South Africa to continue its illegal behaviour with impunity.

327. Mr. RENZAHU (Rwanda) (*interpretation from French*): The delegation of Rwanda is pleased to be able to associate itself with previous speakers in extending to Mr. von Wechmar its sincere and warm congratulations on his assumption of the presidency of the General Assembly. We are convinced that the great respect that he receives from all our States and delegations here, and the wisdom, devotion and energy with which he has conducted the work of the thirty-fifth session of the Assembly constitute a guarantee that our work will be crowned with success and will be a decisive stage in the process of bringing about the self-determination and independence of the people of Namibia.

328. Once again the Organization is called upon in an emergency special session to debate a problem of decolonization which, but for South Africa's continued and stubborn defiance of the international community and its illegal actions, would have long since been settled.

329. Many speakers have already described the painful experiences of the oppressed people of Namibia at the hands of Pretoria's racist régime, as well as the tireless efforts made by the international community to put a halt to this illegal situation.

330. The position of my country and its Government on the question of Namibia is clear and unambiguous. Major-General Juvénal Habyarimana, President of the

Republic of Rwanda and the Founder-President of the National Revolutionary Movement for Development, made this point clear when he said:

“We have condemned and will continue to condemn categorically the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa which, although condemned by the international community and harassed by the freedom fighters, is now seeking to divide the people along clan and tribal lines so that tomorrow it can dominate them after weakening them from the outset. We think that true independence for the Territory can be guaranteed only if there is a party with a truly national following, and that party already exists. It is SWAPO”.

331. Hence the importance which, like other peoples which love peace and prize freedom and justice, my country attaches to this session. Our interest in its debates is the unequivocal expression of the indignation, concern and frustration felt by the international community and by African countries in particular at the continuing illegal occupation of Namibia by the racist and retrograde régime in Pretoria in defiance of all resolutions and decisions of the United Nations.

332. Were it not for the time-limit we have, the Rwandese delegation should have liked to describe the background of the United Nations commitment to the question we are discussing today. Nevertheless, given its importance, I hope that I may briefly recall the context in which Security Council resolution 435 (1978) was elaborated and adopted.

333. In 1978, when the situation seemed to be deadlocked, the five Western countries in the contact group that were then members of the Security Council presented a proposed settlement which it was felt could lead to independence for Namibia.

334. That proposal, after long negotiations, culminated in Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which, as is known, provided for a cease-fire and free elections under the control and supervision of the United Nations, as well as the creation of a special United Nations Transition Assistance Group.

335. That plan to settle the Namibian question presented by the Five Western Powers was accepted and supported in good faith by the African countries, by SWAPO and by the international community, in the hope that its authors would use their means and power to get South Africa to put a speedy and final halt to its illegal occupation of Namibian territory.

336. The convening in Geneva last January of the meeting to consider measures for the pre-implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia marked the culmination of the efforts made by the five countries in the Western contact group, the front-line African countries, together with Nigeria, the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the Secretary-General of OAU to convince South Africa to sit down at the negotiating table with SWAPO in order to pin down the means of implementing the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia on the basis of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

337. Whereas SWAPO showed a remarkable spirit of compromise in accepting the various proposals for a negotiated settlement, including the setting of a cease-fire date, the intransigent attitude and the

manœuvres of Pretoria were, without any doubt, responsible for the failure of that meeting in Geneva.

338. In fact, those were just new delaying tactics by the racist régime of Pretoria, which, as in the past, was only playing for time in order to consolidate and perpetuate its domination of Namibian territory by the establishment of a puppet régime, after having tried in vain to make it its own province and to stifle the aspirations of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence.

339. The disappointment and bitterness felt by the entire international community following the failure of Geneva reflected the hopes which the conference had aroused for a negotiated settlement of the problem which has all too sorely tried the patience of the Namibian people under the wise leadership of SWAPO.

340. The efforts of the international community to achieve a peaceful solution were not interrupted, however, despite the arrogance of the racist régime in South Africa. Intense diplomatic activities took place in the African front-line States, in OAU, in the non-aligned group, as well as in the United Nations itself, in order to open up the situation. At the same time, the position of SWAPO was further strengthened internationally and the Namibian people received unreserved and increasingly active support in their just struggle to achieve their right to self-determination and independence.

341. The Republic of Rwanda, which was a member of the mission sent to the countries of the contact group by OAU, is convinced that the only framework for Namibia's achievement of self-determination remains the full implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

342. For that purpose my delegation would like to remind the international community that that resolution, which was the result of long and laborious negotiations, was inevitably a compromise accepted by all the parties, including South Africa, but which was far from reflecting everything that Africa and SWAPO desired. Having been accepted by all the parties, it cannot be subject to modifications or interpretations and still less to distortions. It must be applied as adopted, because the independence of Namibia has been all too long delayed.

343. It cannot be too often stated that South Africa's presence in Namibia is illegal. The sole legal authority now is that of the United Nations, exercised by the United Nations Council for Namibia. The international community must use all its authority to compel South Africa to withdraw from Namibia, in its own interest, in the interest of the Namibian people, and, in the interest of peace itself. South Africa is powerful militarily, economically and politically speaking, but that cannot bring it security as long as the Namibian people are unable fully to exercise their fundamental rights. No force—be it military, economic, political or moral—has succeeded or can ever succeed in halting the natural aspiration to freedom which is, after the right to life, the first right of man.

344. We regret that South Africa is thus hampering the advent in Namibia of an era of peace and freedom and that the Security Council was unable to decide unanimously to apply comprehensive mandatory

sanctions against the racist régime in South Africa, on the pretext that no solution to the Namibian problem could be brought about without South Africa's agreement and that the imposition of sanctions on the South African régime would do more harm to the African populations and those of the front-line countries. Those were just unacceptable subterfuges, because the Namibian people which has already accepted sacrifices as the price of its freedom is also quite capable of enduring hunger and poverty.

345. This is the stage we have reached 36 years after the United Nations first took up the problem of Namibia and 15 years after the Organization unanimously put an end to South Africa's Mandate over Namibia, placing it under the direct responsibility of the United Nations.

346. There is no doubt that the continued illegal occupation of South Africa in defiance of countless United Nations resolutions and the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of 21 June 1971, the brutal repression of the Namibian people, the strengthening of the military arsenal in the Territory, the brutal oppression suffered by the population at the hands of the *apartheid* régime, the systematic and continued plundering of the natural resources of the Territory, in violation of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia,—enacted in 1974 by the United Nations Council for Namibia, the annexation of Walvis Bay—an annexation which is null and void since it constitutes a criminal act of piracy—and South Africa's attempts to impose a neo-colonialist solution in the form of an internal settlement, setting up a puppet régime entirely at the beck and call of the minority régime in Pretoria are a series of acts which today constitutes a serious threat to international peace and security which our Organization can no longer tolerate.

347. Repeated acts of aggression from a usurped territory against the front-line States, most recently against the People's Republic of Angola, constitute grave violations of peace and security in southern Africa. Despite such flagrant violations, we have witnessed, unfortunately, in recent time, a stalemate as a result of the inability of the Security Council to take a decision to apply comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the racist régime in South Africa or unequivocally to condemn acts of aggression perpetrated against independent African States from Namibian territory.

348. Therefore, the General Assembly meeting in this emergency special session must once again invite the Security Council to enact without delay comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the racist régime in Pretoria until that régime realizes that it cannot violate the Charter of the United Nations with impunity.

349. I should like to reaffirm the solidarity of the Republic of Rwanda with the just cause defended by the United Nations, as well as its total and unflinching support of SWAPO, the sole, authentic and legitimate representative of the people of Namibia in its just struggle waged for the speedy and total liberation of Namibia.

350. Moreover, my delegation is convinced that comprehensive and speedy implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia,

in accordance with Council resolution 435 (1978), including rejection of any internal settlement, remains the fundamental basis for any effort to find a peaceful solution to the problem of the independence of Namibia. In this regard, the five countries of the Western contact group have a special responsibility to apply urgently and comprehensively the plan which they themselves conceived and put before the international community for endorsement.

351. Faithful to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and that of the OAU, the Republic of Rwanda has always advocated and followed a policy of peace and concord, of settlement of disputes by peaceful means and recourse to negotiations. That is why, in my delegation's view, the future of the Organization requires firm and sincere commitment by all Member States to apply undeviatingly the United Nations plan for Namibia which, today more than ever, is the exclusive responsibility of the United Nations.

352. My delegation is convinced accordingly that, following this special session on Namibia, the Organization must finally and unhesitatingly set about the final process for the Namibian people's accession to national independence. This is what we wish, this is what the international community must demand today.

353. This is the meaning of the present session; the Rwanda delegation has the pleasure of once again wishing it success in its task.

354. Mr. OULD HAMODY (Mauritania) (*interpretation from French*): Again today with unflinching pleasure we are happy to be able to express to Mr. von Wechmar, on behalf of the delegation of the Islamic Republic of Mauritania, our appreciation of his outstanding qualities which have allowed us since September 1980 to conduct all our meetings with openness of mind and competence.

355. If there is any truly surprising paradox, it is the establishment of and the desire to perpetuate colonial domination in the twilight of classic colonialism. If there is a truly revolting paradox, it is the abuse of a mandate of the international community to commit the crime of usurpation of the land of others, the denial of all rights to an entire people over its homeland and the sowing of death and desolation in an entire region.

356. Palestine is the locale of one of these totally anachronistic cases, Namibia of the other, the subject of our present emergency special session and the sole and entire responsibility of the United Nations.

357. The systematic obstruction, the obvious bad faith, the dilatory tactics of Pretoria and the unconditional support of its protectors, have compelled Africa to call for the convening of the Assembly today.

358. The position of principle of the Islamic Republic of Mauritania is that of all of Africa and we, therefore, need not expatiate on a subject that is sufficiently well known and disquieting, not only to our continent but also to the conscience of the world.

359. We reaffirm our commitment in the first instance to Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which, in our view, constitutes the sole minimally acceptable basis for a peaceful outcome to the independence

process in Namibia. This resolution is a compromise which, following its judicious and responsible acceptance by SWAPO, was endorsed by Africa in a spirit of conciliation in order to prevent the tremendous sacrifices in human lives, both black and white, and material losses that would result from a violent solution of the conflict.

360. The five Western countries, the so-called "contact group", should fully appreciate this concession and should therefore endeavour to reduce the suicidal intransigence of the South African racist régime. The demands of that régime are, in the view of our delegation, absolutely unacceptable because they are contrary to realism, justice and universal consensus.

361. SWAPO, to which we should like to pay a tribute for its courage and realism by bowing to the memory of its martyrs, is the sole legitimate representative of the Namibian people, of which it is the fighting vanguard.

362. Similarly, we do not accept the insult proffered to Africa under the mendacious pretext of using the strange, unilateral logic of the "protection of the rights of the minority" of European origin. That notion is used to justify all the aberrations and particularly the total, scornful lack of consideration for the masses of our brothers of the majority in Namibia and in South Africa itself.

363. While respecting the rights of all racial communities in southern Africa, we consider—and the example of Zimbabwe is eloquent testimony in this regard—that only a democratic and just solution, preserving the right of the majority, can constitute a lasting guarantee. And, speaking of a lasting solution, it is appropriate to hail the efforts made by the United Nations Council for Namibia, the sole legal authority entrusted by the Organization with governing the Territory until it regains its national sovereignty. The far-sighted action of that Council has strengthened SWAPO in the combat it is waging in Namibia to compel South Africa to choose the path of reason. It is that path of reason, which South Africa, true to the methods of all colonial Powers, has lost sight of by seeking elsewhere, particularly in Angola, the solution to a problem which it is distorting and complicating.

364. In that respect the Islamic Republic of Mauritania reaffirms its total solidarity with our sister Republic of Angola and strongly deplores the obstructionist attitude which is preventing the Security Council from assuming its statutory responsibilities by condemning an act of aggression which has the merit of presenting itself clearly and proudly as such.

365. However, neither indulgence nor weakness will bear any result with regard to the unacceptable claims of a régime which is racist and oppressive by its very nature and whose consistent policy is to defy all decisions of the United Nations.

366. In our view, the Charter of the Organization provides for precise and clear sanctions against the irresponsible actions—contrary to peace and justice—of South Africa. The imposition of those sanctions provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter is called for by the present situation, a situation of defiance against this Organization and of confiscation, pure and simple, of an entire country by the exercise of a mandate duly and legally terminated 15 years ago.

To wait any longer would be tantamount to shirking one's responsibilities and would, above all, mean accepting the continuation of the suffering of the Namibian people and further complicating of an already explosive situation in southern Africa.

367. For its part, the Islamic Republic of Mauritania prefers, for the sake of Namibia, Africa and the global community, to take the opposite course by its sponsoring of draft resolution A/ES-8/L.1, just submitted for the approval of the Assembly.

368. Mr. DASHTSEREN (Mongolia) (*interpretation from Russian*): For 35 years the question of Namibia has constantly been discussed in various bodies of the United Nations and in other international organizations, and many resolutions have been adopted condemning the annexationist policy of the Republic of South Africa and calling for the immediate granting of independence to Namibia.

369. The question of the granting of independence to Namibia has recently acquired an especially urgent character, as is shown by the convening of this emergency special session of the General Assembly.

370. As is known to all, in 1966 the General Assembly adopted a resolution [2145 (XXI)] in which the inalienable right of the people of Namibia to independence and self-determination was confirmed; the Mandate of the Republic of South Africa to govern that Territory was terminated; and it was stated that, in the future, the Government of that Territory would become the direct responsibility of the United Nations.

371. Thus the Namibian people and all progressive peoples in the world began to hope for a peaceful settlement of the problem of Namibia; but unfortunately, despite the consistent efforts made by the world community, the last 15 years have been years of hope crushed and of the betrayal of the trust and aspirations of the Namibian people.

372. It is clear to all that the picture would look quite different if the handful of Western Powers, which only rarely condemn the reprehensible actions and policies of the South African racists for tactical reasons, were not providing large-scale military, economic and political support and assistance to the Republic of South Africa.

373. We can now say quite definitely that the initiators of the well-known Security Council resolution 435 (1978), the five Western countries, never had any serious intention of achieving a just settlement of the Namibian problem in the interests of the Namibian people.

374. Motivated by their greedy desires for superprofits and by their military-strategic ambitions the South African racists and some imperialist circles in the West, by various sophisticated wiles and by a policy of stalling, have been trying to thwart compliance with United Nations demands for the independence of Namibia. Is that not what is shown by the undermining of the so-called Geneva pre-implementation talks on the plan for a peaceful settlement?

375. By predatory exploitation of just one of the major resources of the country, uranium, the Western monopolies have plundered the people of Namibia in an amount of \$US 870 million. In this plunder of the natural wealth of Namibia, both transnational

corporations and monopolies in almost all the major capitalist countries have taken part.

376. In April and August of this year we again saw that the United States provided invaluable assistance to the racist régime of South Africa by twice vetoing in the Security Council draft resolutions calling for the imposition of sanctions against the Republic of South Africa.

377. The policy of the United States Government with respect to the Republic of South Africa has now become crystal clear and there can be no doubt of its essential features in anyone's mind. In that respect, the statement made by the President of the United States, Mr. Reagan, is characteristic. He said:

"Can we leave to the fickleness of fate a country that has supported us in all the wars we waged, a country that is of such strategic importance for the free world? I feel that we absolutely must leave the door open and continue negotiations with a country as friendly as the Republic of South Africa."

378. The policy of a sharp turn towards rapprochement with the racist régime was recently reconfirmed in an official statement made by the Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, Mr. Crocker, who said that the Reagan Administration "seeks to build a more constructive relationship with South Africa, one based on shared interests, persuasion and improved communications."\* That statement cannot be described as anything other than an open challenge to world public opinion and all the relevant decisions of the United Nations.

379. Assured of support from its Western protectors, primarily the United States, the *apartheid* régime is becoming more and more arrogant every day and increasingly aggressive in its actions concerning Namibia and the front-line States. The racists are constantly building up their armed forces. Recently they increased their military budget by 40 per cent, and in addition they have allocated an enormous amount for a "special defence fund"—in other words, for aggression.

380. The intensive militarization of the Republic of South Africa, its armed aggression against neighbouring sovereign States and its punitive, terrorist actions against the national liberation movement of Namibia, which are becoming more and more frequent and ever larger in scale, constitute a serious threat to peace and security in Africa and elsewhere. Such acts of aggression might have far-reaching consequences if they are not halted in time.

381. The Government and people of the Mongolian People's Republic strongly condemn the gangster-like attack carried out by the armed forces of the Republic of South Africa against the People's Republic of Angola as a criminal act of international terrorism. We should like to express our solidarity with the Government and people of the People's Republic of Angola and we demand the immediate cessation of this aggression.

382. The policy of the Republic of South Africa with respect to Namibia includes the stationing there of large contingents of troops; the construction of military bases; the use of those bases for constant acts

of aggression against neighbouring countries; the intensification of the exploitation of Namibians; and the establishment and strengthening of the *apartheid* system in Namibia by the setting up of a puppet régime there.

383. That policy of the racists, in addition to being supported by certain Western countries, is also abetted by some other States which, although they pay lip-service to Namibian independence, in actual fact cooperate with the Republic of South Africa, in particular by assisting it in its development of nuclear weapons. The South African racists are trying by all possible means to preserve the colonial régime in Namibia and they are prepared to do anything for that, because they are aware that radical changes in that Territory would be the last decisive step towards the collapse of the *apartheid* system in the Republic of South Africa itself. If with the aid of the countries I have mentioned the *apartheid* régime is able to get nuclear weapons, there is no doubt that there will exist a real danger that the racists will use them, just as in another time the Nazis would have been prepared to use them before their final destruction, had they had them.

384. Thus the present situation in southern Africa is fraught with serious consequences and requires that we, the United Nations, promptly adopt the most decisive measures in the name of justice and peace and the security of peoples.

385. The position of the Mongolian People's Republic and its people on the question of Namibia has been set forth on many occasions. It is an unvarying position of principle. We have always advocated and will continue to advocate the exercise of the inalienable right of the Namibian people to independence and self-determination on the basis of the preservation of the territorial integrity of that country, the immediate withdrawal from Namibia of all racist troops and the creation of objective conditions that will enable the people of Namibia to decide its own destiny.

386. In view of the circumstances that have developed, the patriots of Namibia, and especially SWAPO, the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people, deserve all our support and assistance in the struggle they are waging by all means available to them to gain freedom and independence for the Territory.

387. My delegation continues to believe that the adoption of comprehensive, mandatory sanctions against the Republic of South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter and their strict observance are the only effective measures that can be adopted by the United Nations.

388. The key question of a Namibian settlement, we feel, is and will remain a question of power—whether the people of Namibia is to be the true master of its own country or whether a puppet régime of South African henchmen will rule there—which is what the *apartheid* régime and its allies are so persistently striving to achieve.

389. In our view genuine independence can be ensured only by a Government created as a result of democratic elections and the free expression of the people's will. Therefore our delegation continues to view Security Council resolution 435 (1978) as the basis

\* Quoted in English by the speaker.

for a peaceful settlement of the Namibian problem. We fully share the views that have been expressed here to the effect that the resolution should not be further changed or weakened and that no one should refuse to implement it. Resolution 435 (1978) constitutes the minimum to which the patriots and freedom fighters of Namibia can agree.

390. The time of great hopes and patience has long since gone by. Those who are protecting the outmoded shameful *apartheid* régime must finally understand that no tricks or wiles will enable them to slow the course of history and human development. The just cause of a people fighting for its freedom and independence will inevitably triumph.

391. Our delegation would like the question of Namibia to be settled once and for all, so that this

emergency special session will be the last session on the Namibian question.

*The meeting rose at 8 p.m.*

---

NOTES

1. *Legal Consequences for States of the Continued Presence of South Africa in Namibia (South West Africa) notwithstanding Security Council Resolution 276 (1970), Advisory Opinion, I.C.J. Reports 1971*, p. 16.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 46.
3. *International Status of South-West Africa, Advisory Opinion, I.C.J. Reports 1950*, p. 137.
4. See A/CONF.107/8, sect. X.
5. *Ibid.*, para. 226.
6. *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-fifth Session, Supplement No. 24*, vol. I, annex II.