



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

*In the absence of the President, Mr. Kasemsri*  
(Thailand), Vice-President, took the Chair.

**AGENDA ITEM 5**

**Question of Namibia (continued)**

1. Mr. MUFAREH (Yemen) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The delegation of my country is convinced that, thanks to the experience, political wisdom and high level of confidence of the President, Mr. von Wechmar, this emergency special session of the General Assembly on the question of Namibia will be crowned with success.

2. The Namibian people, which still suffers the bitter consequences of coercion at the hands of the odious Pretoria racist régime, pins great hopes on the outcome of this session thanks to the support and sympathy it enjoys on the part of the majority of peoples and States of the world.

3. The Namibian people realizes that the Pretoria racist régime will not voluntarily withdraw from its territory and that the only way to dislodge it is by pursuing its armed struggle at the sacrifice of the flower of its youth, under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization [SWAPO], recognized throughout the world as the sole, legitimate representative of the Namibian people. Similarly, the General Assembly has recognized the legitimacy of the Namibian people's armed struggle. Moreover, history has taught the Namibians that the terror and coercion imposed upon them by the racist régime are the same price that other peoples have already paid after having suffered for many long years under the yoke of domination before they emerged victorious and gained their sovereignty and independence.

4. In 1966 the General Assembly adopted resolution 2145 (XXI), whereby it terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia, declaring the presence of South Africa in Namibia illegal, and placing Namibia under the direct responsibility of the United Nations through the administration of the United Nations Council for Namibia. At that time the international community assumed the historic responsibility of protecting the rights and interests of Namibia, as well as the responsibility for adopting the necessary measures to enable the people of the Territory to exercise its right to self-determination and national independence through South Africa's withdrawal from

Namibia and the maintenance of the territorial sovereignty of that region.

5. It is now 15 years since the termination of South Africa's Mandate over Namibia. Yet, in defiance of the various Security Council resolutions calling for withdrawal of the illegal South African administration from Namibia, the transfer of power to the people of Namibia, the freeing of all Namibian political detainees and the implementation of the right of political exiles to repatriation, South Africa continues to flout the United Nations and to disregard its resolutions, while committing one act of aggression after another against the people of Namibia.

6. The aggressive, expansionist policy practised by South Africa is itself a threat to the freedom and independence of the people of Namibia and it has turned that Territory into a springboard for incursions against neighbouring countries, as witness the criminal military campaign carried out against a State Member of the United Nations, which has endangered peace and security in the whole region.

7. The Security Council's failure, last week, to adopt a resolution condemning the acts of South African aggression against Angola has dire consequences for all Members of the international community, which is why they are unanimous in declaring that that setback will encourage the racist Pretoria régime to maintain its hold over the people of Namibia and to pursue its policy of prevarication in order to gain further time to exploit and plunder the natural resources of the Territory and to deprive the Namibian people of its right to self-determination, independence and freedom.

8. We request all Western States, in particular those which still have economic, political and cultural links with the racist régime in South Africa, to heed the will of the international community, given the threat to international peace and security represented by that régime, and to terminate all assistance to the Angolan puppets who strive to serve the Pretoria régime. Those States have the responsibility of complying with the international will and international law and not perpetuating the dangerous situation in Namibia, if they are really determined to maintain co-operative relations with States of the region and ensure the peace and security of the world.

9. States which prevented the condemnation of South Africa following its criminal act of aggression against Angola are urged by all Members and peoples in the international Organization to abide by justice and law and the principles that they themselves advocate in order to bring about the freedom and independence of all States in the world and, in this case, to give heed to the seriousness of the situation in the region and particularly in Namibia, that oppressed country.

Sooner or later the people of Namibia, supported by the majority of States throughout the world, will win its legitimate rights, whether by peaceful means or by armed struggle. Western interests and the plundering of the natural resources of Namibia cannot prevent the people of Namibia from achieving their freedom, sovereignty and independence.

10. Present circumstances and the worsening situation in the Territory of Namibia make it necessary for the international community and the United Nations to adopt decisive, effective measures against the Pretoria régime, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations which envisages the need to impose comprehensive economic sanctions, as well as a diplomatic and military embargo, against any State which does not respect and implement United Nations resolutions. Those measures must be taken, without any further hesitation, against the racist régime of South Africa, because it has disregarded and continues to violate the Charter as well as the resolutions of this Organization and because it has openly challenged the will of the international community.

11. The General Assembly is required to discharge its historic responsibilities in order to bring about freedom and national independence for Namibia and must use every means at its disposal to secure South Africa's withdrawal from Namibia and to maintain the sovereignty and territorial integrity of that Territory, so that its people can exercise its legitimate rights.

12. Since the Security Council has failed to impose sanctions against South Africa, the General Assembly has become the only forum which can assume that responsibility by adopting measures to isolate the racist régime of Pretoria in all international forums and to prevail upon that horrendous régime finally to respect and implement United Nations resolutions.

13. We know that, if the majority of the States Members of the United Nations boycott South Africa economically, politically and militarily, it will involve many sacrifices, but it will indeed have an impact on the situation in South Africa in every activity and over the long term and that country will be prevailed upon finally to accept the fait accompli after having suffered from the isolation imposed on it.

14. The Government and people of the Yemen Arab Republic, on the basis of the principles of the resolution of 26 September, support all efforts exerted by the international community to defend the sovereignty and independence of Namibia.

15. We unreservedly support Security Council resolution 435 (1978) without any modification or amendment, and we consider that Walvis Bay is an integral part of the Territory of Namibia. We firmly denounce the racist policies practised by South Africa to dismember and destabilize Angola in an effort to eliminate the resistance of the Namibian people and in a desperate attempt to increase pressure on the Government and people of the front-line countries which are shouldering a historic responsibility in the war of liberation being waged in Namibia.

16. The Government of the Yemen Arab Republic in no wise recognizes the puppet régime established in Namibia which resulted from the rigged elections organized by the racist régime of Pretoria. It is a mask

behind which that régime perpetrates its criminal actions. We consider SWAPO to be the authentic, legitimate representative of the people of Namibia and will side with it until final victory—which will certainly come.

17. Mr. ALBORNOZ (Ecuador) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should like to present my greetings to the President, Mr. von Wechmar, on the occasion of this emergency special session, in which, once again, his universal outlook, experience and intelligent objectivity on third world problems are helping to guide the highest forum of contemporary international law to take one more step towards resolving one of the major problems of concern to the international community.

18. For my country, Ecuador, which resolutely supported the convening of this emergency special session, the topic of Namibia is not remote nor can it be looked at with indifference. It is a problem of vital legal and political significance because the prestige of our world Organization itself is at stake in the face of South Africa's rebellious non-compliance with its resolutions and because of the violation of principles that accompanies this recalcitrant conduct. This affects each and every one of the Members of the United Nations, apart from the humiliating and distressing situation imposed on a fraternal people of Africa by the shameful system of *apartheid* and a systematic violation of human rights.

19. Since the days when the Charter of the United Nations was drafted in 1945, Ecuador, together with the other Latin American founding Members of the Organization, has maintained a firm anti-colonialist position and contributed to the creation of the Trust Territory system and to the establishment of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples [*resolution 1514 (XV)*]. Hence the United Nations is committed, before mankind, which it represents, and before history, to the promotion of self-government, which is the result of the self-determination of peoples in the march towards the elimination of colonialism in all its forms.

20. The attitude of Ecuador in this area stems from its attachment to democracy and from its law, as clearly expressed in the political Constitution of our country, article 4 of which states:

“Ecuador condemns all forms of colonialism, neo-colonialism and racial discrimination and recognizes the right of peoples to free themselves from those oppressive systems.”

Moreover, article 19, paragraph 4, states in part that

“all discrimination is prohibited, for reasons of race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, social origin, economic position or birth”.

21. In the case of Namibia, moreover, there is a violation of principles such as that of the non-recognition of the occupation of territories obtained and maintained by the use of force and the civilized principle of the peaceful settlement of disputes is being set aside.

22. Only the people of Namibia has a right to decide on its own destiny and the only solution, contained in Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978), is that of free and democratic elections under

United Nations supervision, with the prior withdrawal of the foreign troops that are occupying the territory. Without the withdrawal of foreign troops there can be no free elections anywhere in the world; without free elections a State cannot join the community of nations. Thus the example of Zimbabwe arises once again, clear and impressive, as a country that held elections with the full participation of all the political sectors of the people and won, through democratic channels, international recognition and a place in the concert of nations.

23. For 34 years now we have been seeking a solution of this problem. On the one hand, we have the right of a people to independence which is supported by law and by the entire international community. On the other, there is the wilful wrongdoing of a country that does not obey the United Nations and that stubbornly endeavours to maintain its domination solely by the use of force, in spite of the recommendations and demands of the General Assembly, the Security Council and the advisory opinions and judgement of the International Court of Justice. More than 14 years ago the General Assembly declared that South Africa had no right whatsoever to administer the Territory of Namibia and, therefore, any measure or Government act on the part of that country over that Territory was completely null and void.

24. The territorial integrity of a new State is, likewise, essential to its emergence into independent life and universal recognition. Therefore Walvis Bay and the off-shore islands that form part of the Territory of Namibia, because of the geographic and economic unity recognized by South Africa, must be turned over to the new authorities without any restriction.

25. The struggle of the Namibian people for freedom has the support and solidarity of the people and the Government of Ecuador and therefore we admire the persevering and resolute action of the liberation movement, SWAPO, as well as the front-line States that support it, even to the point of resisting acts of aggression they suffer for that reason. The international policy of Ecuador is against any form of aggression, regardless of its nature, be it armed or economic, because it violates the essential principles of civilized coexistence and, therefore, we forcefully condemn the recent incursions by South African troops into Angola, reprehensible acts that have caused further suffering to the civilian population of that country, just as we completely disapprove of the presence of foreign troops in Namibia. For their part, the Western States are committed to achieving results in their work on those aspects of the plan which have already been accepted by SWAPO and by South Africa, but which have not yet been implemented.

26. Therefore, since Namibia is the sole and exclusive responsibility of the United Nations, Ecuador will be in favour of a resolution forcefully condemning the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa, one which demands the unconditional implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and, failing that, the imposition of the corresponding sanctions provided for in the Charter of the United Nations.

27. Mr. DAVIN (Gabon) (*interpretation from French*): At this late stage in our work, I shall not uselessly prolong our debates. In any case, everything

has been said and said well, with much warmth and eloquence, by all the speakers who have preceded me. Hence it is certainly not my claim to bring any new elements to the discussion of the subject before us. I shall merely confine myself to voicing very briefly the point of view of my Government on a particularly burning and disquieting subject of deep concern to us all.

28. The current emergency special session on the question of Namibia is being held in accordance with the recommendations of the heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity [OAU] and the Non-Aligned Movement, in order to take over where the Security Council left off in its meetings last April, when it considered the adoption of comprehensive sanctions against South Africa in view of the latter's continued illegal occupation of Namibia and its persistent refusal to abide by and implement the decisions of our Organization on the immediate granting of independence to that international Territory.

29. Because of the triple veto cast by certain great Powers at that time, the Security Council was unfortunately unable to achieve a positive result, neither with respect to mandatory sanctions nor the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia endorsed by Security Council resolution 435 (1978). The Security Council's failure could not and should in no case mean the Organization's relinquishment of the United Nations settlement plan, to which we are strongly devoted. Therefore, because of the seriousness of the problem, it was more important than ever to resume the debate in the General Assembly so that law and justice could triumph over the obstruction of some and the obvious bad faith of South Africa, which is bent on maintaining its illegal occupation of Namibia and continues to deny the people of Namibia their right to self-determination and independence.

30. The Assembly is holding this emergency special session in disquieting international circumstances arising from the proliferation of serious tensions and conflicts, both overt and covert, which may result in our world being caught up in a catastrophic planetary conflagration.

31. To mention merely the Namibian problem, which is the subject of our concern at this time: who today could deny that the situation prevailing in that region of southern Africa is explosive and constitutes a serious threat to international peace and security?

32. With total scorn for ethics and the rules that govern relations between States, in flagrant violation of international law and the fundamental principles of the Charter of the United Nations, the Government of the Republic of South Africa—strengthened by the impunity granted it owing to its overwhelming military superiority and the acknowledged support given to it by certain Powers—did not hesitate, even in the absence of any state of war, to invade Angola, a sovereign State and a Member of the Organization. Using the fallacious pretext of the so-called right of hot pursuit, even though in fact Angola and South Africa have no common border, South African troops penetrated deep into Angolan territory, massacring innocent, peaceful civilian populations and destroying everything in their path. The Government of Gabon

vehemently condemns that unjustifiable and inadmissible act of aggression, an odious act that threatened the territorial integrity of Angola and thus the territorial integrity of all the countries of the subregion.

33. The systematic policy of provocation and aggression and the maintenance of the southern region in a permanent climate of insecurity, provide, if ever there was need for this, further proof of the determination of the racist Pretoria régime to perpetuate its illegal occupation of the Territory of Namibia.

34. In view of the seriousness of the situation, the international community must strongly and unequivocally condemn South Africa for its warmongering policy against its neighbours and for its wrongful and illegal exploitation of Namibian territory as a base for the launching of its aggressive raids. It must be clearly reaffirmed here that Namibia is not an integral part of the Republic of South Africa, but is a separate territorial entity that falls under the sole authority of the United Nations. The most reliable way of immediately terminating the illegal occupation of Namibia is to compel South Africa, without further delay, to conform to the unanimous will of the entire international community and accept immediate implementation of Council resolution 435 (1978) as well as the settlement plan by Namibia.

35. That plan was conceived and established on the initiative of the five Western Powers of the contact group and has been approved and accepted by all United Nations Members, which gives it legitimacy and confers upon it the authority and force of law. There is, then, no question of accepting any challenge to that plan, especially by its initiators, who themselves obtained its endorsement by the international community. That is why we request those countries not to change anything in the plan, not to distort it by adding new restrictive or specious clauses, which is what South Africa wants. The Western contact group possesses the necessary means of persuasion to convince South Africa to relinquish the annexationist policy that it is trying to impose on Namibia, with the complicity of internal elements, whether they are the supporters of *apartheid* or those who have been won over to that cause through the racist terror exercised over the indigenous population. We reject any so-called internal settlement solution that might be imposed on Namibia in violation of the interests of the people of Namibia, which is represented by SWAPO. No one can challenge the legitimacy of SWAPO, the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people, which is recognized as such by the United Nations and in all international forums. SWAPO has furnished proof of its authenticity and its representative character by its total commitment to the national liberation struggle, which it supports and has been supporting unflinchingly for many years now, notwithstanding all sorts of difficulties and the harsh sacrifices it has made. As long as the Pretoria Government opposes the implementation of the settlement plan adopted by the United Nations, SWAPO must enjoy not only our moral support but also our broad-based material assistance. The wide variety of increased assistance that the international community is in duty bound to give SWAPO must help the people of Namibia, through their freedom fighters, to oppose victoriously South

Africa and force it to recognize their inalienable right to freedom and independence.

36. However, the bad faith that South Africa has always demonstrated, the numerous pretexts that it has advanced and the delaying tactics it has used to put off the day of reckoning remind us not to harbour too many illusions in this respect. It is highly unlikely that South Africa will spontaneously demonstrate good will and finally agree to co-operate sincerely with the United Nations to bring about Namibia's accession to independence. By its past and present behaviour, South Africa has proved that it does not understand the language of reason but knows only the use of force. In these circumstances, what means could the United Nations use against Pretoria if not mandatory sanctions? We are convinced that only the effective imposition of severe sanctions will force South Africa to abandon its racist policies of *apartheid* and put an end to its illegal occupation of Namibia. That is why we are convinced that at this emergency special session, in accordance with its previous decisions, and in full exercise of its competence and prerogatives as defined by the Charter of the United Nations the General Assembly will not fail in its duty and will decide to impose sanctions against South Africa as provided for under Chapter VII of the Charter.

37. Mr. BURWIN (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*interpretation from Arabic*): I should like to congratulate the President of the General Assembly on his assumption of the presidency of this emergency special session. We are convinced that his competence and experience will help to direct this session towards tangible results.

38. Once again the General Assembly is meeting in an emergency special session to deal with one of the problems threatening international peace and security. This session is the result of the failure of all international attempts to find a solution to the Namibian problem and to implement the Security Council resolutions, especially resolution 435 (1978), which provides for South Africa's withdrawal from the Territory and the attainment of independence by the people of Namibia. Since the beginning of this year we have witnessed intensive international efforts to find a way out of the impasse on the issue, especially following the failure of agreement between SWAPO and South Africa at the January 1981 Geneva meeting, which was aimed at establishing administrative measures for the independence of Namibia. There is no doubt that the failure at Geneva was due to the cunning tactics of South Africa and its refusal to implement Security Council resolution 435 (1978), whereas SWAPO was willing to give its full co-operation and to accept an immediate cease-fire. This question has been discussed on many occasions in many international forums since then including the Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi from 9 to 13 February 1981, the thirty-sixth ordinary session of the Council of Ministers of OAU, held at Addis Ababa from 23 February to 1 March 1981, the resumed thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly, held at New York from 2 to 6 March 1981, and the Extraordinary Ministerial Meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Countries, held at Algiers from 16 to 18 April 1981. All of those international bodies

demanded the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the South Africa régime, in accordance with the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter so as to make the Pretoria régime comply with United Nations resolutions on Namibia. Those bodies also condemned the aggressive policy of the racist Pretoria régime in southern Africa.

39. As far as the United Nations is concerned, the Security Council met between 21 and 30 April 1981 to consider the question of Namibia, and the majority of the international community expressed the hope that the Council would discharge its responsibilities and take measures against South Africa in order to induce it to comply with United Nations resolutions and grant independence to Namibia. Yet the Council was unable to adopt practical measures because of the use of the right to veto by three Western States, which are permanent members of the Council.

40. That situation encouraged the racist régime of South Africa to persist in its aggressive policy against front-line African States. The last example of that policy is the recent act of aggression perpetrated against the People's Republic of Angola, which violated its independence and territorial sovereignty, causing losses of human life and property. In spite of condemnation of that act of aggression by an absolute majority of States throughout the world, the United Nations, as represented by the Security Council, was unable to take any strong measures against South Africa. The reason was, as usual, that the United States, the enemy of the African continent, went against the will of the international community and took the side of coercion and aggression by siding with the racist régime of South Africa. It used its veto against the draft resolution submitted in the Council and thus completely paralysed that body, confirming United States support of South African aggression against Angola. The new United States Administration has demonstrated by its behaviour in many parts of the world that it is attempting to increase international tension. That is confirmed by its unlimited support of the racist régime in all aspects, notably, through the provision of destructive weapons to that régime, thus enabling it to oppress peoples and commit acts of aggression against neighbouring countries. We mention the example of its support of the racist régime of South Africa, but there is also its support of the Zionist régime in occupied Palestine, which enables that régime to oppress the Palestinian people and the Arab peoples in general. The similarity between the policies practised by these two racist régimes, South Africa and occupied Palestine, is great. Neither pays any heed to United Nations resolutions or the rights of peoples to self-determination and independence. The South African *apartheid* régime is perpetrating acts of aggression against neighbouring African States and claims the right to pursue what it calls "terrorists", namely, the SWAPO fighters. Likewise we see the Zionist racist régime violating the sovereignty of Arab States every day, killing innocent people and committing acts of aggression against the Palestine Liberation Organization [PLO]. The co-operation between those two régimes in all activities, nuclear, as well as economic, is one of the reasons for their non-compliance with international resolutions. Furthermore, the support given

them by the United States only increases international tension, bringing the world closer to war. We wish to stress that the United States Administration, within the framework of its attempts to extend its spheres of influence in the world and impose its hegemony, has begun to use a new and very dangerous method which represents a direct threat to international peace and security. The United States has been showing its strength to the small States in Africa, Asia and Latin America by deploying its fleets throughout the world. Last month we saw that State violate the airspace of my country, a direct act of aggression against our sovereignty. We also saw a violation of the airspace of the People's Democratic Republic of Korea and continued threats to a certain number of States in Latin America—continued direct intervention in the internal affairs of those countries.

41. The cause of Namibia has been discussed at sufficient length, be it within the framework of the Organization or in other international and regional organizations, such as OAU and the Non-Aligned Movement. World public opinion is well aware that this question is one of illegal occupation and colonization which must be terminated as soon as possible. Three years ago the Security Council adopted resolution 435 (1978), which represents the only acceptable framework at an international level for a solution to the problem. That resolution was adopted following tireless efforts by the two parties directly concerned, namely, SWAPO, as the sole representative of the people of Namibia, supported by the United Nations, and the South African racist régime, which is illegally occupying the region. Yet, since the beginning of this year and, more precisely, since the Geneva meeting, we have seen the delaying tactics used by the racist régime which refuses to act in accordance with its commitment to that resolution. At the same time manoeuvring has begun on the part of the Western contact group, headed, of course, by the United States, in order to make modifications in the United Nations plan, provided for in Council resolution 435 (1978). Those manoeuvres are nothing but an attempt to delay a political settlement of the problem and bring it back to square one, thereby prolonging the occupation of Namibia and the plunder of its wealth.

42. Having established the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, the members of the Western contact group should be those most concerned with its implementation. But exactly the opposite is the case, since those countries began to hamper the implementation of the plan after its adoption. The reason for this is well known: the Western States have investments and important strategic and economic interests in Namibia and in South Africa. They feel it is in their interests to perpetuate South Africa's domination over Namibia and to impose a *fait accompli* through all types of attempts to consolidate the puppet régime set up by South Africa in Namibia so that the transnational corporations may be able to continue their destructive activities in the Territory, plunder the wealth of the region and transfer it to the Western States. In this respect we must point out that, in spite of all the resolutions adopted by the United Nations concerning the preservation of Namibia's natural resources, including Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the

Natural Resources of Namibia,<sup>1</sup> enacted by the United Nations Council for Namibia, the wealth of the region continues to be plundered before the very eyes of the international community. Moreover, the documents of the United Nations, and in particular those of the United Nations Council for Namibia, stress that the leading corporations operating in Namibia are those of the members of the Western contact group. They also show that a number of Western countries still import Namibian uranium which is being illegally exported by the South African *apartheid* régime. We categorically condemn all States that are accomplices of the racist régime in exploiting Namibia's natural resources and depriving the Namibian people of that wealth.

43. In spite of a few positive initiatives taken by the new administration of France concerning southern Africa, the policies of other European countries in the Western contact group do not augur well. Even worse, the United States Government has now begun to give particular attention to its relations with the racist South African régime considering it to be a "traditional ally" which it cannot abandon. It continues to see the question of Namibia in a strategic context and as part of the East-West confrontation. It does not recognize the decolonization aspect of the problem. Hence it is endeavouring to rally the other Western States to its side. Should it succeed in this approach, it would be a disaster for peace and security in southern Africa and throughout the world.

44. The situation in Namibia and in southern Africa is, generally speaking, deteriorating day after day. The South African *apartheid* régime has intensified its campaign of repression through further arrests, coercion and the detention of fighters in South Africa and Namibia. Similarly, atrocious manœuvres have been perpetrated in a desperate attempt to undermine SWAPO, the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people. With the support of certain Western States, South Africa is attempting by all means to strengthen the puppet régime, the so-called "Democratic Turnhalle Alliance"; it is also intensifying its efforts to recruit Namibians and form the so-called "South African army." It has mobilized some 100,000 men in Namibia in order to coerce black Africans and attack neighbouring African States.

45. It is high time for the United Nations to adopt effective measures to demonstrate its authority over the Territory and bring the Namibian people to self-determination and independence in accordance with relevant United Nations resolutions. The General Assembly, in the face of the Security Council's failure to adopt any decisive measure, must at this emergency special session adopt all necessary measures to safeguard international peace and security. This is its responsibility under the terms of the Charter.

46. My delegation feels that what is expected of the United Nations is the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the *apartheid* régime, in order to induce it to comply with United Nations resolutions, in particular Security Council resolution 435 (1978), aimed at implementing the United Nations plan to guarantee the complete independence of the people of Namibia, under the leadership of

SWAPO, and its sovereignty over the entire Territory, including Walvis Bay and the off-shore islands.

47. Lastly, I should like to say that the persistent delays of South Africa, and others which support it, and its reluctance to implement those resolutions will not prevent the people of Namibia from obtaining independence by peaceful means, if possible, or by armed struggle, which seems to be the only language that can be understood by the racists and the imperialists.

48. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya reiterates its complete support for the people of Namibia in its just struggle, under the leadership of SWAPO, to obtain self-determination and independence, and will continue to provide all material and moral support to that heroic people and all the peoples of southern Africa until independence can be achieved and until an end can be put to racism in that region. We also wish to reaffirm our solidarity with the front-line States victims of acts of aggression by the *apartheid* régime.

49. Mr. OTUNNU (Uganda): I should like to say how very fitting it is that the consideration of the question of Namibia should once again be held under the distinguished leadership of our current President of the General Assembly. His personal commitment and that of his country in this matter are well known and much appreciated.

50. Towards the close of 1980 the hopes of the international community were focused on Geneva. So high were those hopes that the Group of African States even yielded to the request by the Western contact group of five countries to postpone a scheduled debate on Namibia until the resumed thirty-fifth session of the General assembly.

51. It was argued then that a General Assembly debate prior to the meeting at Geneva might provide South Africa with an excuse for stalling on a settlement. We were wrong in assuming this. It turned out that the South Africans needed no excuse from the General Assembly. It soon became clear that the racists were determined in any event to wreck the Geneva talks. And equally clear was the unwillingness of the Western contact group to keep their side of the bargain.

52. It was against the background of the Geneva debacle that a global consensus emerged. The global consensus was formed around the need for the Security Council to use more specific means of applying peaceful pressure against South Africa in order to compel the racist régime to comply with the United Nations plan for Namibia.

53. And so it was that the OAU Co-ordinating Committee for the Liberation of Africa during its meeting at Arusha in January, the Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries during its meeting at New Delhi in February, the Council of Ministers of OAU during its meeting at Addis Ababa in February and March, the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Countries during its meeting at Algiers in April, and the resumed thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly all called upon the Security Council to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa in accor-

dance with the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

54. In spite of the magnitude of that consensus; in spite of the fact that no less than 19 Foreign Ministers from four continents met in New York to deliver that global consensus; in spite of the overwhelming evidence that South Africa's continued illegal occupation of Namibia constitutes a grave threat to international peace and security; in spite of the fact that this unusual act of illegality has given rise to constant acts of aggression and breaches of the peace—in spite of all that, action against the racist régime was blocked on 30 April by the veto of three Western permanent members of the Security Council. On the night of the veto, the three Powers cast no less than 12 heavy votes against the people of Namibia and in favour of the occupying Power.

55. This eighth emergency special session of the General Assembly became necessary because of the veto of three Western Powers on 30 April. The purpose of this session is, therefore, to enable the Assembly to review the objective implications of the veto exercise and to seek new ways of expediting the independence of Namibia.

56. The first and immediate impact of the veto exercise was clearly that it gave new confidence to the racist régime. It strengthened the resolve of the occupying Power to continue its illegal occupation of Namibia and encouraged it to pursue with impunity its aggressive designs against the neighbouring States. Those responsible for the veto of 30 April can in no way escape responsibility for the increased repression inside Namibia, nor can they escape responsibility for the present aggression against Angola.

57. To add insult to grievous injury, at the very height of this aggression, one of the vetoing Powers issued a major policy statement that was, in substance and logic, indistinguishable from what we have become so accustomed to hearing from the masters of *apartheid*. What is more, the same super-Power even blocked a mere condemnation of South Africa in the Security Council. Yet, as President José Eduardo dos Santos reminded the world only the day before yesterday, even as we are meeting here today South Africa is continuing to occupy the southern part of Angola—no doubt with a view to creating a "south Lebanon" situation in the area.

58. The second implication of the veto exercise lies in the fact that it represents the triumph of narrow strategic and ideological considerations over the public interest of international peace and security. In that exercise the principles of self-determination and freedom were also subordinated to an inordinate concern for bonanza profits.

59. The third implication of the veto exercise concerns the perversion of the doctrine of "power with responsibility". The founders of the United Nations gave the permanent members of the Security Council greater responsibility than other members. It was intended that the permanent members should use their powers to defend the principles of the Charter and enhance the prospects of peace, security and freedom in the world. Instead, what we witnessed on 30 April

and again on 31 August were the manifestations of naked power divorced from corresponding responsibility.

60. Finally, the veto exercise also represents an increasing tendency on the part of some of the Powers to demobilize the Security Council with regard to some of the most serious situations around the world today, situations which are notorious for the threats they pose to international peace and security. This tendency is dangerous, not the least because it undermines the Security Council in its role as the organ entrusted with the primary responsibility for maintaining international peace and security. Those developments are disturbing and should be of special concern to the General Assembly.

61. In vetoing the measures that were proposed in the Security Council in April, the three Western Powers pleaded for more time and more patience. They argued that, together with the other members of the Western contact groups, they would utilize their own means of pressure to compel South Africa to implement the United Nations plan for Namibia.

62. It is now nine months since Geneva and four months since the veto. There are still no discernible signs of any meaningful pressure against South Africa. Instead, what we have observed over the past several months is a protracted episode of benign neglect. Yet during this same period the situation in and around Namibia has deteriorated considerably. The present aggression against Angola and the occupation of the southern part of that country is only the most dramatic illustration of this state of affairs. Meanwhile, inside Namibia itself South Africa is working frantically to prepare the ground for an internal settlement, while also planting the seeds of a civil war in that country.

63. Since Geneva, the Western contact group has been holding consultations; but we have waited in vain for positive results to emerge from those consultations. The itinerary of the consultations has indeed been very long: the meeting of senior officials in London in April was followed by the meeting of Foreign Ministers in Rome in May, which was followed by another meeting of Foreign Ministers in Ottawa in July. Moreover, those meetings were interspersed with various high-level consultations in Africa by a prominent member of the Western contact group. Still there are no results.

64. At one stage we were given to believe that the Western contact group would have concrete proposals in time for this emergency special session. We are now approaching the end of this session, and still there is nothing. Now we have been informed that the next stage in the itinerary of the Western contact group is the meeting of Foreign Ministers here in New York on 24 September.

65. Just how long will this waiting game continue? We expected tangible pressure on South Africa. Instead, the Western contact group has been tinkering with Council resolution 435 (1978). We expected definitive movement towards implementation. Instead, the group has been talking about so-called minority rights. In any case, who are the members of this minority? If they are *bona fide* Namibians, then clearly their rights and obligations should be no less and no more than those of their compatriots.

66. We hope that in all this there will be no attempt to smuggle through the back door the same colonial privileges which the people of Namibia and the international community are seeking to dismantle through the front door.

67. It is indeed very ironic that the issue of so-called rights for a highly privileged minority should defer the attainment of freedom for the vast majority of Namibians who are still brutalized and dispossessed in their own land.

68. Nothing in the recent history of Africa can possibly justify this preoccupation with the "rights" of the white minority in Namibia. The fact is that, far from suffering any disadvantages, white minorities have generally prospered in post-colonial Africa.

69. How long will the Western contact group continue to play hide-and-seek with the future of Namibia? That group has a moral and political obligation to make good their original undertaking on Namibia.

70. In this regard it must be made clear that Council resolution 435 (1978) is a compromise package, which has been put together by the Western contact group of five countries and accepted by both SWAPO and South Africa, the two parties to the conflict. It is needless to say, therefore, that resolution 435 (1978) is non-negotiable under any circumstances.

71. It was in 1966 that the General Assembly terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia. Today, some 15 years later, Namibia is still under racist domination and occupation.

72. It was in this connection that the International Court of Justice, in its advisory opinion of 21 June 1971, made the following categorical declaration:

"A binding determination made by a competent organ of the United Nations to the effect that a situation is illegal cannot remain without consequence. Once the Court is faced with such a situation, it would be failing in the discharge of its judicial functions if it did not declare that there is an obligation, especially upon Members of the United Nations, to bring that situation to an end."<sup>2</sup>

73. The General Assembly is the highest and most representative organ of the United Nations. It is the most democratic in its practice. It has a commendable record on decolonization, and it bears a special responsibility and a historic one for Namibia.

74. For these reasons and others, the General Assembly must spare no effort in discharging the obligation about which the International Court of Justice spoke so clearly.

75. During this emergency special session, the Assembly must strike a decisive blow for freedom by imposing comprehensive sanctions against South Africa, in accordance with the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter. Only such decisive action can compel the racist régime to comply with the decisions of the United Nations relating to Namibia and, in particular, Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

76. On this occasion the people and Government of Uganda salute the people of Namibia, under the leadership of their sole and authentic representative, SWAPO, for their heroic struggle against the forces of oppression and occupation.

77. We commend the front-line States which, against formidable odds, have maintained a steadfast commitment to the cause of justice and freedom in southern Africa.

78. Finally, I wish to pay a tribute to the Secretary-General, the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, the Secretary-General's Special Representative for Namibia and members of the United Nations Council for Namibia for their tireless efforts in support of Namibian independence.

79. But the greatest tribute of all will be a free and independent Namibia.

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

80. Mr. JANKU (Albania): The Socialist People's Republic of Albania, in accordance with its well-known and principled policy of supporting peoples fighting for freedom and national independence, welcomed and supported the initiative for the convening of this emergency special session of the General Assembly to consider once again the question of Namibia, whose just and final solution concerns not only the Namibian people and African peoples in general, but all peoples throughout the world who love peace, freedom and justice.

81. The Namibian question is one of the issues with which the United Nations has been dealing for a very long period of time—since its founding 36 years ago. But the events which occurred before and especially after the last debate on Namibia have given us fresh proof of, and made ever clearer, the true intention of the enemies of the Namibian people to perpetuate colonial domination in that country.

82. For many years now, the Fascist régime in Pretoria, having the full support of the imperialist Powers, has continued its policy of war and aggression, intensifying crimes, massacres, arrests and murder of patriots and the Namibian people and their sons and daughters.

83. During the last year, here in the United Nations too, on many occasions we have had ample and indisputable proof which clearly demonstrated that the South African régime has never had and does not now have the least intention of voluntarily renouncing its colonial domination of Namibia. That racist régime continues not only to challenge the decisions of the United Nations and to defy with impunity repeated United Nations demands for it to withdraw from Namibia, it continues to trample underfoot the sovereign rights of the Namibian people, and, at the same time, with the greatest arrogance, to defy all peoples and world public opinion which firmly condemn it.

84. The legitimate aspirations and just demand of the Namibian people for freedom and national independence are still being faced with countless new obstacles and with plots and intrigues hatched by the Fascist régime of South Africa and the imperialist Powers which support it. Those Powers are the ones that have always done everything they could to help the Pretoria régime to maintain its colonial domination in Namibia and, thereby, to protect their own neo-colonialist interests in that country and in the whole African continent.



85. While continuing to supply military and economic aid to the South African régime, both overtly and covertly, and in spite of the United Nations decisions condemning the illegal and barbaric occupation of Namibia by South African troops, the Western contact group is continuing to hold meetings after meeting to plot a "political" settlement, under which the Namibian people would lay down their arms while the imperialists would safeguard their privileges in those African countries which are rich in minerals and of great strategic importance to them.

86. In order better to assist the racists in Pretoria, the United States and other imperialists have always pretended to work towards finding so-called political or negotiated settlements that would allegedly be to the advantage of and acceptable to everyone. But, now more than ever before, it has become crystal clear that that racist régime is not interested in an internationally acceptable settlement. It is interested only in a settlement acceptable to itself and compatible with its *apartheid* system.

87. Hence, today the American imperialists are speaking about the necessity of their being neutral in southern Africa to help to promote a diplomatic solution for Namibia, at a time when "neutrality" can only mean support for the *status quo*—support for the system of *apartheid*. Under the cover of this concern for "peace"—for a "political settlement" of the question of Namibia—they instigate and sanction the most criminal activities of the Fascists of the Pretoria régime. All the manoeuvring of the imperialist Powers has been aimed at deceiving the Namibian people, the people of Africa and public opinion throughout the world.

88. After the Geneva experience, after the failure of those talks, one would have thought that the logical next step would be for the international community to apply affective pressure on Pretoria to accept the opinion of the majority. Indeed, one might even have expected that the five Western countries would be the first to demonstrate this commitment since they were the originators of the idea of a negotiated settlement. But, at least not to our surprise, none of this happened.

89. By placing their own economic and strategic interests far above the expressed will of the international community, the imperialist Powers—the United States, in particular—have encouraged South Africa to pursue a perilous path threatening international peace and security. It is a well-known and generally accepted fact—and there is no further need to show this—that the racist régime of South Africa would not dare to continue its colonial policy in Namibia if it could not rely on the strong and consistent political, economic, military and diplomatic support of these imperialist Powers, in particular, the United States.

90. The Albanian delegation holds the view that the intensification of fierce rivalry between the super-Powers—the United States and the Soviet Union, without excluding other imperialist powers—and their bargainings and plots for the division and redivision of markets, for military bases and spheres of influence, find their expression in southern Africa and Namibia as well.

91. The Pretoria Fascists are being encouraged by and making use of the turbulent situation; they are gaining from the dangerous and explosive situation of tensions and conflicts which has been and is being created in southern Africa and the whole of Africa by the imperialist Powers—the United States, the Soviet Union, China and other imperialist Powers.

92. Our delegation is of the opinion that, as was clearly expressed by many delegations here and demonstrated by the recent development of events, there will be no genuine solution for the Namibian people through negotiations. This problem will find its just and final solution only if the racists of South Africa are made to withdraw from the Territory of Namibia and give up their colonial policy in southern Africa; only if an end is put to the interference and intrigues of the super-Powers in Namibia and the African continent in general, thus granting those peoples the right to self-determination.

93. The Namibian and other African peoples can only win peace and freedom by heightening their vigilance and intensifying their struggle against racism, *apartheid*, imperialism, social-imperialism and all reaction. The heroic people of Namibia, who have never for a moment accepted the neo-colonial domination of their country and have never given anyone the right to decide their future, are bound to win victory in their armed struggle by fighting without compromise to drive the South African Fascists and their imperialist masters out of their country.

94. The armed struggle of the Namibian people to put an end to the barbaric racist régime of Pretoria is a just struggle which enjoys the support of all democratic and progressive forces the world over.

95. In conclusion, the Albanian delegation wishes once again to emphasize that the Albanian people and their Government will firmly continue to condemn and denounce the colonial policy of the Pretoria régime and, at the same time, will continue to support with the strongest determination the just struggle of the Namibian people, which is sure to lead them to ultimate victory and national independence.

96. Mr. HOLST (Norway): Nearly 15 years have now elapsed since the General Assembly terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia, declared the presence of South Africa in that Territory illegal, and assumed direct responsibility for the United Nations over the Territory of Namibia. Ten years have passed since the International Court of Justice confirmed the illegality of South Africa's continued presence in Namibia. Three years have gone by since the Security Council adopted resolution 435 (1978), providing for a peaceful transition to majority rule in Namibia through free and fair elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations.

97. So far, 1981 has not brought us closer to the established goal of securing Namibia's independence. On the contrary, South Africa's refusal in January to agree to an early implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia at the Geneva meeting, and the recent escalation of its attacks against Angola, have created a situation in southern Africa which is pregnant with danger, frustration and injustice. South Africa must, in our opinion, bear responsibility for this unacceptable situation. There is no acceptable

excuse or justification for the South African policies which have led to the present impasse. The Norwegian Government has condemned firmly the latest acts of aggression against Angola. Norway has joined with the other Nordic countries in demanding the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of all South African troops from Angola. I repeat that demand here and now. In order to alleviate the suffering and hardships endured by the civilian population in southern Angola, particularly as a result of the large numbers of Namibian refugees in the area, the Norwegian Government has recently granted the sum of \$US 350,000 to the emergency food programme initiated by the World Lutheran Federation.

98. At this point, we have to raise the question of possible action by the international community for purposes of removing the barriers to Namibian independence. More specifically, we must confront the issue of how the United Nations can exercise its responsibility for the Territory of Namibia until the arrival of the day of independence in that country.

99. From the point of view of resolving conflict, the point of departure would seem more promising in Namibia than in most other international conflicts. A comprehensive consensus has been encompassed in Security Council resolution 435 (1978). Such a consensus does not exist in other conflicts. It embraces the legal issues as well as the plan for implementing the transition to independent rule.

100. A broad consensus has existed behind the proposition that every peaceful means should be tried in order to convince or pressure South Africa into accepting the fact that the emergence of a free, and independent and, if it so chooses, a non-aligned Namibia would also be a solution in its own best interest. I should hasten to add, however, that in the view of the Norwegian Government, Council resolution 435 (1978) continues to be the basis for a peaceful and just solution in Namibia. The right of the Namibian people to independence is an inalienable right. It cannot, of course, be circumscribed by or made conditional to particular changes in or concessions by adjacent countries. Namibian independence and the cessation of South African aggression in Angola would, in our view, contribute to a situation in which all foreign troops could be withdrawn from southern Africa, as they indeed should be.

101. The Norwegian Government has consistently supported the long and arduous diplomatic process which was initiated by the five Western countries of the contact group and which led to the adoption of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia. We wish to express our gratitude and admiration to the Secretary-General and his staff for their valiant efforts in getting all the parties concerned to agree to the implementation of that plan. In the present situation we share the hope that the renewed efforts of the Western contact group will lead to early and concrete results.

102. We understand and share the sense of impatience and frustration which has been voiced in this debate by the members of the group of African States. In this connection, I want to pay compliments to SWAPO and the front-line States for the positive

and constructive attitudes shown by them during the long and arduous negotiating process.

103. The diplomatic efforts designed to reach a negotiated solution should, in our view, be supplemented by a concerted application of pressure on South Africa. The Norwegian Government has supported the idea of mandatory economic sanctions against the Pretoria régime. Norway was one of the initiators of the proposal to impose an arms embargo against South Africa. Together with the other Nordic countries, we have adopted various measures aimed at severely curtailing our own relations with South Africa.

104. At the recent International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa, held in Paris, the Norwegian Government committed itself to co-operating actively with other major oil-producing countries to translate into effective and concerted action their policies of not supplying oil to South Africa. We are following up on that commitment.

105. Such initiatives must, in our opinion, be supported by an international effort to aid the victims of the policies of South Africa. Along with each act of oppression by the South African Government against its own black majority and after each act of aggression against a neighbouring State, there has been a growing number of victims and refugees. The Norwegian Government participates in a number of programmes to aid such victims, through specific projects and by humanitarian support and assistance to the liberation movements, including SWAPO, and the front-line States. We shall continue these efforts.

106. The continued intransigence of South Africa over Namibia is a challenge to the authority of the United Nations itself. It is an affront to the civilized norms of the international community. It is unacceptable, and it must be overcome.

107. Mr. KIBANDA (Central African Republic) (*interpretation from French*): The holding of an emergency special session of the General Assembly on Namibia, after the resounding failure of the Geneva talks which should have been the last stage in a long decolonization process that would have led the Territory to independence, is proof of the great concern of the international community and shows the determination of the United Nations to radicalize the solution of a problem the worsening of which poses a threat to international peace and security. It brings to human and international attention the acts of cruelty and the barbaric actions perpetrated daily by the racist régime of Pretoria, which has been condemned and denounced universally for its hateful policies of *apartheid*, persistent violations of human rights and numerous acts of aggression perpetrated against its neighbours. It, indeed, highlights the collective responsibility of the United Nations to give effect to its universal dedication to peace by implementing the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations in order to ensure and guarantee world peace and security. Finally, it reaffirms, if there was ever any need, the profound legitimate aspirations of the Namibian people to freedom, justice and independence, which are inalienable rights explicitly set forth in the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

108. This emergency special session is being held at this decisive phase in the total decolonization of Africa, the final tragic and pathetic episodes of which are taking place in the southern part of the continent where the last bastions of colonialism, racism and oppression are entrenched.

109. After Zimbabwe, whose brilliantly won independence demonstrated once more the inevitable victory of the struggle for freedom and justice, Namibia has now become the Territory whose need for decolonization is decisively clear. In this regard, this session has a particular importance: it must reaffirm the solemn commitment of the United Nations to the promotion of international peace and security, its determination to work for a future of justice and freedom throughout the world and for a more fraternal community. While the specific item on this session's agenda is certainly the independence of Namibia, above and beyond this, the irreversible nature of the liberation process and the justice of the emancipation struggle of peoples under colonial domination must also be recognized.

110. The task incumbent on this body is of primary importance. And, your abilities Mr. President, which we have so much appreciated throughout the work of the thirty-fifth session, are commensurate with it. The profound faith that you have in peace and the overwhelming importance that you accord to the freedom and independence of individuals and peoples make us glad to see you guide our work. That is why we congratulate you.

111. For 15 years now the United Nations, guarantor of international peace and security, has been trying with perseverance and determination, to resolve the dilemma of the situation in Namibia which has been created by the persistent refusal of South Africa to abide by the decisions of the international community aimed at achieving free expression and self-determination for the Namibian people. The joint and sustained efforts tirelessly exerted by the United Nations and the Secretary-General, their constant activities to seek a negotiated solution to the problem, have often been thwarted by the arrogant attitude of the racist Pretoria régime which has ceaselessly and brazenly defied the world through its blind policy of domination, expansion and annexation. Recent events that have occurred in the region and the brutal invasion of southern Angola are still in our minds.

112. As a former German colony, which was placed in trust after the First World War, Namibia—like many others which now have become Members of the great United Nations family, and make with conviction and fervour their valuable contribution to the maintenance of international peace and security—has never ceased to be a source of concern for the international community because of the illegal presence of South Africa there and the latter's ceaseless acts of aggression, perpetrated against neighbouring States.

113. In defining the basic aims of the Trusteeship System, Article 76 of the Charter of the United Nations provides, *inter alia*, that it is:

“... to further international peace and security;

“... to promote the political, economic, social and educational advancement of the inhabitants of the trust territories, and their progressive development towards self-government or independence as may be appropriate to... the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned...”.

114. Instead of undertaking that lofty mission, implementing those objectives and fulfilling hopes, South Africa sought to stifle the aspirations of the Namibian people to liberty and independence, to crush its yearning for justice and, by its dilatory tactics and methods, to put off the termination of the Mandate of trusteeship given to it. Thus, given such telling facts, it was clear that the failure of South Africa to discharge its obligations was total and highly revealing. The Pretoria régime, which had, as it were, consecrated racism through its execrable policies of *apartheid*, had not led Namibia towards its noble destiny, by creating conditions favourable to its self-determination. In short, it had not shouldered its responsibilities under the Mandate entrusted to it.

115. Then the General Assembly, in its resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966, proclaimed the illegality of the presence of and the occupation by South Africa in Namibia and subsequently entrusted the administration of the Territory to the United Nations Council for Namibia, established by Assembly resolution 2248 (S-V).

116. By establishing that Council, which is responsible for ensuring the promotion of the Namibian people to freedom and independence, while respecting its dignity, its identity and its unity, the international community wanted to mark the solemn consecration of its devotion to universal peace as well as its staunch determination to meet challenges to moral values and to respect for human rights.

117. In terminating South Africa's Mandate and in explicitly recognizing the illegality of its occupation, the United Nations—constantly seeking a world at once more balanced, more just and more equitable, a world where the overriding interests would be those of man, his happiness and his well-being—made it clear that it rejected colonialism, the remnants of which should not be perpetuated.

118. Now, as guarantor of the destiny of the people of Namibia, of its independence and sovereignty, the United Nations must exercise its authority and discharge its responsibility for ensuring the protection and the security of Namibia against any action which might challenge its international status. Furthermore, it must take all the steps necessary to defend and preserve the territorial integrity and national unity of Namibia,—since Pretoria still harbours the desire to dismember that Territory.

119. In entrusting its fate to SWAPO, the spearhead of the emancipation struggle, the Namibian people made a decisive choice, the significance of which is consistent with the logic of history, a choice between freedom and bondage, between independence and oppression, between courage and honour, which enoble, and domination and alienation, which demean. An unequivocal choice was made, because it embodies the indestructible determination of an oppressed and subjugated people to achieve its freedom and sovereignty by armed struggle, whatever the cost.

120. In taking up arms, SWAPO, convinced of its invincibility and the righteousness of its struggle for independence, proved its ability to take command to defend the vital interests of Namibia and to lead its people towards its noble destiny. Against the over-equipped army of South Africa it fiercely pits a relentless courage and a staunch determination, which have prompted admiration and increased its international support and credibility. Thus one can easily imagine the heavy price paid and the enormous sacrifices made by the Namibian people.

121. It is fitting here to salute, to glorify the memory of those heroes of freedom who were sacrificed on the altar of the Namibian nation, who were interred without coffin, shroud or epitaph, anonymous in death. The blood they shed will make fruitful the history of independent, sovereign Namibia and will inspire future generations. And the wild flowers that will grow on their nameless tombs will represent the hope of a united, strong Namibia and, beyond that, of a fraternal world.

122. It is consoling to note that politically SWAPO has reached the pinnacle of its hopes. Having been recognized by the international community as the sole representative of the Namibian people, it has been mandated to speak on its behalf and is thus a favoured spokesman. Any disqualification of SWAPO from participation in any settlement would, in our view, delay the advent of peace in that part of the world. But SWAPO has already shown its readiness to seek any solution and proved its political maturity by supporting, with ardour and conviction, the settlement plan proposed by the United Nations, on the basis of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which called for free and fair elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations.

123. It is the obstinate refusal of Pretoria to change, to consider any political innovation, which is prolonging the present impasse in which the international community has found itself. South Africa has strayed into a dead-end road of history.

124. Indeed, it is the systematic refusal of the racist régime of Pretoria to bow to the verdict of history by recognizing the international status of Namibia and it is the repugnant arrogance which it flaunts, by violating with impunity the sovereignty and the territorial integrity of neighbouring States to destabilize their régimes, which has dangerously worsened the situation in Namibia and, more than that, has opened the way on the African continent to the struggle between hegemonistic influences, if indeed they are not already present.

125. South Africa's presence in Namibia is illegal, inadmissible and unacceptable. The advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice is eloquent in more than one respect. South Africa's presence constitutes a threat to international peace and security. The withdrawal of Pretoria must be demanded.

126. The nature of the question of Namibia, taken up at this emergency special session, is political. It is a question of decolonization, for which the numerous decisions of the United Nations have provided an appropriate framework. We feel that the settlement proposed by the international community in Security

Council resolution 435 (1978) is all that needs to be implemented.

127. The settlement proposed by the United Nations, which was the subject of laborious compromise wisely interwoven with subtlety and finesse, in which prudent, traditional diplomacy dominated by interests does not cease to be appropriate and needful even in a grave situation, is a minimum that should have commanded the adhesion of the entire international community.

128. Mr. DE PINIES (Spain) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Once again we are gathered here to deal with the question of Namibia. Almost 15 years have passed since the General Assembly adopted its resolution 2145 (XXI) by which it put an end to South Africa's Mandate over Namibia, declared South Africa's presence there illegal and placed the Territory under the direct responsibility of the United Nations. This September marks the third anniversary of the adoption by the Security Council of its resolution 435 (1978), which sets forth the plan for Namibian independence. Regrettably, the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council have not yet been implemented.

129. On different occasions the delegation of Spain has expressed its conviction that the people of Namibia must forthwith exercise its right to self-determination and independence through free and fair elections on the basis of universal suffrage. Support for that right to independence and full territorial integrity has been a constant element of Spain's foreign policy. As our Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Robles Piquer, said in reference to the question of Namibia in his statement to the General Assembly at its thirty-fourth session that

"... any delay in the effective and immediate implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia represents not only an affront to a people that for many years has been awaiting the attainment of its most basic rights... but also a defiance of the entire international community." [96th meeting, para. 116.]

130. Following many attempts and efforts of the international community to obtain a negotiated agreement that would make it possible for Namibia to accede to independence, the Security Council, by its resolution 435 (1978), adopted the plan that remains the basic framework for a peaceful transition to self-determination: the establishment of a demilitarized zone, the dispatch of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group for the transition period, the organization of free elections supervised by our Organization, and rejection of any internal settlement that would violate the legitimate rights of the population.

131. Unfortunately, following all the efforts made by the Secretary-General and his Special Representative, by the five Western countries members of the contact group, the front-line countries, Nigeria and other members of OAU, which have made many attempts to find a negotiated solution, as well as SWAPO, which on different occasions has demonstrated its perseverance and political maturity, South Africa's refusal at the beginning of this year to set a date for a ceasefire has meant a serious halt to the negotiations and a further cause for concern on the part of the international community.

132. From its seat in the Security Council, Spain has reiterated its appeal to South Africa to abandon this attitude of defiance and disobedience of the mandates of the Organization. As was reflected in our statements before the Security Council in April last, Spain was prepared to support different measures that might induce South Africa to reconsider its position on Namibia and ensure respect for the principles of international law and the provisions of the Charter.

133. But South Africa, far from reversing its negative policy of continually delaying a solution for Namibia, has pursued its retrograde plans, heightening its military presence in Namibia and its acts of repression against African patriots. It has recently extended the powers of the internal Council of Ministers and held fraudulent elections in Namibia. Lately, it perpetrated an act of aggression and occupation against the People's Republic of Angola from the very territory of Namibia. When it learned of that further incursion, the Spanish Government repudiated and condemned that act of aggression against a sovereign country, and from my seat in the Security Council I denounced that flagrant act of aggression because of the danger it posed to peace and stability in the region, and demanded that the South African forces immediately withdraw from the territory of that country.

134. As was affirmed by our Minister for Foreign Affairs in his statement before the Assembly at the thirty-fifth session:

“The continued occupation by South Africa of the Territory of Namibia, contrary to the resolutions of the United Nations, is a persistent element of conflict in the entire region.” [4th meeting, para. 133.]

South Africa's attitude towards the implementation of Council resolution 435 (1978), its acts of aggression against neighbouring countries and its stubborn refusal to accept the resolutions of the Organization only reaffirm the truth of those words and their dramatic consequences.

135. Before I conclude, please allow me to express words of appreciation and encouragement to the United Nations Council for Namibia, which is the Administering Authority of that Territory and has since its establishment been entrusted with defending the rights and interests of the Territory and its people. We thank the United Nations Council for Namibia for its tireless work, its consultations with the Governments of Member States in order to ensure the implementation of United Nations resolutions on Namibia, and its work in the different organs which have accepted it as a full-fledged member. This year the United Nations Council for Namibia has visited different countries, including Spain, to promote understanding and to obtain assistance from different Governments in connection with Namibia.

136. What gives momentum to the liberation forces is an irreversible historical current whose objectives are being met day by day. But it is of little use for the neighbouring African countries, the liberation movements and the various countries attempting to exert pressure on South Africa to obtain a negotiated solution to increase their efforts unless that Government itself takes the necessary steps to arrive at a just and lasting solution. From this forum we wish to

make another urgent appeal to South Africa to accept the plan drawn up by the United Nations for the immediate accession of Namibia to independence.

137. As has been mentioned here by the speaker representing OAU, Africa's patience is running out. I would also say that the same is true for the rest of the international community.

138. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with General Assembly resolution 3237 (XXIX) of 22 November 1974, I now call on the observer of the Palestine Liberation Organization.

139. Mr. AL SOURANI (Palestine Liberation Organization) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Mr. President, on behalf of the Palestine Liberation Organization [PLO], I should like to thank you for having given my delegation the opportunity to participate in this emergency special session of the General Assembly on the question of Namibia.

140. As I listened to the preceding statements, I said to myself that if any speaker in the Assembly had replaced the word “Namibia” by the word “Palestine” it would not have changed anything in their statements. The question of Namibia, the question of South Africa, the question of Palestine—they are one single cause. Under the umbrella of imperialism and of the then British occupation in Palestine and in South Africa, foreigners, with the arms of imperialism, ousted the indigenous population and took their place. They created racist régimes with the message of white supremacy, a message of fire and the sword, a message of wretchedness and suffering, a message of poverty and sickness, a message of plundering of the homelands and the natural resources of those countries and their inhabitants for the imperialists and their greed—all in the name of civilization.

141. The question before us does not require eloquence or rhetoric, nor does it require any legal or moral proof. Right is on the side of the people of Namibia, as is legitimacy. United Nations resolutions are on the side of the Namibian people as well. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Charter of the United Nations, the Members of the General Assembly, OAU, the Non-Aligned Movement, the Organization of the Islamic Conference, the League of Arab States and the socialist group—all side with the Namibian people and favour the independence of Namibia. However, the United States of America and some other Western countries and their agent Israel hamper the implementation of that goal. They are the ones who openly supply the Government of the racist régime of South Africa with all kinds of support, material and political, and frustrate the work of the United Nations, including the Security Council, by having recourse to the abusive use of the right of veto. They have also given military support to South Africa, which has enabled it to manufacture atomic bombs.

142. The question is not only about the independence of Namibia. It is also about the illegal presence of the racist régime of South Africa there, supported by world imperialism led by the United States.

143. South Africa and Israel are two military bases in the Arab homeland and on the African continent which allow the United States to impose its policy and

to keep Africa and the Arab homeland in its zone of influence in order to continue to plunder their riches and property.

144. The United States, in fresh attacks against the region after the Camp David policy in the creation of military bases in the Red Sea, the Arabian Sea and the Indian Ocean, and in consolidating its bases in Israel and South Africa and on Diego Garcia, is taking us back to the 1950s, that period of the madness of alliances, military bases and the cold war, thus threatening international peace and security.

145. I wish to point out that none of the alliances created by the United States, nor any of its military bases in any way protected the States in which they were established. Rather, they were used against the Arab and African people as in the case when the North Atlantic Treaty Organization was used against Algeria in its heroic revolution, and against Egypt in the tripartite aggression, and when the American forces disembarked in Lebanon and British forces disembarked in Jordan in 1958. And now quite arrogantly and brazenly the United States is training a rapid deployment force to occupy one or several countries of the Arab homeland and is asking the whole world to acclaim that action and to believe that, thanks to one rapid deployment force, it can protect the region from what it calls Soviet influence or expansion.

146. We state here that the only danger for the region would come from the United States, and its agent Israel, and American greed, as it does in Africa from the Government of the racist régime of South Africa. We see the United States establishing a new military base in the Sinai on the pretext that it can bring about a disengagement between the Egyptian and the Israeli forces there, while they claim incessantly that peace has been established between Egypt and Israel. If genuine peace has been established, what are they doing there? The fact of the matter is that this is a camouflage operation, on the pretext of ensuring peace and security, to establish an American military base in the Sinai, threatening the peace of the region and of the world.

147. The heroic people of Namibia, in its just struggle against the racist Pretoria régime and against American imperialism, does not only need a resolution to complement those already adopted by the Assembly and other international bodies but, rather, material, military and financial support from Members, so that it can continue its struggle, under the leadership of its sole authentic representative, SWAPO. Similarly, the General Assembly is required to impose as many economic, political and military sanctions as possible against the racist régime of South Africa, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, in particular Article 41 of Chapter VII. The struggle being waged by the Namibian people is not only to bring about self-determination and independence and to eliminate foreign exploitation and intervention but also to eliminate the crimes perpetrated by the white man against morality by creating and consolidating these racist régimes, under which the Namibian people, as well as the peoples of South Africa and Palestine, have been suffering just as the fraternal people of Zimbabwe and Algeria suffered in the past.

148. The PLO will staunchly and tirelessly side with the Namibian people, represented by SWAPO, in their just struggle—which is in fact our struggle—that of the Palestinian people. We are all fighting racism, imperialism, racial discrimination and zionism; we are all struggling for freedom, self-determination, independence and the establishment of an independent State.

149. We appeal to our brothers in SWAPO and to the Namibian people to continue the armed struggle, which is the way to accede to their rights, and, thanks to the sacrifices they make and the defeats they inflict on their enemies, they will obtain their rights. They are in harmony with history while their enemies are going against the trend of history. We are at their side to implement the United Nations resolutions, in particular Security Council resolution 435 (1978), and we shall continue to support them in accordance with international law to achieve freedom and the ethical right to independence. In this war imposed on them and on us, we shall continue to fight against foreign invaders who have nothing to do with the heritage of our countries, invaders who came by force of arms and will only leave us by force of arms, by force of law and of international legitimacy.

150. The PLO would like to take this opportunity to hail the heroic people of Angola, which supports the struggle of the Namibian people under the guidance of SWAPO, thus confronting military aggression, including the occupation by the racist Pretoria régime of part of its territory.

151. We wish to recall here that the role being played by Israel in the Arab homeland is exactly the same as that played by South Africa in southern Africa. These régimes are not content with the horrible crimes they have perpetrated against the Palestinian and Namibian peoples, as well as the people of South Africa; they also commit aggression against other neighbouring Arab States and African countries, as was the case in southern Lebanon and Angola. Similarly, the PLO salutes our brothers in South Africa struggling against the Pretoria racist régime, which inflicts on them the most horrible form of racial discrimination. We also salute our brothers in El Salvador and all liberation movements throughout the world. We salute peoples struggling for their freedom and independence. Freedom and independence are one and indivisible. We shall continue to support the people of Namibia and other peoples to create a world dominated by freedom, legality and the primacy of law, in order to open up a better way for man in the future.

152. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Zambia wishes to speak on a point of order.

153. Mr. SIKAULU (Zambia): Since last Friday we have been listening to very important statements made in the general debate by a number of representatives, and I think it is natural that statements dealing with such an important topic and the question of Namibia should be subjected to thorough study and examination so that they may be helpful in the over-all consideration of this issue, particularly since we are meeting in emergency special session. My delegation has encountered difficulties in seeking to study those statements, because we have noted that there has, regrettably, been an absence of provisional verbatim

records. I believe that so far there is no verbatim record even of the meeting that took place on Friday afternoon, and today happens to be the last day. My point of order is to establish when we can expect to receive the provisional verbatim records. I am rather concerned, because, if we receive the verbatim records after we have adjourned, they will not really have helped us in following the deliberations of the General Assembly at this important session. Perhaps there is a good reason but, at least for its part, my delegation would like to know why no provisional verbatim records have been supplied to date.

154. The PRESIDENT: I have no quick response to the question that the representative of Zambia has raised. I will check with the Secretariat and have the information available this afternoon. However, may I inquire whether the representative of Zambia wishes to indicate that more time might be needed for the study

of verbatim records—in other words, whether there is a feeling that we might interrupt our proceedings or postpone them until Saturday or Monday morning?

155. Mr. SIKAULU (Zambia): I am not about to make that suggestion.

*The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.*

---

NOTES

1. *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-fifth Session, Supplement No. 24, vol. I, annex II.*
2. *Legal Consequences for States of the Continued Presence of South Africa in Namibia (South West Africa) notwithstanding Security Council Resolution 276 (1970), Advisory Opinion, I.C.J. Reports 1971, p. 54.*