

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

EIGHTH EMERGENCY SPECIAL SESSION

Official Records



**5th
PLENARY MEETING**

Tuesday, 8 September 1981,
at 3.20 p.m.

NEW YORK

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

In the absence of the President, Mr. Al-Saffar
(Bahrain), Vice President, took the Chair.

AGENDA ITEM 5

Question of Namibia (continued)

1. Mr. ABDALLA (Sudan) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The General Assembly has convened in an emergency special session at a critical stage on the road towards decolonization in Namibia. It is a critical stage because the world community represented in the United Nations was unable to achieve and to secure independence and freedom for the people of Namibia early in the current year, as had been promised us. It is a critical phase because the five Western Powers that sponsored what is today known as the peaceful settlement did not honour their pledges to secure South Africa's agreement to begin implementation of the provisions of that settlement. It is a critical phase because we shall reach a dead end unless we start to move seriously as required by the present situation. It is a critical stage because Africa and the Non-Aligned Movement have found themselves forced to call for a convening of the General Assembly in an emergency special session so that this body may shoulder its obligations, in view of the failure of the Security Council to impose economic sanctions against the racist régime according to Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations because of the use of the veto by some members of the Council.

2. The call to convene an emergency special session is appropriate in the light of the deteriorating situation in southern Africa. The situation in Namibia threatens not only peace and security in that region, but the peace and security of the whole African continent. The continued illegal occupation by Pretoria of Namibia, despite the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice¹ and resolutions of the United Nations, and the legalization of South Africa's practices of large-scale coercion, repression and oppression, its systematic liquidation of the national leadership in Namibia and its flagrant and continued violations of the sovereignty of the States bordering on Namibia confirm that the world community faces a mutinous Government that does not respect law, the basic principles of the Charter or basic human rights, unless forced to do so. It is a conceited, racist Government, which will not be deterred from these illegal and inhuman practices, which represent a serious threat to world peace and security, except

through effective and genuine confrontation by the whole international community. It is a matter of regret for our delegation that the Security Council failed to apply deterrent sanctions against the racist régime, according to Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, and we are sure that the emergency special session will take a serious and decisive view of the matter before it.

3. South Africa proved over the years, when this issue was in the process of negotiation, that it was not ready to implement General Assembly resolutions and to end its control over the area. This is reflected in its procrastinating methods which are characteristic of its position. South Africa was given more than one chance as a responsible party to the issue, but each time it presented a new position, while the South West Africa People's Organization [SWAPO], supported by the African States, expressed a willingness to co-operate and showed a spirit of genuine understanding. For two decades the world community tried different tactics with the racist régime, sometimes resorting to denunciation and condemnation, at other times to consultations and negotiations. All this failed to bring about what the Namibian people aspire to, namely, its freedom and independence; because of this serious situation my delegation believes that the time has come to change tactics. The world community at this session should impose effective economic sanctions, according to Chapter VII of the Charter, as the only means of forcing the racist régime in Pretoria to discharge its international obligations.

4. It could be useful, now that the issue of Namibia has reached an historic crossroads, to recall Africa's constructive co-operation in favour of the initiative of the five Western States for a peaceful solution since adoption of resolution 435 (1978) by the Security Council. A review of this aspect of the issue could contribute by throwing light in the Assembly on what Africa has always reiterated as being the basic elements in the plan for a peaceful settlement. Africa was quite confident that the absence of such elements would leave the door open for procrastination on South Africa's part and a refusal to comply with the provisions of the settlement.

5. Members may remember the gratitude of the heads of African States and their appreciation when the Luanda Agreement² was signed, as expressed at the fifteenth ordinary session of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity [OAU], that took place at Khartoum in July 1978. Despite all the shortcomings of that Agreement, it may be remembered that the Sudan, which had the honour of presiding over that session of OAU, warmly congratulated the Security Council on behalf of President Nimeiry, the then Chairman of OAU. African support for the initiative of the five

Western countries was also expressed in the Sudan's statement before the Security Council on 30 September 1978.³ Africa recognized, in the light of its experience and practices, the necessity of providing basic and vital safeguards to ensure the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). Hence the Sudan's proposal in its statement on behalf of Africa called for a United Nations peace-keeping force, with both civil and military contingents, and stressed that any arrangements to bring freedom and independence to Namibia must take into account recognition of the basic role that must be played by SWAPO as the sole legal representative of the Namibian people and the leader of its struggle for freedom and independence. That statement also indisputably confirmed that Walvis Bay is an integral part of Namibia and that any attempt to dismember Namibia must be decisively dealt with. In our statement we called for resolute opposition to the tactics of South Africa and we stressed that the Security Council must exert all possible pressure upon the racist régime, including the imposition of sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter, to isolate it internationally and force it to discharge its international obligations.

6. At the time, it was said that such a call could make the peaceful negotiations for the resolution of this issue more complex; today, more than three years after that statement, it is quite clear to us that the contrary was true and that Pretoria, by adopting policies and strategies of procrastination and prevarication, was just trying to buy time to strengthen its control over the area. The time has come to understand this lesson and not permit the racist régime of Pretoria to achieve the same objective with new excuses.

7. Pretoria declared its determination unilaterally to hold elections in the area and to establish a puppet régime to distort the issue. It was natural that the international community should confront this situation with all seriousness and decision, as is reflected in Security Council resolution 439 (1978). That resolution, which was adopted unanimously, declared those elections and their results null and void and stated that no recognition would be accorded by the United Nations or any Member States to any representatives or organ established by that process. It was a historic resolution, and we have to implement it if we want the Pretoria régime to change its approach and to forgo its colonial policy in Namibia.

8. The so-called Democratic Turnhalle Alliance must be rejected, not only because it would be contrary to the unanimous resolution of the Security Council but also because it would strengthen South Africa in its intransigence and in its obstruction of the efforts of the international community to end the occupation of Namibia and to implement Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

9. At the Geneva meeting last January—where we expected that a deadline would be set for the implementation of the peace plan—the Pretoria régime rejected all the arrangements and pledges that had been made as a result of complex negotiations, even though it had participated in all phases. We cannot forget South Africa's accusation that the United Nations was not neutral. Nor can we forget its call for the halting of support for SWAPO. Can the United Nations be neutral on the issue of freedom and inde-

pendence for an entire people and its legal right to self-determination? These are principles that are basic to the United Nations.

10. The world community, which is represented in the Assembly, will support SWAPO because it believes in its right, and will implement the basic principles of the Charter so that the Namibian people can exercise its legal rights. Neither will it give the racist régime any opportunity to have other parties obstruct its solution for the purpose of legalizing the puppet régime installed in Windhoek.

11. As a result of all the schemes of the racist régime, the Geneva meeting failed. Africa and the non-aligned countries did not follow the same road of surprise and disappointment as others because they were familiar with the tactics of South Africa. Africa and the non-aligned countries had always issued warnings about the immoral behaviour of the Pretoria authorities and their incredible way of dealing with the international community. At all stages of the preparation and adoption of the settlement resolution, they warned against schemes being hatched by South Africa. The apprehensions and doubts about South Africa did not arise out of a vacuum: the peoples of Africa, because of their suffering and their actual experience with colonialism and because of their support for the ideals of freedom and independence, understand the schemes and other tactics of the racist and colonialist authorities in Namibia.

12. Some have stressed the supposed need to strengthen Security Council resolution 435 (1978) to provide safeguards for the white minority in Namibia. We are surprised at that Western demand because we do not believe that it is based on any valid principles and because it is clearly an attempt to undo what was agreed to in resolution 435 (1978). If this is not the purpose, then why does this demand ignore the basic human rights of the blacks who are citizens in South Africa, who have been robbed of their land and property and whose constitutional rights and basic freedoms have been violated by the policy of *apartheid* and exploitation adopted by the white minority in South Africa? The basic principles of human rights are indivisible, regardless of colour, race, creed or culture, and cannot be used to destroy, prevaricate or procrastinate.

13. We endorse resolution CM/Res. 853 (XXXVII),⁴ adopted by the Council of Ministers of OAU at its thirty-seventh ordinary session and endorsed by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of OAU at its eighteenth ordinary session, held at Nairobi last June, which states that Security Council resolution 435 (1978) is a minimum requirement and cannot be modified or amended.

14. Because of the seriousness of the explosive situation in South Africa and especially in view of the recent acts of the racist régime against Angola, we have to express our disappointment at the failure of the Security Council last week to take a decision condemning that aggression—and that at a time when there was international consensus to the effect that the gravity of the situation required a decisive resolution to halt further deterioration in the area. We are fully convinced that the failure to achieve consensus among the members of the Council, despite the flagrant

nature of the act of aggression against Angola, can only encourage Pretoria in its practices in the area and in the continuation of its illegal occupation of Namibia, not to mention its insolent attitude towards United Nations resolutions.

15. In that regard, the Sudan strongly denounces and condemns the attempts of the racist régime to destabilize Angola and to eliminate popular resistance in Namibia, in a desperate effort to increase its pressure on the peoples and Governments of the front-line African States so that they will abandon their responsibilities towards the liberation war in southern Africa. In an official statement by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs following South Africa's aggression against Angola, the Sudan expressed its full support for the heroic people of Angola and also stated that we will continue our support for SWAPO in its struggle for freedom and independence. Indeed, in that statement we invited the world community to take all necessary measures to halt Pretoria's acts of aggression in the area and called upon all peace-loving, brotherly and friendly countries and peoples to lend their full support to Angola to enable it to withstand the aggression being unleashed by the racist authorities against its people and its territory.

16. The five Western States' direct participation in the negotiations was no coincidence; it was dictated by historical and cultural relations and the possibility of large-scale co-operation which ties Africa to the Western world.

17. In this connection, we should like to reaffirm our conviction that vital Western interests will be tied in the long term to those of the free and independent peoples of the area. Statistics confirm that the relationships, economic investments and commercial and cultural interests that tie the Western world to Africa far outweigh its relationship with the racist régime in South Africa and that the possibilities for future large-scale co-operation are very considerable economically and strategically. That is why our country, together with all of Africa, I think, attaches special importance to those relationships and historical ties, tries to develop them on the basis of what is right and just and will stop all that would obstruct them—in contrast to the practices of the racist South African régime in the area.

18. The Western States in particular must apply pressure on South Africa to force it to comply with international legality and the will of the international community, if they desire to continue those relations and that co-operation with Africa and to maintain peace and security in the entire area and throughout the world. We ask the Western States only to stand on the side of right and the basic principles which they advocate, to understand the dimensions and the realities of the African position, which has been made clear during all phases of the negotiations, and to understand all aspects of the Namibian issue within the framework of current relations. The Western States should know that the situation in South Africa is only temporary; sooner or later the majority will achieve victory and recover its legal rights from the Pretoria bandits. Western interests should not obstruct the people's achievement of self-determination, independence and freedom.

19. The Security Council's failure on more than one occasion to impose sanctions against South Africa in accordance with the Charter dictates that we call on the Assembly to undertake the duty of maintaining peace and security in the area and isolate the racist régime in all spheres of international relations so as to make it comply with the international will and to respect and implement the United Nations resolutions. In this connection, the Sudan delegation calls for the necessary measures to impose on the racist régime comprehensive economic sanctions and a full military and diplomatic embargo. We call on all members of the international community, in particular the major Powers which have economic, military and nuclear ties with the Pretoria régime to comply with those resolutions and measures to compel the racist régime to accept its international responsibility and to implement the United Nations resolutions concerning Namibia.

20. In conclusion, our delegation cannot but express our admiration and appreciation for the leading and historical role played by SWAPO, the legitimate representative of the people of Namibia in its struggle to achieve freedom and independence. Our delegation renews the pledge of the Government and people of the Sudan to support our brothers in southern Africa—Namibia and Azania. We continue our pledge to support and assist until the power of oppression and coercion falls and justice and right are victorious.

21. Mr. NZE (Congo) (*interpretation from French*): The competence, skill and wisdom that the President of the General Assembly demonstrated during the thirty-fifth session make us pleased to see him once again presiding over the eighth emergency special session on Namibia. This is invaluable assurance of the proper functioning and success of the present session, the importance of which he is well aware. Indeed, as the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany, he has been at the heart of the process begun by the five countries of the Western contact group and has thus been able to gauge the hope that the Namibian people and Africa as a whole have placed in his actions. On behalf of my delegation, I should like to congratulate him most sincerely.

22. In this very Hall on several occasions the People's Republic of the Congo has expressed its position on questions concerning the national liberation of peoples still under colonial domination. I am speaking again in this emergency special session to make clear the attitude of the Congo on this burning question, which would have been resolved a long time ago had the monied Powers demonstrated political will by detaching themselves a bit from their selfish interests and their complicity with South Africa.

23. The statements made by delegations preceding me at this rostrum all bear witness to a deep understanding of the situation in Namibia and the profound concern that it inspires. The holding of this emergency special session is itself eloquent proof of the commitment of the United Nations to the bitter struggle being waged against the forces and manifestations of colonialism and racism that have deprived an entire people of its most fundamental rights.

24. The Congo's commitment to the cause of justice and freedom in Africa and throughout the world is well known. In decolonization matters my country

has always given its unswerving support and its material and political assistance to the freedom fighters in southern Africa in their heroic struggle to recover their inalienable right to freedom and independence.

25. The delegation of the Congo is therefore convinced that the results of the present session will undoubtedly strengthen the efforts of the international community to free Namibia in order to find at last a definitive solution to the problem which southern Africa as a whole poses to all those who consider freedom to be an essential and precious component of human dignity.

26. In this connection, we wish first of all to bow respectfully to the memory of the innocent victims killed since 23 August 1981 as a result of the barbaric act of aggression perpetrated against the People's Republic of Angola by the South African military. Those victims must be added to those who paid with their lives at Kassinga two years ago the high cost of the liberation of Namibia from the colonial yoke. Our thoughts go out also to the many Namibian patriots, for the most part unknown, victims of the hatred and genocide that have cut them down since the colonial doctrine showered on Africa its horde of bloody mercenaries.

27. We bow to those men, women and children killed, crippled, wounded, and we pay a tribute to their sacrifice and proclaim once again that that sacrifice will not be in vain but, rather, will further spur on fighting Africa in its struggle for national liberation.

28. A certain number of decisive factors, all involving serious danger to international peace and security that exist, have rendered necessary the convening of this emergency special session, pursuant to General Assembly resolution 377 A (V) of 3 November 1950.

29. We already knew that the sudden halt to the process leading to the independence of Namibia pursuant to Security Council resolution 435 (1978) revealed a plot which had to be thwarted without delay, before we found ourselves, in the 1980s—a decade threatening in all respects—faced with an uncontrollable situation. We were already aware of that. But now in recent days we have witnessed a further aggravating factor: the aggression of South Africa against the People's Republic of Angola which, because it is an act of provocation and deliberate arrogance, is today, in the view of the Congolese delegation, an additional reason for the convening of the present session.

30. We realized also that the deterioration of the situation in Namibia would inevitably create serious trouble for that part of Africa and, in particular, for the front-line countries, whose unforgivable fault, in the view of the friends of *apartheid*, is their positive attitude towards the relevant decisions of the United Nations and their loyalty to our brothers struggling against oppression to free their country.

31. The aggression suffered by Angola, through which Pretoria has attempted to demonstrate its real intentions concerning Namibia, is outrageous not only because it took place. It is part of the unfortunate design of the South African racists to try by all possible

means to hold sway over the African peoples under their domination.

32. A State which, within its borders, will do anything, however base, in its treatment of its nationals, cannot be expected to respect international law outside its borders.

33. The South Africans have seen in recent days, in Lebanon, in Libya, in Korea, in El Salvador and elsewhere, so many examples of State terrorism promoted by those very Western sources that are enthusiastic advocates of the iron fist that they themselves had no reason to dispense with it. Their cynical consciences were further allayed by the fact that Washington, for example, at the height of the South African incursion in Xangongo, Cahama or elsewhere, more than 200 kilometres inside Angolan territory, devised rather strange attenuating circumstances for the aggressors.

34. Certain Western Powers, and not the least of them, have never concealed their sympathy for the racist colonialist régime of Pretoria, which they consider a worthy friend and ally. By casting a negative vote a few days ago in the Security Council, the United States deliberately refused to side with right and justice, freedom and respect for the rules of international law. Yet it is not so long since the last International Conference on Kampuchea, held in New York from 13 to 17 July, when the head of the United States delegation affirmed that respect for the rules of international law was the concern of his Government.

35. The veto cast in the Security Council on 31 August shows that the United States interprets international law so selectively that it results purely and simply in an absence of law. This return to the law of the jungle meant no condemnation, no blame, for South Africa, when the least that should have been done was to apply binding sanctions, pursuant to Chapter VII of the Charter, as provided in Security Council resolution 475 (1980), unanimously adopted by the Council following an earlier act of aggression against Angola.

36. Need one recall that the problem of Namibia is a problem of decolonization? It is of interest to the entire international community. Many resolutions of the United Nations request Member States to provide their support and moral and material assistance to the efforts of the United Nations, with a view to the decolonization of that colonial territory. We wish solemnly to commend the Government and the people of Angola, who, in spite of many sacrifices, continue in Namibia to support the action of the United Nations.

37. The international community must know that no bomb, no show of brutality, can ever deter a people from aspiring to freedom and independence. The international community must be aware that the will of the peoples of Africa to struggle to the end for the total liberation of the continent will never falter.

38. Through its aggression against the People's Republic of Angola, South Africa has carried to an extreme the arrogance of the imperialists in their aggression against the forces of progress. This dangerous breach of world peace cannot fail to outrage the Congolese people and make it determined, together with all other peoples that cherish peace and freedom

throughout the world, to intensify all means available to them to compel South Africa to withdraw from Namibia.

39. In fact what we have before us is not a struggle between communism and capitalism in Africa, as some would have it, but rather between free Africa and the *apartheid* régime, between oppression and freedom. There is no doubt as to the objective. South Africa must withdraw from Namibia its army and its racist, colonial Administration, to enable the Namibian people freely to exercise its right to independence and national sovereignty.

40. This emergency special session must also, in a clear and definitive way, reaffirm the position of the United Nations vis-à-vis any attempt to renege on all or part of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). That is the minimum that the Namibian people is entitled to expect from our gathering here.

41. It is already alarming enough that already twice this year the Security Council has seen fit not to play its role and has witnessed several vetoes, which spared recidivist South Africa from sanctions warranted by its criminal behaviour.

42. The Assembly of OAU, held at Nairobi in June, did not fail to draw the attention of some major Powers, members of the Security Council, to the consequences of their act for the fate and lives of thousands of persons in southern Africa who look to the Organization.

43. Legally as well as politically the Western Powers concerned should feel especially bound by their own commitment to the Namibian people pursuant to the provisions of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). That resolution was the result, to say the least, of a patient process which took into account the expressed wishes of the Namibians as well as the role of the United Nations as the proper Administrator of the Territory. Account was even taken of the position of South Africa, which is, to say the least, debatable. It was authorized to keep its military bases and to have its Administration function during the electoral process provided for. In fact, those were the best possible qualifications that could be attached to the implementation of the principles contained in the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples [*resolution 1514 (XV)*]. In our concern to maintain peace, we all encouraged SWAPO to accept such a compromise so that the people of Namibia might, as soon as possible, enjoy the security and freedom which are indispensable for its own progress and development.

44. By accepting a peaceful course of action and the democratic principle for Namibia's accession to independence, we undertook to respect the results of impartial elections under the exclusive auspices of the United Nations.

45. Therefore any attempt to perpetuate the privileges and domination of the white minority by promising it what are euphemistically called "guarantees" is, in our view, totally unacceptable. It is depriving the notions of self-determination and independence, as formulated and understood by the international community, of all significance to attach restrictive conditions to those concepts, such as, for example, a

constitution which would provide justification for all manner of obstructions and intervention.

46. It is dangerous to deal with problems of decolonization from the standpoint of ideological choices. The United Nations recognizes that every people has a right freely to choose a government in keeping with its fundamental interests.

47. South African propaganda, based on an anti-Communist crusade, classifies liberation movements as trouble-makers in the service of international communism. This simplistic view of the national liberation struggle is absolutely erroneous. It dangerously implies a negation of the aspiration of peoples to independence and freedom. This outdated propaganda thus constitutes a factor that creates further tension in international relations, pointlessly exacerbating East-West relations and introducing into the cold war the right of peoples to self-determination and independence.

48. In the past the international community has demanded and obtained, not without difficulty, freedom for most of the colonial peoples now represented here. Some of those countries were, in despair, forced to resort to armed struggle. Today that is true of Namibia, which remains illegally occupied 10 years after the opinion handed down by the International Court of Justice on 21 June 1971.¹ At the present time we are going through a crucial phase in this shameful, unacceptable and anachronistic occupation—a distressing, cruel, repressive occupation characterized by the scourge of *apartheid*, a neo-Nazi ideology.

49. The serious damage thus done to Namibia and to the international conscience must be redressed. My delegation will support any decision that will compel South Africa to repair the damage it has done to Angola in the course of the criminal acts of aggression against it, any decision that will force South Africa to comply with the decisions of the United Nations on the question of Namibia, concerning which the Secretary-General, Mr. Kurt Waldheim, has extended efforts for which we are grateful.

50. That is the unequivocal position of the Government of the People's Republic of the Congo.

51. Mr. SULONG (Malaysia): We are gathered here in an emergency special session of the General Assembly to focus the world's attention on an issue that has been in the forefront of our minds and on the agenda of the General Assembly since the beginning of the United Nations. For more than 30 years we have grappled with this issue and yet there is no solution in sight. Despite the intensified efforts of the United Nations and other organizations within the United Nations system, Namibia remains under the illegal control of the repressive régime of South Africa. The people of Namibia continue to be denied their inalienable right to self-determination and independence.

52. Since October 1966, when the General Assembly terminated South Africa's League of Nations Mandate [*resolution 2145 (XXI)*], declaring that South Africa had no right to administer the Territory and that henceforth Namibia would come under the direct responsibility of the United Nations, both the General Assembly and the Security Council have adopted a

series of resolutions declaring, *inter alia*, that the continued presence of South Africa in Namibia is illegal. But, as we all know, all these resolutions have been ignored by South Africa. United Nations actions have been marked by a series of unfulfilled resolutions and frustrations. Meanwhile South Africa has proceeded with its tactics of deception in defiance and contempt of those resolutions and decisions, which we have overwhelmingly endorsed.

53. The international community has now reached the limit of its patience. For so long we have been led through needless delays by various acts of procrastination. The record of South Africa's intransigence provides ample evidence of its deliberate intention to perpetuate its illegal occupation and to impose what is known as an "internal settlement" on the Namibian people. It has created an administrative structure in Namibia to protect its own political and economic interests. It has committed brutal acts of repression against the people of Namibia, including imprisonment and detention and the torture of prisoners, which are designed to create an atmosphere of intimidation and terror. It has manoeuvred to militarize Namibia by intensifying the military build-up, conscripting Namibians into the so-called SWA/Namibia Territory Force for the purpose of strengthening the South African army and establishing new military bases. It has committed repeated acts of aggression, intervention and subversion against independent neighbouring African States. It has systematically attempted to discredit and destroy SWAPO, the internationally recognized representative of the Namibian people. It has continued its ruthless exploitation of Namibia's rich natural resources and its efforts to develop nuclear-weapon capability.

54. Time and again we have highlighted these acts of defiance and provocation in various international and regional forums, and we have strengthened our resolve to bring about a prompt end to this tragic problem. General Assembly resolution 35/227 A, adopted on 6 March 1981, bears that out. In addition, the final communiqué of the Extraordinary Ministerial Meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Countries on the Question of Namibia, held at Algiers in April 1981,⁵ the Paris Declaration on Sanctions against South Africa and the Special Declaration on Namibia,⁶ adopted by the International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa, held in Paris in May 1981, and the Panama Declaration on Namibia adopted by the United Nations Council for Namibia in June 1981 have all strongly condemned the intransigence of South Africa and called for comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against that régime. Yet time and again South Africa has chosen to ignore them and appears to be immune to them.

55. South Africa's massive incursions into Angola are the latest instances of a deteriorating situation that requires our immediate attention. Malaysia is as outraged as the rest of the international community by those bold acts of aggression against an independent and sovereign African country. South Africa's readiness to use force and to commit such acts of aggression in a sovereign territory is an open and blatant violation of the Charter of the United Nations. We need no reminder that such violations are being committed not only in Namibia but increasingly in

other parts of the world as well. It is sad and tragic that, even though those lofty principles and ideals of the Charter are being trampled upon by the South African régime, the United Nations has been reduced to inaction. It could not even utter words of condemnation. We can therefore only conclude that the boldness of South Africa's actions is possible only because of its knowledge that it has the backing of its friends and that the United Nations could be rendered ineffective. As Members of the United Nations we have all undertaken to uphold and support the principles of the Charter. We can allow no room for circumspection or neutrality in cases of this kind lest others are emboldened by such bad examples and we small countries of the world become victims of similar irresponsible acts of aggression.

56. The long road to Namibia's independence has now brought us to a critical impasse seriously affecting international peace and security. It is most urgent that the explosive trend in the area be stopped. We remain as convinced as before that South Africa obviously has no intention to commit itself to Namibia's peaceful transition to independence, much less to a free and independent Namibia. It is vital that the endeavours of the international community be brought to fruition instead of being continuously thwarted by the bravado and intransigence of South Africa. It is therefore imperative for us at this session to come out with strong and effective measures under the Charter of the United Nations and consistent with the wishes of the Namibian people.

57. Malaysia would like to reiterate its firm commitment to the freedom and independence of the people of Namibia and its support for all efforts and measures undertaken by the United Nations in that direction to compel the South African armed forces totally to withdraw from Namibia and to terminate South Africa's illegal occupation of the Territory.

58. We wish to reaffirm our support for Security Council resolution 435 (1978) as the only acceptable basis for the peaceful implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia and we would strongly oppose any attempt to revise and weaken that resolution.

59. The inability of the Security Council to pronounce its condemnation of the latest transgression by South Africa because of the exercise of the right of veto by a permanent member is highly regrettable. We are convinced that a much more positive attitude by the member concerned, consistent with its own historical evolution and philosophy on the rights of man, could prove to be an important contribution to the solution of the Namibian situation.

60. We call upon the international community to rally behind the just struggle of the people of Namibia to achieve their inalienable right to self-determination, freedom and independence through free and fair elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations. As end to the illegal occupation of the Territory and the granting to its people of their rights is an indispensable element in eliminating a serious threat to international peace and stability.

61. Mr. BELTRAMINO (Argentina) (*interpretation from Spanish*): This eighth emergency special session of the General Assembly has begun at a time when

the situation in Namibia and in southern Africa in general is presenting us with new alarming signs indicative of a more serious and unstable situation, characterized by an increase in tension and confrontation among the parties involved in the Namibian independence process. The armed invasion of the People's Republic of Angola last month is an example of that new political picture in the region. It was condemned by the majority of the international community. It is something which may set off a new cycle of violent actions and reactions that may continue without any solution, wreaking greater havoc and the destruction of lives and property.

62. In view of this situation the international community, by displaying wisdom and justice, must continue to offer alternatives directed towards peace and negotiation in order to speed up the independence of Namibia and the elimination of the *apartheid* régime, in accordance with the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations. It is within that context that this emergency special session of the General Assembly is being held. The Republic of Argentina which, since the founding of the Organization has consistently supported the objectives of decolonization and the elimination of racial discrimination, wishes to participate in and support these deliberations and we pledge our efforts to the achievement of effective results in the attainment of what we are seeking.

63. My Government had the satisfaction of hosting, at Buenos Aires last May, a mission of consultation from the United Nations Council for Namibia, in response to our invitation, and on that occasion we had the chance to repeat once again our genuine support for the cause of Namibian independence which we reaffirm here before this great Assembly.

64. We feel on this occasion that a peaceful transition to independence for Namibia should be implemented promptly according to the following guidelines.

65. First, Security Council resolutions 385 (1976), 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) constitute a universally accepted framework for the independence of Namibia and their implementation must be ensured without distortions or changes affecting their substance.

66. Secondly, the question of Namibia is a decolonization problem and must be resolved bearing in mind especially General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960.

67. Thirdly, the people of Namibia must exercise their right to independence and national self-determination with full respect for the territorial integrity and unity of Namibia, including Walvis Bay and the islands off its coast which are parts of its territory.

68. Fourthly, there must be full compliance with the provisions of General Assembly resolution 3295 (XXIX) of 13 October 1974, which endorsed Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia,⁸ enacted by the United Nations Council for Namibia, and the continued exploitation of the natural resources of the Territory must therefore cease.

69. Fifthly, South Africa must end its illegal occupation of Namibia, thus complying with the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of 21 June

1971,¹ and the relevant resolutions of other United Nations bodies.

70. Sixthly, there must be universal recognition, particularly by South Africa, of the fact that Namibia is the direct responsibility of the United Nations and that the United Nations Council for Namibia is the sole legal Administering Authority of the Territory until its independence.

71. My delegation is convinced that the guidelines I have just mentioned constitute the proper framework and basis for a just and balanced solution of the question of Namibia. At the same time we are certain that support for OAU and the Non-Aligned Movement must continue in order to achieve that solution by peaceful and rational means. We appeal to the Western countries of the contact group which have a crucial responsibility in this process to make new efforts to fulfil what they themselves have described as the commitment to achieve an internationally acceptable independence for Namibia.

72. We believe that valuable time has already been lost, but we must recall and stress particularly the fact that the dynamics of the decolonization process cannot be held up by the will of those who—particularly South Africa—wish to maintain a *status quo* already rejected by the civilized conscience of nations. We must move along the road of equity and reason, ignoring acts of desperation. Namibia must be truly independent and its people must be able to exercise their full rights to self-determination through free elections supervised by the United Nations. That will occur not only as a result of compliance with United Nations resolutions, but also as a result of the irresistible forward march of history.

73. As maintaining the *status quo* has led and continues to lead to an impasse, we are convinced that a free and independent Namibia, built on just and realistic foundations and a Member of the United Nations, will contribute to stability and peace in the region, thus marking a further step towards ensuring that southern Africa may one day escape from the competition waged to maintain and expand spheres of domination and hegemony.

74. I should like to express the hope that the work of this emergency special session will contribute to creating a greater international consensus on the legitimacy of our objectives, namely, to achieve independence for Namibia, ensure international peace and security, contribute to the elimination of *apartheid* and guarantee the coexistence of all peoples of the region regardless of race, creed or religion.

75. Argentina will continue to extend its fullest cooperation to assist the United Nations in achieving those goals, which are, after all, those of mankind.

76. Mr. MANGWENDE (Zimbabwe): This emergency special session of the General Assembly has been convened because of the concern of Africa and all the peoples of the world who love peace and justice at the dangerous lack of progress towards the implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia. As representatives know, this stalemate is allowing the Pretoria régime an extension of its illegal tenancy.

77. Before turning to the consequences of this stalemate for the oppressed Namibian people, for southern Africa and, indeed, for the international community as a whole, I want to pay a special debt of gratitude to those individuals whose co-operation facilitated the holding of this emergency special session. Accordingly, we wish to thank Secretary-General Kurt Waldheim and the Secretariat for initiating the necessary procedures for the convening of this session. Secondly, we wish to acknowledge with appreciation the efforts of the President of the General Assembly himself in this regard. We are confident that, under this guidance and leadership, which has already been demonstrated so amply during the thirty-fifth session, this emergency special session will address itself seriously to the important business before it.

78. Finally, but by no means least, the delegation of Zimbabwe is very appreciative of the support of all Member States which concurred in the convening of this emergency special session on the question of Namibia, as requested by my country's representative also acting in his capacity as Chairman of the group of African States for the month of August.

79. As we are meeting here, Security Council resolution 435 (1978), the only internationally accepted basis for the settlement of the question of Namibian independence, not only remains unimplemented but is also in grave danger of being undermined by the subtle manoeuvres of some of the members of this body. We are gravely concerned that, as the illegal occupation of Namibia continues unabated, so also do its ugly and dangerous consequences increase in both quantity and intensity. The delegation of the Republic of Zimbabwe is convinced that the convening of this emergency special session is therefore justified. Namibia is a United Nations responsibility and will remain so until the *apartheid* régime has been compelled to leave that Territory, by peaceful international pressure, if possible, and by force, if necessary. Moreover, as representatives know, South Africa has failed to comply with all the relevant resolutions of the United Nations and OAU, as well as those of the Non-Aligned Movement, calling upon it to leave Namibia.

80. It was this defiance by the Pretoria Government which prompted the General Assembly, in paragraphs 28 and 29 of its resolution 35/227 A of 6 March 1981 to call upon the Security Council

“to act decisively against any dilatory manoeuvres and fraudulent schemes of the illegal occupation régime [of Namibia] aimed at frustrating the legitimate struggle of the Namibian people”

and

“to convene urgently to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa, as provided for under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, in order to ensure South Africa's immediate compliance with the resolutions and decisions of the United Nations relating to Namibia.”

81. As is well known, in response to the General Assembly's call, the Security Council convened on 21 April 1981. Regrettably, however, none of the four draft resolutions submitted to the Security Council

in order to implement the recommendations of the General Assembly was adopted. Again, as representatives will recall, this was because of the negative votes of three of the permanent members of the Security Council.

82. For their part, the oppressed Namibians and the dismayed and disgusted world community were bound to conclude that, through their vetoes against the four draft resolutions submitted to the Security Council, those three permanent members deliberately gave comfort, satisfaction and, indeed, encouragement to the illegal régime. Indeed, sufficient evidence exists to show that the triple vetoes and other postures assumed by some of those countries on questions regarding *apartheid* in South Africa and the illegal occupation of Namibia are interpreted by Pretoria as approval of its system.

83. Those three members, together with the rest of the Western contact group, have since asserted that measures provided for under Chapter VII of the Charter will not persuade the Pretoria régime to comply with United Nations decisions and resolutions. Instead they will, we are told, lead to the intensification of paranoia and the *laager* mentality in South Africa. Therefore we are being asked to believe that the racists, who occupy and exploit Namibia in continued defiance of the United Nations decisions and resolutions, are more likely to be amenable to persuasion, reason and common sense than they are to appreciate the language of condemnation and confrontation. However, as we all know, their conduct and behaviour during the pre-implementation meeting at Geneva in January clearly suggest that anyone holding such a view must plead naivety or dishonesty. In any case, why should the international community be asked to appease and pamper those who defy its decisions and resolutions?

84. In their efforts to avoid confrontation with *apartheid* Pretoria the five Western countries now seem to be on the verge of undermining or even overthrowing the United Nations plan for Namibian independence, for, while they now accept Security Council resolution 435 (1978), we are told, as the basis for the establishment of an internationally recognized independent and sovereign Namibia, they also insist that the resolution needs to be strengthened or complemented by the addition of what have been characterized as “confidence-building measures”. These so-called confidence-building measures, we are told, must include guarantees of minority rights. A very strange logic and perhaps a new interpretation of justice—for why should we talk of minority guarantees when the majority, living in extreme oppression and exploitation, has not even the most basic of human rights?

85. Since the last Security Council meeting, in April 1981, on the Namibia question there has been much diplomatic activity among the members of the Western contact group. One of the objectives of this initiative, we are informed, is to find a formula which will allay minority fears: that is, a formula containing the so-called confidence-building measures. Unfortunately, however, this has created a state of expectancy which in turn has led to a delay in the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). No one can deny that there has been some foot-dragging on the

implementation of the resolution, while the international community is being expected to hope, almost *ad infinitum*, that the Western initiative will produce a universally accepted addition to the United Nations Namibian plan. We should perhaps remind the members of the Western contact group that resolution 435 (1978) is the result of their own initiative, which entailed protracted negotiations among all the parties, including South Africa. Therefore there is a moral obligation on the part of the Western contact group to ensure the immediate implementation of the United Nations Namibian plan, without additions, subtractions, modifications or prevarication.

86. Finally, Zimbabwe would like to state its position clearly and unambiguously on the whole Namibian question, in the light of current diplomatic initiatives taking place outside the international forums, such as the United Nations, OAU and the Non-Aligned Movement. Zimbabwe very strongly holds the view that until Namibia is wrenched from the clutches of *apartheid* Pretoria it is and will continue to be the full responsibility of the international community. The international community alone, through the United Nations, must determine and satisfy itself that whatever plan is proposed with regard to Namibia guarantees to the struggling Namibian masses peace, freedom, social justice, self-determination and sovereignty. No Power or group of countries, therefore, has any right to usurp this sacred trust from the international community. It is our sincere hope that the United Nations will discharge this responsibility in accordance with the provisions of its Charter. For its part, Zimbabwe pledges full co-operation with all United Nations efforts to ensure the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) as expeditiously as possible. Until then the people of Zimbabwe will continue to sing with the struggling Namibian masses, under SWAPO, their sole and legitimate representative, the revolutionary tune: "*Pamberi Nechimurenga. A luta continua.*".

87. Mr. GOMA (Zambia): This emergency special session of the General Assembly, being held under the able presidency of Mr. von Wechmar, to consider the question of Namibia, is of great importance to the people of Namibia and to all those who genuinely seek to secure peace, freedom, justice and respect for human dignity throughout southern Africa. My delegation is confident that the President will guide the deliberations of this session to a successful conclusion.

88. The background to this emergency special session on the question of Namibia has been adequately covered by the Chairman of the OAU Council of Ministers and other speakers before me. Indeed, the Namibian problem is not new and its history is well known. It is a problem older than the United Nations itself. For its part, the United Nations has been dealing with the question of Namibia since its founding.

89. The numerous United Nations initiatives on Namibia have, of course, been designed to secure a peaceful settlement of the Namibian problem. We in Africa believe in peaceful change in southern Africa whenever this is possible. For this reason we have always rendered support to meaningful initiatives aimed at achieving that goal. The people of Namibia, like the rest of us in Africa, believe in peaceful change

if possible. Under the leadership of SWAPO, the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people, they have co-operated with the United Nations and encouraged all meaningful attempts at peaceful change in Namibia within the United Nations framework. The statesmanship displayed by SWAPO leaders in relation to Security Council resolution 435 (1978) has been universally recognized and commended.

90. The Lusaka Manifesto on Southern Africa of April 1969⁹ embodies Africa's basic position on the liberation of southern Africa. The choice between war and peace articulated in that historic document thus has validity and relevance to the Namibian question. If South Africa and the other enemies of Africa reject the peace option, can we be blamed for resorting to other means to resolve the Namibian problem? Can the oppressed people of Namibia, under the leadership of SWAPO, be justly accused of violence if they intensify their armed struggle? And given the military might and intransigence of South Africa, can anyone legitimately blame the Namibian people and deny them the right to seek the support of friends to achieve their cherished goal of peace, freedom and independence?

91. This has been a particularly bad year for the Namibian people. They have seen their hopes for peaceful change on the basis of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) rudely dashed by South Africa. The South African racist régime has intensified its repression of the Namibian people and has continued to commit aggression against front-line States in flagrant violation of their sovereignty and territorial integrity.

92. The recent act of aggression committed against the People's Republic of Angola by South Africa is the latest example of the threat to international peace and security that the South African régime represents. South Africa invaded Angola from Namibia, a Territory it illegally occupies. The Security Council failed, because of a United States veto, to take measures to terminate South Africa's latest act of aggression against Angola or even to condemn it. That veto, which amounted to condoning South African aggression against Angola, was a shameful exercise of power by the United States.

93. Let there be no doubt that we are meeting in an atmosphere of acute crisis. The serious war situation between Angola and South Africa continues, contrary to pronouncements emanating from Pretoria that the South Africans are withdrawing their forces from Angolan territory.

94. The act of aggression committed against Angola by South Africa, which we in Zambia most strongly condemn, clearly demonstrates the fact that as long as South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia persists, peace and security in southern Africa will continue to elude us. South African aggression against Angola, which the Security Council is watching in a state of paralysis, is but one of the many serious repercussions of the continued illegal occupation of Namibia.

95. It is a fact that South Africa has no common borders with Angola. It launches its acts of aggression against Angola from Namibia, a Territory it illegally occupies. The persistent violation of Angola's sover-

eignty and territorial integrity by South Africa can be effectively terminated only by South African withdrawal from Namibia and the accession of that country to genuine independence.

96. The pronouncements emanating from certain Western capitals are therefore a source of great concern to us. Some of those pronouncements clearly suggest support for the South African racist régime in its intransigence, defiance of the international community, acts of aggression against other States in southern Africa and *apartheid* policy. In the particular case of Namibia, no one can truthfully refute the fact that the basic problem is South Africa's illegal military occupation of Namibia. The armed struggle being waged by the Namibian people under the leadership of SWAPO stems from South Africa's persistent defiance of the will of the United Nations and of all progressive mankind that the Namibians should be permitted to exercise their right to freedom and independence.

97. We are against the continued South African illegal occupation of Namibia, South African aggression against neighbouring independent African States and the obnoxious system of *apartheid*. Are these unfair demands? There can be no doubt that the continued illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa and that régime's policies and practices of *apartheid*, together with the support or signals which South Africa receives from certain Western countries, have impeded progress towards the achievement of Namibia's independence.

98. Certain countries have made statements implying that suggestions have been made to them that they should take sides between the blacks and whites in southern Africa. Let me stress here that we in Africa have never asked any country to take sides between blacks and whites in southern Africa, nor are we asking any country to make that choice now. Our policies are not predicated on a racist premise. Africa is asking the international community as a whole to choose between right and wrong—indeed, between justice and injustice in southern Africa.

99. The economic potential of the southern African region is considerable. Those of us in southern Africa are anxious to get on with the development of our region. We want to exploit the tremendous resources of our countries not only for the benefit of our peoples, but also for that of mankind as a whole. However, we cannot effectively do this as long as we are engaged with the problems of liberation and are constant victims of aggression and destabilization by South Africa. We need peace founded on justice and freedom for the whole of southern Africa so that we can devote our attention and energies to development.

100. It is precisely because we cherish peace in freedom and justice and wish to promote the economic and social development of southern Africa that we are committed to the liberation struggle. All those who genuinely wish to see peaceful change in Namibia should support United Nations efforts to implement Security Council resolution 435 (1978). To block United Nations efforts in this direction is to block peaceful change and unwittingly to advocate violent change.

101. Members of the Western contact group on Namibia, individually and collectively, have tremendous human and other resources which can be used to find an early solution to the problem of Namibia. Basically, what is lacking is a demonstration of political will on their part. No meaningful initiative has emerged since the collapse of the Geneva pre-implementation meeting. The triple veto cast last April by the three Western permanent members of the Security Council has compounded the problem. The triple veto has, in fact, been helpful to South Africa, the oppressor.

102. There is, currently, talk about the desire to strengthen Security Council resolution 435 (1978). We reaffirm our position that that resolution should be implemented without further delay. No real progress can be made if the five Western countries are seen to be capitulating from time to time and asking for concessions from Africa and SWAPO, which have nothing more to give.

103. It is my delegation's view that the contact group should spare no effort to work for the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia. Any attempt to sidetrack the provisions of the plan would only serve to aggravate the dangerous situation currently prevailing in and around Namibia.

104. This emergency special session on Namibia is indeed of great importance. It provides yet another opportunity for the international community categorically and unequivocally to indicate to South Africa that there can be no compromise on the question of freedom, independence and justice for Namibia. It is my delegation's fervent hope that this emergency special session will go down in history as a milestone in the United Nations efforts for the liberation of Namibia.

105. Mr. BEDJAOUI (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): Our meeting here at this emergency special session devoted to Namibia affords me the honour of speaking on behalf of the group of African States. In that capacity, I am pleased to pay a tribute to the benevolent authority with which the President, Mr. von Wechmar, of the Federal Republic of Germany, has guided the work of our thirty-fifth session, as well as to his initiatives and unflagging efforts throughout a very busy year, as it indeed has been. I am firmly convinced that he will be able to guide our present debate in a manner consistent with his heavy responsibility to strive for peace and freedom.

106. The Namibian people is waging nothing more or less than a struggle for national liberation. It is a struggle with world-wide repercussions which it will wage to a successful conclusion with the assistance of Africa and under the leadership of SWAPO against a cruel, inhuman enemy which is armed to the teeth and benefits from a combination of support and complicity, endowing it, thus far, with a very disturbing impunity. The oppressive violence inflicted on the Namibian people—and on the other peoples of the region—is, of course, typical of the South African leaders, beguiled by their insane dreams of imperial racism. But it is now taking on genocidal proportions which no State can longer ignore.

107. I need hardly repeat that the countless sacrifices of the Namibian and South African peoples are a

direct result of the need to safeguard the great values of mankind and that southern Africa is a region where Africans are fighting for all, while the Pretoria régime is fighting against all. Namibia's independence will be the fruit of the sacrifices of its sons and daughters. Their martyrdom is the measure of a people's determination, the vitality of its nationalism and its burning thirst for freedom.

108. After 15 years of struggle against an incomparably well-equipped enemy, SWAPO has proved both its determination to triumph and the authenticity of its status as the sole representative of the Namibian people, as well as its ability to carry out its national and international obligations as such. The history of the great movement for the liberation of peoples which will have proved to be the salient feature of this century by the time it ends is thus enriched by the inestimable contribution of the Namibian people.

109. But the illegal occupation of Namibia persists despite these great victories of the Namibian people. The prolongation of the colonialist war can actually be explained by the now clearly discernible appearance on the scene of machinations which reflect a large-scale imperialist deployment in southern Africa aimed at perverting the decolonization process in Namibia and pursuing a policy of geopolitical partitioning which is becoming quite apparent in the region.

110. That is why the collective response to the South African racist régime has to this very day been frustrated. That is also why 1981, which was to be the year of Namibia's independence, will, quite the contrary, be shown to have been marked by the deployment of new South African manoeuvres, culminating in the resounding failure of the Geneva meeting on the pre-implementation of the United Nations plan, and by acts of armed aggression against neighbouring States on an unprecedented scale.

111. That is why just a few days ago, at the very time that this showdown session was being convened, where from all parts of the world the same condemnation of Pretoria's crimes was being voiced in a rising wave of solidarity in support of the peoples of the region which had been attacked and plundered, South Africa did not hesitate to launch, with the premeditation required for such action, a cold-blooded large-scale aggression against Angola, a sovereign, independent country and a Member of the Organization. The use by the United States of its right of veto against what was actually a timid reaction by the Security Council perpetuates the era of complacency, frustration, a constant procrastination, dashed hopes and a trust betrayed.

112. And do we have to say it again and again? The persistence of the illegal occupation of Namibia, the perverse and monstrous system of *apartheid* imposed on the people of South Africa, the repeated unpunished acts of aggression against the sovereign States of the region keep all the southern part of the African continent in a permanent state of instability and insecurity. As a result of this, we find in southern Africa the existence of a real threat to international peace and security, under all definitions of the subject laid down in the doctrine of the United Nations.

113. Given this state of permanent crisis, the Security Council has been called upon ceaselessly for two

decades now to exercise fully the responsibilities vested in it to deal with a situation that it itself described, as early as 1963, as gravely threatening international peace and security, as a result of acts by South Africa. Since that time the aggravation of the crisis, constantly fuelled by South Africa's increased defiance, has made this body not only acknowledge a breach of the peace and a serious challenge to the authority of the United Nations but also call upon the Pretoria régime to comply with international law and to respect the decisions of the United Nations, failing which the coercive measures provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter would be applied to it, we were told.

114. But apart from an arms embargo, subtle interpretations of which moreover invite violations, the Security Council has actually never acted with the necessary firmness required both by the clear violations committed and by the extreme seriousness of the situation.

115. The systematic impasse in the Security Council and the frustration of that body's proceedings as a result of the veto exercised by some of its permanent members thus continue to thwart the will of the international community, which continues to be frustrated in its desire effectively to implement the first of the objectives entrusted to the Organization under Article 1 of the Charter, namely:

"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..."

116. Indeed, the vetoes cast in the April debates have further diminished our hopes. Thus the speedy solution expected under the auspices of the United Nations has been compromised and the martyrdom of the peoples of southern Africa has been prolonged; thus, too, the aggressiveness of the South African leaders has been strengthened.

117. This situation constitutes a condemnation of the paranoid régime of South Africa. In addition, it does grave damage to the credibility of the United Nations. Finally, it is a harbinger of perilous developments in southern Africa. The situation is even more serious in view of the lessons apparently drawn from it, in particular by certain members of the contact group who have sponsored the settlement plan under which the United Nations has gone very far towards meeting South Africa's claims, but who nevertheless side-step their commitments and responsibilities when it comes to actually exercising the necessary pressure on the Pretoria régime. In these conditions, the plans for amending the United Nations-supported plan appear quite evidently to be unacceptable concessions that would give rise to others without overcoming the intransigence of the racist Pretoria régime in any way. Thus, the moral and political responsibility of the five Powers members of the contact group remains complete and unaffected.

118. Thus it would appear that we must "strengthen" Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which for all the international community actually constitutes a minimum for settling the question of Namibia. Referring to the need to recall the general

principles of government, requesting a recapitulation of human rights and insisting upon demanding that the rights and privileges of a minority be guaranteed give rise to questions on our part. These new demands—assuming that they could be divested of all manoeuvres and tactics, all the negative after-thoughts and considerations, and all the ulterior motives traditionally underlying South Africa's behaviour—lead, in the final analysis, to denying the rights of peoples. Independence implies the right of every people freely to choose its political, economic and social system. The international community cannot underwrite an undertaking founded on limiting the sovereignty of a nation. The Namibian people and SWAPO, its sole and legitimate representative, cannot be satisfied with conditional independence. The people of Namibia and all Africa do not trust racist South Africa. If we must strengthen resolution 435 (1978) by measures conducive to building trust, then it will have to be clear that the Namibian people, SWAPO and OAU are the parties which need safeguards and guarantees.

119. The policy of defiance and *faits accomplis*, the unacceptable resort to force and aggression, even if encouraged by the wrongful use of the veto by certain permanent members of the Security Council, cannot indefinitely continue to thwart the inevitable triumph of law and the coming to pass of a true, universal consensus. That fact is now more cogent than ever.

120. It is a good sign that this session is taking place just at the time when one of the five members of the contact group, France, has announced its decision to halt all public investment, to discourage private investment and strictly to apply the arms embargo decreed by the Security Council against South Africa.

121. Our present deliberations constitute a decisive turning-point in the settlement of the Namibian question and the restoration of peace and security in southern Africa. In meeting to that end in emergency special session, this Assembly is not without the means to fulfil these expectations of our peoples.

122. Thus, under the Charter, the main responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security cannot be interpreted as an exclusive prerogative of the Security Council. That is clear not only from the provisions of Articles 10, 11, 12 and 14, but also from Article 24 of the Charter. This fact faithfully reflects the need to respect the sovereign will of the international community, which the General Assembly has the privilege of expressing. The necessary functional distribution of tasks and the swiftness of their execution in the context of the normal operations of an institution cannot serve as a basis for an oligarchical concept of powers or justify the paralysis of this institution.

123. This interpretation of the Charter has, for three decades now, been confirmed by both the doctrine and the practice of the Organization. Having noted the limits of the system of collective security of the Charter, the General Assembly, through its resolution 377 A (V) of 3 November 1950, recognized that failure by the Security Council did not absolve Member States of their obligations nor the Organization of its responsibility under the Charter in the matter of the maintaining of international peace and security.

124. Drawing conclusions from that basic requirement, the General Assembly decided, in paragraph 1 of resolution 377 (V) A that when the Security Council

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

125. The purpose of our present deliberations is precisely to respond to these two factors: on the one hand, the existence of a breach of the peace recognized by the Security Council itself, indeed since 1963, and, on the other hand, the inability of the Security Council to do anything about it.

126. Given this increased danger in southern Africa, the United Nations must not content itself indefinitely with verbal condemnations or half-measures. The General Assembly's action since 1946, by its clarity and consistency, constitutes an important legacy. By the same token the solemn warnings addressed to South Africa by the Security Council itself and the arms embargo it decreed against South Africa constitute a solid basis and, as it were, an intermediary stage towards a firmer commitment, more resolute action and more specific measures.

127. Our present deliberations must take up and translate into reality the general conviction that international law and the decisions of the United Nations can prevail in southern Africa only through an organized concerted reaction from the international community.

128. In this context it follows from the special responsibility of the United Nations towards Namibia that everything be done, up to and including coercive measures provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter, to ensure that right prevails in that part of the world and that an end is put once and for all to the machinations of the racist régime of Pretoria.

129. Mr. MATTHEWS (Liberia): The delegation of Liberia is pleased to have Mr. von Wechmar presiding over this emergency special session of the General Assembly, given the marked contribution which his able leadership made to the success of its thirty-fifth session. The active role which his great country continues to play as a Member of the United Nations and especially as a member of the contact group on Namibia's independence places him in a unique position effectively to preside over this session.

130. The issue of Namibia has claimed the attention of the Organization during every session since 1946. It is an old one—and we have talked, and talked and talked. Why, then, is there a need for an emergency session? Why are we here today?

131. We are here because the issue has gone beyond the question of Namibian independence and has now engendered the potential for wider internationalization of that conflict. It now poses a clear and present danger to international peace and security. We see Namibian independence being steadily sacrificed on

the chessboard of super-Power rivalry. Our urgent quest for freedom in Namibia is being used to blackmail the neighbouring African States and to endanger their independence and security.

132. We are here because we ardently believe it is time to take appropriate measures against racist South Africa, which believes it can defy the will of the international community. South Africa must be made to know that it will not be permitted to draw up and follow, with impunity, independent rules outside the rule of law, for what it believes constitutes civilized behaviour.

133. We have come here because some of the nations of the world which once championed the cause of liberty, freedom and equality for all men have now drawn their swords to determine selectively how far and to whom those eternal principles should be applied.

134. The history of the Namibian issue presents us with a number of paradoxes. Thirty-six years ago South Africa helped to draft a Charter for the United Nations which commits all Member States to upholding the principles of self-determination and equal rights for all peoples. And yet today South Africa remains the hard core of resistance to the applicability of those principles in respect of Namibia.

135. We recall, further, that on 27 July 1978 R. F. Botha, Minister for Foreign Affairs of South Africa, addressing the Security Council, stated: "Very soon South West Africa"—Namibia—"will be independent. The people of the Territory demand it; it is their will and inalienable right".¹⁰ To nourish further the illusions of those who believed him, he announced that South Africa had accepted "the proposal for South West Africa"—Namibia—"in its final and definitive form".¹¹ Have South Africa's deeds been consistent with its declarations?

136. The most significant paradox surrounds the contact group. Having negotiated its plan for Namibia's independence as couched in Security Council resolution 435 (1978), the contact group has come back to say that the plan is a good, but not a sufficiently good, basis for bringing freedom to the long-suffering people of Namibia. Today we are told by certain quarters in the contact group that resolution 435 (1978) needs to be strengthened. They now speak of "constructive engagement" and "confidence-building measures". What, indeed, is meant by those terms? How many States here obtained their independence through them? From the engagement at Bunker Hill to the surrender of General Cornwallis at Yorktown, the American colonies certainly did not wait for confidence-building measures. Why should SWAPO?

137. South Africa, having found solace in some quarters, has rejected the plan for Namibia's independence and has proceeded with the division of Namibia into bantustans. It has staged ethnic elections and it has changed the Administrator-General's Advisory Council of the Democratic Turnhalle Alliance into a council of ministers with executive powers. It has increased its repression of the Namibian people and engaged in acts of destabilization and terrorism against Mozambique and Angola. What more do we need? South Africa is an outlaw State which has demonstrated the urgent need for concerted action against it by the international community.

138. It is clear to all of us by now that some members of the Security Council are opposed to the international community's taking appropriate and effective measures under Chapter VII of the Charter against South Africa. Recognizing the limits to what is possible, Liberia hereby urges all peace-loving countries to initiate individual and independent sanctions against South Africa.

139. While we must continue to strive for collective action, let us here decide in unison that each State will hereafter, in a way and manner it can afford, work towards the isolation of South Africa from the community of nations until it fulfils its obligations to humanity.

140. During the meetings of the Security Council on Namibia in May of this year, some Powers pretended to be so concerned about Africa that they had to warn that mandatory comprehensive sanctions against South Africa would work against the interests of blacks in southern Africa. We appeal to them to spare us their colonial arguments, for we know that there are no pains comparable to the pain of being denied the right of liberty, self-determination and independence.

141. Liberia continues to feel that Security Council resolution 435 (1978) has all the attributes necessary for ensuring the independence of Namibia under the leadership of SWAPO. Consequently we will oppose its alteration in any form. It was the Assembly that rightfully decided to recognize SWAPO as the sole legitimate representative of the Namibian people. And it was also the Assembly which with a clarion call proclaimed South Africa's occupation of Namibia to be illegal. It is therefore incumbent on the Assembly to renew its call for the full and speedy implementation of resolution 435 (1978).

142. In the cause of the people, the struggle continues.

143. Mr. CALLE Y CALLE (Peru) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Peru is participating in this solemn gathering of the United Nations in keeping with the principles of third-world and non-aligned solidarity, which are corner-stones of Peru's foreign policy. It welcomes with renewed optimism the convening of this eighth emergency special session of the General Assembly to study the situation prevailing in the Territory of Namibia in southern Africa.

144. This session is being held precisely at a time when the Republic of South Africa, the illegal occupier of the Territory of Namibia, has perpetrated acts of aggression against the territory of Angola, a country it has invaded using as its excuse the struggle against terrorist movements. The South African troops have left behind them a painful legacy of incalculable human and material losses.

145. The Pretoria régime does not recognize the just struggle of the Namibian people, whose sole objective is to achieve full independence for its country. History has taught us that processes of colonial liberation and national independence have in most cases meant severely trying times for peoples. As members of the international community we are duty-bound to support the just and heroic struggle of the people of Namibia for independence and to demand by all means possible

the withdrawal of South Africa from the territories it is occupying illegally, so that Namibia can at long last join the family of free and independent States.

146. The United Nations, as an international organization, and we Member States in particular, are obliged to arrive at a complete and definitive solution to the Namibian problem. To attain that shared objective, the Peruvian Government will always be ready to co-operate with the United Nations. That same conviction and solidarity with the cause of the Namibian people was reaffirmed by the President of the Republic, Fernando Belaúnde Terry, to the delegation of the United Nations Council for Namibia, which visited our country for a second time in May last under the presidency of the Permanent Representative of Algeria, Mr. Mohammed Bedjaoui, to whom we are so indebted for his efforts and stand in the brilliant and unflagging defence of Namibia's rights.

Mr. Ortiz-Sanz (Bolivia), Vice-President, took the Chair.

147. On the occasion of that visit the Government of Peru and the mission of the United Nations Council for Namibia signed a joint communiqué dated 7 May 1981¹² which condemns the continued illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa and recognizes that the principal problem of decolonization confronting the United Nations is that of Namibia, which is under the direct responsibility of the Organization until it achieves genuine self-determination and the Namibian people fulfil their destiny, which is none other than full independence.

148. Peru, as a democratic country and one which went through its own anti-colonial struggle, has endeavoured to be very clear and explicit as it has always been concerning the struggle against colonialism.

149. The Constitution of Peru, in article 88, states explicitly:

“The State rejects all forms of imperialism, colonialism, neocolonialism and racial discrimination. It supports the oppressed peoples of the world.”

There is therefore in the case of Peru not only a moral mandate to support Namibia, but also a legal mandate contained in its supreme law, the Constitution of the State.

150. The South African régime must be persuaded once again that there is no justification whatsoever for its presence in the Territory of Namibia. The International Court of Justice, the highest legal body at the international level, in its advisory opinion of 21 June 1971,¹ so often quoted in this Hall, stated that South Africa's presence in Namibia is illegal and that it is therefore obliged to withdraw from that Territory. It has been clearly established and reaffirmed that Namibia is under the direct and special responsibility of the United Nations until its independence is attained.

151. Peru wishes to issue a fervent appeal to the Powers that have direct access to the parties to the conflict, especially those close to the Pretoria Government. We believe that in the case of Namibia, unlike other conflicts, the prospects for a negotiated solution

are real. The liberation movement which is leading the struggle for liberation in Namibia has clearly expressed its intention to comply with the cease-fire and to allow the application of the United Nations plan for Namibia, the most recent instrument awaiting implementation to facilitate the process leading that emerging State to independence. For its part, South Africa, which agreed with the original United Nations plan, has unjustifiably opted for a policy of delaying the settlement of the matter and has even placed obstacles in the path of the independence process through its policy of fragmenting the Namibian people by the creation of ethnic zones or bantustans, or by promoting the creation of an invalid national assembly in the Territory which it is illegally occupying and which is far from representing the genuine interests of the majority of the people of Namibia. This is therefore the time for the Powers which have direct access to the parties, especially those which Pretoria cannot fail to heed, to adopt the historic decision to compel South Africa to sit down at the negotiating table, to comply with an unconditional cease-fire and to implement once and for all the United Nations plan. The only possible course of action is that leading to independence under the auspices and guarantees of the United Nations. The Members of the Organization, and especially those which are permanent members of the Security Council, cannot renege on or abandon their collective obligations the principles on which the United Nations was founded and is maintained. We cannot forget that the countries that designed and did not oppose the adoption of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) have the historic and inescapable obligation to keep that pledge. That is the correct conduct which has always been the hallmark of countries that know how to write history not just in one sole fashion but by fulfilling unswervingly and without hesitation the obligations that they themselves undertake. That is the historic mandate of our day.

152. Peru, as a democratic country with a glorious anti-colonial past, Peru which, with its own blood, on the plains of Ayacucho placed the seal of independence on the American continent, unconditionally supports the right of the people of Namibia to self-determination as well as their right to complete and genuine independence with full respect for their territorial integrity.

153. Mr. CORRÊA DA COSTA (Brazil): The convening of this emergency special session of the General Assembly was decided following a request made by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of OAU at its eighteenth ordinary session held earlier this year at Nairobi. That request reflects the frustration and disappointment of the nations of Africa at a fundamentally unjust and anachronistic situation, namely, the persistence of the last stronghold of colonialism in their continent. Many countries, including my own, have informed the President of their support for the convening of this emergency special session, thus clearly indicating that the repudiation of South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia has transcended the boundaries of Africa and has evolved into a world-wide and deep-rooted anxiety over what is perceived to be a major threat to international peace and security. Time is running out. Indeed, the urgency of a prompt and just settlement of the question of Namibia is dictated, on the one hand, by the overriding

moral necessity of giving effect to the principle of self-determination, to which we are all committed and, on the other, by the undeniable fact that it is in the best interest of the international community as a whole to dispel an atmosphere of mounting strife, with unpredictable consequences for international relations.

154. Although one could have possibly argued that there might have been grounds for rather high expectations, 1981 cannot claim to have been a very encouraging year, to say the least. After having systematically thwarted the process of negotiating an adequate formula providing for the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), the South African authorities did not hesitate to doom to failure the pre-implementation talks held in January in Geneva on the initiative of the Secretary-General. At that juncture, it became evident that the problem bothering South Africa was not any specific element of the implementation proposal, which, if it departed at all from resolution 435 (1978), was to allay South Africa's alleged concerns; it was, rather, that South Africa was not willing to envisage the possibility of Namibia becoming independent one day under a leadership other than that appointed by Pretoria itself. SWAPO, on the other hand, indicated that it was ready for the ballot and would abide by its results. At the resumed thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly [105th meeting], I commented at some length on the reasons alleged by South Africa for refusing to bring about the settlement of the Namibian question by peaceful means. Suffice it for me to say now that none of those stated reasons deserves to be given any credence. To attempt to meet Pretoria's so-called concerns would not bring any closer our shared objective of ensuring Namibia's independence but would be tantamount to surrendering to South Africa's procrastinating tactics.

155. Confronted with Pretoria's intransigence and having lost faith in stalled negotiations that had lasted much too long, the group of African States legitimately requested an urgent meeting of the Security Council to consider imposing sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter. It should be understood that the action which the Council was called upon to take was merely to apply the relevant provisions of the Charter, as the organ of the United Nations entrusted with the responsibility for maintaining international peace and security. After all, the provisions of the Charter are not only to be complied with but also to be applied whenever necessary. Otherwise, what recourse is left for the international community? What prospect is there for the future other than disorder and chaos resulting from the abolition of incentives to restraint and accommodation? And yet, as is well known, the Security Council, by virtue of the negative votes of three of its permanent members, decided not to live up to its high responsibilities, thus contributing to polarizing the situation further and to strengthening if at all possible, Pretoria's adamant opposition to Namibia's independence.

156. The International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa, held in May in Paris under the sponsorship of the United Nations and of OAU, intensified the strong feeling that effective urgent action was needed in order to constrain South Africa to relinquish its illegal military occupation of Namibia.

The Paris Declaration on Sanctions against South Africa and the Special Declaration on Namibia,⁶ both adopted by consensus, are a clear statement of the commitment of the overwhelming majority of the international community to pursue the only path still open leading to fulfilment of the aspirations of the Namibian people. Nevertheless, we still hear from certain quarters the assertion that more time is needed to convince South Africa to abide by the decisions of the United Nations and that pressure on the Pretoria régime will only further delay the achievement of a final settlement. Certainly, no one can challenge the fact that peaceful negotiations are the best means of settling international disputes. Indeed, in respect of Namibia, that has always been the position of my country and, for that matter, that of the countries of Africa. At present the question is not whether we are in favour or against engaging in a productive negotiating process with a view to expediting the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). The question simply does not arise. We should first ask ourselves whether there are any prospects of fruitful negotiations. South Africa has made it abundantly clear that it is not prepared to yield its control over the Territory of Namibia; it has cast unjustifiable aspersions on the United Nations; it has intensified its armed forays into sovereign African States; and it has not missed any opportunity to publicize its stubbornness and spurious intentions. Under those circumstances, how can we still harbour any hope that South Africa is willing to negotiate responsibly?

157. Resolution 435 (1978) was adopted unanimously by the Security Council, and the Government of South Africa itself vouchsafed its willingness to go along with the course of action set forth in that resolution. And yet we are now told that resolution 435 (1978) is not enough and that it must be either amended or coupled with other provisions. Is it the intention to deny SWAPO a fair chance to participate in future elections in Namibia and to deprive the Government of an independent Namibia of any power to run the country in a sovereign manner? Resolution 435 (1978) lays the ground for fair and democratic elections and does not grant privileges to one party to the detriment of any other. It should therefore neither be detracted from nor quibbled about.

158. I should like to return for a moment to a point I touched upon in previous statements in the Assembly. It concerns South Africa's contention that the United Nations lacks impartiality and has already decided beforehand that SWAPO will be the victor of elections in Namibia. South Africa should know better and realize that the General Assembly has recognized SWAPO as the sole and legitimate representative of the Namibian people because SWAPO was the only Namibian political force which sought independence for its country. The recognition of such a role of SWAPO did not necessarily mean that it was the intention of the General Assembly or of any other organ of the United Nations to determine that SWAPO was to be the future Government of Namibia. Neither has SWAPO, for that matter, wished the Assembly to take such a decision. SWAPO has time and again stated that it would abide by the results of the ballot.

159. At the beginning of my statement I said that an ever-growing consensus was developing concerning

the extent of the threat to international peace and security posed by the illegal South African occupation of Namibia. The recent act of aggression perpetrated against Angola is an undisputable harbinger of the extremely dangerous consequences that lie ahead if South Africa's reluctance to comply with the decisions of the Organization is not overcome. Given the brutality of the foray by Pretoria's armed forces into Angola, to whose people we now renew our full solidarity, one can find no justification for the failure of the Security Council to adopt even an extremely mild resolution condemning South Africa, so much so because the explanation given by the permanent member responsible for the immobility of the Council refers to the problem of Namibia as if it were not essentially one of decolonization. By refusing even to respond partially to the appeal of the Government of Angola, the Security Council has certainly not contributed to reversing the trend of violence in southern Africa. It behoves this emergency special session of the General Assembly to reaffirm its commitment to the independence of Namibia and to take the necessary measures accordingly. The people of Namibia, which has suffered bloodshed and havoc for so long, cannot expect anything less from us.

160. Mr. NUSEIBEH (Jordan): The blatant large-scale military invasion perpetrated during the last week of August 1981 by the condemned and isolated racist regime of South Africa, breaching the inviolability of the People's Republic of Angola, is a most adverse and ominous turn of events in view of the sustained efforts of the United Nations during the past three and a half decades to restore the natural and inalienable rights of the oppressed people of Namibia to genuine independence, self-determination and a life in dignity in their homeland.

161. The bigoted and racist South African régime has thrown down the gauntlet and has revealed, for all to see, its true ugly, deceitful face and its unabashed determination to deny Namibia independence, in defiance of the consensus of mankind, the Charter of the United Nations and numerous General Assembly and Security Council resolutions.

162. Furthermore, it has signalled, in no unmistakable terms, its categorical and defiant repudiation of its earlier lip-service acceptance of the political settlement carefully designed by the Security Council and the five members of the Western contact group and the commendable detailed recommendations made by the Secretary-General for implementation in 1979. In sum, it has indicated to the community of nations, represented in the Assembly, its choice of the military option, in support of its continuous, relentless and rapacious colonization, exploitation and vivisection of Namibia, in furtherance of its notorious Odendaal plan of "internal settlement", in order to confront the world with a *fait accompli*.

163. This deceitful and fiendish internal plan of liquidation, designed to destroy the integrity of Namibia through the establishment of a variety of bantustans, located on marginal and poorly endowed land in non-contiguous areas, has been repeatedly condemned by our world body and has been declared totally null and void by the United Nations, which regards Namibia and its valiant people as a sacred trust, as that Territory is supervised by the United

Nations Council for Namibia on behalf of the community of nations.

164. The latest and most outrageous invasion of the sovereign, independent State of Angola is part of the unfolding of an over-all plan to circumvent and torpedo the orderly transfer of power to the legitimate representatives of the Namibian people—SWAPO—through free and unfettered elections held under United Nations auspices and supervision, in blatant defiance of the Security Council's pertinent resolutions. The bullet has been chosen to replace the ballot.

165. Since the General Assembly discussed the question of Namibia in March of this year, events have taken a very bleak turn. The earlier rays of hope have since been all but dissipated. The Western initiative, which we had been told would accomplish through quiet diplomacy what forceful United Nations action might not accomplish, has been virtually aborted. The Security Council, which the community of nations had hoped would start implementing punitive action as spelled out in Chapter VII of the Charter, has failed to act, in consequence of a veto cast by a super-Power, the United States of America, one of the five members of the Western contact group.

166. What is even more unsettling is the motivation of the United States and the complete change of outlook with which it has come to view the tragic and sanguinary events in southern Africa. A flagrant large-scale aggression by the *apartheid* régime of South Africa must be assessed, we are told, within a broader context, thus condoning the latest aggression and giving the green light to further and more destructive aggressions. That South Africa's lawless aggression should be viewed within a broader context is perfectly correct, for armed invasions are never isolated exercises. However, the context referred to in that statement, which was made to apportion blame between the aggressor and the victim, is totally at variance with the real full context, in which virtually the entire world, other than the aggressors and those who acquiesce in its commission, has condemned that savage aggression.

167. The declared objective of the racist South African régime has been to hit and destroy as many as possible of the freedom fighters of oppressed and cannibalized Namibia and to do so, reprehensibly, from the usurped soil of that Territory, to which those valiant and indomitable freedom fighters belong and for whose redemption they have been and will always continue to be ready to fight and die and to endure in dignity whatever sacrifices their tormentor may be capable of inflicting upon them. Assuredly, these sacrifices will lead only to an intensification of their resolve and a heightened awareness of what their pariah enemies have in store in attempting to thwart their struggle that will continue until freedom and redemption are achieved.

168. I am sure many of us have read with shock and dismay the detailed broad lines of a new policy enunciated recently by the Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs in the United States Administration. This would have been inconceivable a few decades ago, when the United States Government and people were still inspired by the legalistic-moralistic approach whereby the inherent value of individuals

and peoples and their right to freedom and self-determination were an overriding consideration in the conduct of relations among nations.

169. Priority in that foreign policy statement was very candidly given to the grabbing of enormous resources, such as minerals and other raw materials, with undisguised disregard for the welfare, freedom and survival of the inhabitants in whose lands those resources lie. Thus the people of Namibia will remain in bondage, because human freedom would be bartered for the human greed of the few. This is not only immoral but myopic in the extreme, because legitimate international trading can never be conducted within areas of conflict, turbulence and enslavement. This is literally, and astoundingly, a blueprint identical to what racist and expansionist Israel has done in Palestine and has been doing in the occupied Palestinian and Arab territories during the past decades. As a matter of fact the South African régime has even imitated Israel by creating its own buffer zone. I wonder who is teaching whom in this massive despoliation and in this brutal behaviour. It is certainly reciprocal.

170. I said in my statement before the General Assembly on 5 March 1981 at the resumed thirty-fifth session [109th meeting] that failure of the Security Council to take effective measures against South Africa in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter would herald not only further serious erosion of United Nations authority but also an inescapable green light for the aggrieved party to intensify its legitimate armed struggle against South Africa and eventually to stop mining the resources that have enslaved rather than enhanced the freedom and welfare of the toiling people of Namibia and of South Africa itself and thereby spark a racial war of indefinite duration and unforeseeable magnitude.

171. Our brethren on the African continent need and deserve a helping hand to build themselves up and make up for centuries of unconscionable exploitation and neglect. Must they and their exploiters continue to undergo the ordeal of blood-baths before the world represented through us realizes this inevitable fact and takes effective measures to forestall it?

172. Another disturbing and most sinister development has been the attempt to abort Namibian independence by linking it to the global East-West rivalry. We thoroughly reject this novel interpretation, which is merely a last resort and a crude excuse to evade the moment of reckoning. We have been debating the question of Namibia for decades as an integral part and parcel of the great movement of emancipation and decolonization. This is the first occasion that certain circles are attempting to confuse the real and fundamental issue by injecting extraneous factors into a cause that is universally acknowledged and impeccable.

173. If outside military assistance is needed by a people that is fighting for freedom after all other peaceful avenues have been closed, there is a duty which devolves upon all Members of the United Nations to provide it in accordance with Article 51 of the Charter. May I ask in all earnestness: how many independence movements in the world have had to seek and obtain assistance in waging a just struggle,

including the great American Revolution? Outside assistance is a consequence and not a cause, and it should be understood within this universal and historical context.

174. As for the matter of the extremely vital strategic resources of the area which is manifestly standing in the way of Namibia's independence, there is hardly a case where independence has resulted in the denial of legitimate trade between former adversaries. But it could well become a self-fulfilling prophecy if a transient conflict were allowed to turn into a prolonged and costly enmity.

175. My Government urges that Namibian independence be put back in its proper context and be achieved without additional gruesome struggles. This can be immeasurably facilitated if the General Assembly, after decades of futile waiting, acts decisively and with maximum effect in accordance with the powers vested in it by the Charter of the United Nations.

176. Mr. KRISHNAN (India): My delegation is pleased to see Mr. von Wechmar presiding over this emergency special session of the General Assembly. His rich experience and diplomatic skill are indeed an asset to the Assembly. Moreover, the personal commitment to the cause of Namibia and the fervent hope for its early independence which he expressed on Namibia Day this year give us reason to feel confident that he will guide the present session to a successful conclusion.

177. The present emergency special session on the question of Namibia has been convened against the background of the increasing frustration of the international community, which is repeatedly thwarted in its efforts to enable the people of Namibia to exercise their right to self-determination and independence. It was in 1966 that the United Nations terminated the Mandate of South Africa over Namibia and assumed direct responsibility for the Territory. Fifteen years have since passed, but even today Namibia remains in bondage, its people brutally oppressed, its resources plundered and the Territory itself used by South Africa to wage wars against neighbouring States. And now the virtual rejection by South Africa of the United Nations plan and the failure of the Security Council to take quick remedial action have created an emergency situation, which has made it imperative for the entire membership of the United Nations to contemplate collective action. Despite the prevailing mood of frustration, our abiding faith in the potential of the United Nations has brought us together once again in an effort to eliminate this last bastion of colonialism from the continent of Africa.

178. The backdrop provided by South Africa to the present session in the form of a massive aggression committed against Angola is a rude reminder of the dangers inherent in the present situation in Namibia. Angola and other front-line States which have steadfastly supported their Namibian brethren in their struggle to liberate their motherland have been victims of South African aggression for a long time. But the scale and nature of the recent aggression have added a new dimension to the situation in southern Africa. The latest South African aggression has made it abundantly clear once again that South Africa is determined to intensify its attempts to intimidate the

neighbouring African countries with a view to weakening the support they extend to SWAPO. The Government of India strongly condemns those acts of aggression. We stand shoulder to shoulder with Angola and other front-line States in their determination to assist in the liberation of Namibia, however arduous the struggle and however great the sacrifices may be. Angola has the sympathy and support of the world community at large in the defence of its sovereignty and territorial integrity. This became clear during the recent meetings of the Security Council, despite the failure of the Council to take action owing to the veto cast by one permanent member.

179. The fact that the continued illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa, together with the acts of aggression committed by it against neighbouring States, poses a grave threat to international peace and security has been universally recognized. The negotiations within the Security Council leading to the elaboration of the United Nations plan for Namibia resulted from that recognition. The adoption of the plan as an internationally acceptable course of action was due to the statesmanship and the spirit of compromise of SWAPO and the front-line States. The plan, after all, had not been altered by the people of Namibia or by African countries. It had made compromises on the two fundamental premises that the United Nations had accepted, first, that with the termination of the Mandate South Africa had ceased to be of any legal relevance in Namibia and, secondly, that SWAPO alone represented the people of Namibia.

180. Discerning members of the international community knew then, as it has become abundantly clear since the Geneva meeting earlier this year, that, even after extracting these concessions, South Africa would persist in its colonialist and aggressive posture and use the negotiations as a cover for pursuing the path of an internal settlement by setting up fraudulent entities in Namibia. Even certain Western countries, which were motivated by the belief that South African preoccupations were genuine and should be accommodated, have awakened to the realization that, by maintaining a facade of movement in the negotiations, South Africa had merely gained time to strengthen its hold on Namibia and that the present situation contained the seeds of a widespread conflict in Africa, with grave consequences for the rest of the world.

181. The failure of the negotiations and the realization of the dangers inherent in the impasse necessarily led to a reassessment of the situation and adoption of measures that would compel South Africa to quit Namibia. This logic, and the means for action contained in the Charter of the United Nations, raised hopes when the Security Council met following the Geneva debacle. But the vetoes cast by three permanent members, virtually paralysing the Council, raised serious doubts not only about the credibility of the United Nations but also about their own intentions with regard to Namibia. Do they place their own economic and strategic considerations above their responsibility under the Charter for maintaining international peace and security? Are they willing to dismiss the will of the overwhelming majority of the nations of the world as deliberate fuelling of, or misguided support for, what they mistakenly regard as international terrorism?

182. It was in the face of these doubts and the challenge the new situation posed to the international community as a whole that the Non-Aligned Movement, OAU and the Members of the United Nations resolved that the General Assembly, in an emergency special session, should accomplish what the Security Council had failed to achieve: namely, the adoption of collective measures to enforce South Africa's compliance with the United Nations decisions.

183. The nature of the emergency with regard to Namibia facing us today is indeed evident. The United Nations plan for Namibia lies all but abandoned because of South Africa's intransigence, as well as the readiness of its authors to resile from their position merely to placate South Africa. In its place, we hear vague ideas about strengthening or amplifying the plan and dubious protestations of neutrality. How can one be neutral between freedom and oppression? And if anything needs to be strengthened, it is the power of SWAPO. The credibility of the United Nations itself stands eroded because it has so far been unable to secure freedom and justice for the people of Namibia and has shown no willingness to act on the basis of its Charter. The sovereignty and territorial integrity of the front-line African States stand violated as a result of aggressive acts by South Africa in gross violation of the fundamental principles of international law. International peace and security stand threatened as a consequence of South Africa's menacing attitude, combined with its military might and possible clandestine acquisition of nuclear weapons.

184. The current emergency in southern Africa can be ended only through the immediate liberation of Namibia. The only way that the United Nations can assist in the liberation of Namibia is by taking collective measures to compel South Africa to implement the United Nations plan without modification, dilution, prevarication or delay. The present emergency special session should, therefore, resolve that the Member States shall cease forthwith every kind of dealing with South Africa with a view to isolating it politically, militarily, economically and culturally. The total isolation of South Africa, secured by action which we ourselves are capable of taking, will ensure South Africa's compliance with the decisions of the United Nations.

185. We do recognize that the effectiveness of the action taken by the present session of the Assembly will depend largely on the readiness of the Member States to enforce the decisions even if they involve sacrifices and inconveniences. The major trading partners of South Africa and those who maintain political and cultural links with the Pretoria régime will have to act with a sense of international responsibility. At the same time, the capability for self-reliance of the independent States in southern Africa will have to be strengthened to enable them to meet the new situation. A comprehensive programme of boycott of South Africa, together with a well-considered programme of action to assist the neighbouring States, will certainly have a decisive impact on the Pretoria régime.

186. The Government of India, having imposed sanctions on its own against South Africa by appropriate legislation several years ago, stands ready to join in any action that this session will take to liberate

Namibia. We have extended moral and material support to SWAPO in the past and shall continue to do so as long as it is necessary. We were privileged to receive a delegation of the United Nations Council for Namibia at New Delhi recently to discuss the possible approach of the United Nations during the present session. The Prime Minister of India, Mrs. Indira Gandhi, who received the delegation, assured the Council that India would continue to champion the cause of Namibia because it believed that its own freedom was incomplete till colonialism was totally eliminated. In keeping with the decisions of the Non-Aligned Movement taken in New Delhi, India will continue to give all possible support to SWAPO, the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people. The invitation we have extended recently to SWAPO to open an office in New Delhi demonstrates our continuing commitment.

187. The significance of the very convening of this emergency special session as an act of solidarity with the people of Namibia cannot be missed. South Africa and its supporters should see in it a gathering of the storm that shall blow away colonialism in a final decisive sweep. The liberation of Namibia is sure to be secured by the people of Namibia by their own struggle, if the lessons of history are any guide. This session has shown that the newly liberated peoples of the world stand solidly behind the Namibian patriots. The decisions taken at this session, even if not implemented by a handful of countries, will be historic in themselves because they will represent the determination of the United Nations to fight for the principles and values it cherishes. They will go down in history as having launched the final onslaught on the last citadel of colonialism in southern Africa.

188. Mr. LING Qing (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): First of all, please allow me to extend warm congratulations to Mr. von Wechmar of the Federal Republic of Germany on his assumption of the presidency of the emergency special session of the General Assembly on Namibia.

189. We highly appreciate the unrelenting joint efforts of the African States, non-aligned nations and the third-world countries, which have made this session possible. This is another important contribution to the Namibian people's cause of national independence.

190. We are equally appreciative of the efforts made by the Secretary-General, Mr. Kurt Waldheim, for the successful convocation of this session.

191. Namibia is the only State on the African continent which has not yet attained its independence. The independence of Namibia has become a pressing issue calling for urgent solution in the present struggle for decolonization in Africa and the world as a whole. As is known to all, as early as 1960 the General Assembly, at its fifteenth session, adopted a resolution on the complete independence and freedom of all colonial countries and peoples. In 1966 the General Assembly formally decided to terminate the so-called Mandate of the South African authorities over Namibia. In 1978 the Security Council adopted resolution 435 (1978) calling for

“the withdrawal of South Africa's illegal administration from Namibia”

to

“ensure the early independence of Namibia through free elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations.”

SWAPO and the African countries have made unremitting efforts for the implementation of that resolution and the winning of the national rights of the Namibian people. The international community and all the justice-upholding countries have also made useful contributions in this respect. Last January, under the auspices of the United Nations, the Geneva meeting, attended by all parties concerned, was held to discuss ways to implement the plan for achieving independence in Namibia. Regrettably, the conference achieved no result and ended in failure owing to the obstruction and sabotage of the South African racist régime. In utter disregard of a whole series of United Nations resolutions on Namibia's independence adopted in the past 20 years and more, the South African authorities have stubbornly persisted in their illegal rule in Namibia. This cannot but arouse the strong indignation of African countries, the non-aligned nations and just world opinion. The Conference of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries, the resumed thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly, the summit meeting of the front-line States, the International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa, the extraordinary plenary meeting of the United Nations Council for Namibia and the eighteenth ordinary session of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of OAU held successively last year, have unanimously voiced their condemnation of the perverse acts of the South African authorities and their support for the just struggle of the Namibian people, and called for the immediate implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). All this fully shows that the termination of the illegal rule of South Africa and independence for Namibia have become an irresistible historical trend. In this context, it is of great practical significance for the General Assembly to be convening this emergency special session to consider the question of the independence of Namibia.

192. Since the Second World War the irresistible historical trend has been that countries want independence and nations want liberation. The national independence movements have developed vigorously in Africa and a number of colonies have freed themselves from the shackles of imperialist colonial rule and won independence one after another. The 1960s have gone down in history as a glorious decade of national independence for African countries. Today, all former colonies on the African continent have achieved independence except Namibia, which is still under the illegal rule of the South African racist régime. This anachronism should no longer be allowed to continue. We may all recall that the Namibian people, led by SWAPO, have waged unflinching and protracted struggles against the South African authorities' illegal occupation of Namibia and for freedom and liberation. The brutal repression by the South African authorities left them with no alternative but to initiate armed struggle in 1966. Theirs is a just struggle which deserves stronger support from the international community.

193. Under the impact of the Namibian people's armed struggle and the boycott of the international

community, the South African authorities, in extreme isolation, find the going tougher and tougher. Yet they are still obstinately clinging to their racist and colonialist position. They have intensified military suppression of the armed forces of SWAPO and persecution of the Namibian patriots. They have stepped up their efforts to prop up puppet forces and organize hired troops and police for the purpose of instituting the sham independence of Namibia to deceive world opinion. They have increased military provocations, armed incursions and subversive activities against neighbouring countries—Angola, Zambia, Mozambique, Botswana and Zimbabwe. In violation of Namibia's territorial integrity and sovereignty, they have claimed that the strategic port of Walvis Bay, an inalienable part of Namibia's territory, belongs permanently to South Africa. They have been finding fault with Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and refuse to implement it. Again, on the pretext of "pursuing" the armed forces of the Namibian people, the South African racist régime flagrantly launched a massive invasion of the People's Republic of Angola on 24 August 1981 with a large number of troops and has refused to withdraw despite strong condemnation by world public opinion. All this serves to show that the South African racist régime is the most stubborn stronghold of colonialism and racism left in the world today. The racists dream of perpetual occupation of Namibia so as to preserve their colonialist interests there. Their acts have not only grossly violated the sacred rights of the people of all countries to self-determination and independence enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations but also constitute an increasingly grave threat to peace, security and stability in southern Africa today. However, no matter how desperately they struggle, the racists of South Africa will eventually be submerged by the torrents of history.

194. It should be pointed out that the recklessness of the South African authorities is inseparable from the connivance of certain Western Powers. For their vested interests in southern Africa these Powers have tried by one way or another to shield South Africa. SWAPO and the front-line African States have made sincere efforts and put forward a series of reasonable suggestions and proposals with regard to the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). But a certain country has attempted to revise the resolution in order to meet the unreasonable demands of South Africa. We think that this is unwise.

195. It should be recognized that the achievement of national independence for Namibia is the irresistible aspiration of the Namibian and other African peoples, which the Western Powers should fully respect and support. On the other hand, if the South African authorities are permitted to continue to move against the historical trend, it will only arouse resentment from the African countries and lead to greater turbulence in southern Africa.

196. What merits attention is that an up-and-coming super-Power which has long cast its covetous eyes on southern Africa is trying hard to exploit the situation in Namibia to meddle and intervene in the affairs there. Keeping an eye on the strategic position and rich strategic resources of southern Africa, that super-Power is trying by hook or by crook to carry out

infiltration and expansion there in its quest for world domination. Meanwhile the South African authorities are citing such infiltration and expansion as a pretext to delay the independence of Namibia. This is something which calls for attention and vigilance.

197. The present struggle centring around the independence of Namibia is complicated. The situation in Africa and in the world as a whole is, however, favourable to the Namibian people. With the support of the African countries, the non-aligned nations and all justice-upholding countries, the Namibian people are carrying on persistent and tenacious struggles in various forms, including armed struggle. Not long ago, Mr. Nujoma, Chairman of SWAPO, solemnly declared: "We are determined to face the South African racist troops with arms in hands and at the same time we are also ready for a negotiated settlement." In a resolution of the Council of Ministers of OAU,⁴ adopted by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of OAU at its eighteenth ordinary session, it was solemnly pointed out that "due to the intransigence of the illegal occupation régime of Pretoria, the armed struggle remains the most effective course of action for bringing about the independence of Namibia" and that Security Council resolution 435 (1978) "is the only basis for a negotiated settlement of the Namibian problem" and that it should be immediately and unconditionally implemented "without any prevarication, qualification or modification". These are just voices and reasonable views, which represent the correct path to the independence of Namibia. We are firmly convinced that, with the support of the African countries and the international community, the Namibian people, persisting in unity and struggle, can certainly overcome all difficulties and obstacles in their march forward and attain the sacred goal of national independence.

198. The Chinese Government and people have always stood by the African countries and peoples and firmly supported the Namibian people in their just struggle against the colonial rule of South Africa and for their independence and liberation. We sternly condemn the Pretoria régime for its crimes of suppressing the Namibian people and invading the front-line countries. We denounce in the strongest terms the latest invasion of Angola by South African forces and demand their immediate withdrawal therefrom. We have consistently maintained that the South African authorities must immediately terminate their illegal rule of Namibia and unconditionally withdraw all their military and police forces as well as their colonialist Administration from Namibia; that Namibia should attain genuine national independence at the earliest possible date in accordance with the aspirations of its people and on the basis of territorial integrity and national unity; that the United Nations resolutions and plan for achieving the independence of Namibia should be promptly implemented; and that the international community should exert greater pressure on the South African authorities in all fields and apply more effective sanctions against them. The Chinese Government and people will, as always, continue to extend moral, political, diplomatic and material support to the just struggle of the Namibian people.

199. Over the years the United Nations has done a great deal of work for the attainment of the independence of Namibia and made positive contributions in this regard. We hope that the current session will approve the various correct proposals and suggestions put forward at the eighteenth ordinary session of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of OAU, the Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries and the United Nations Council for Namibia and by many countries at those meetings, take further and truly effective measures to give stronger support to the struggle of the Namibian people and make new contributions to the early achievement of the independence of Namibia.

200. Mr. PEŠIĆ (Yugoslavia) (*interpretation from French*): We are certain that Mr. von Wechmar's experience, which he so amply demonstrated while presiding over the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly, will once again make an important contribution to the successful conclusion by the General Assembly of the consideration of so acute and complex a question as that of Namibia.

201. The convening of the Assembly in an emergency special session bears witness once again, without the slightest room for doubt, to the fact that the majority of the international community demands that the problem of Namibia be settled as soon as possible on the basis of genuine self-determination and national independence. The latest act of aggression by South Africa against the People's Republic of Angola is a clear and most dramatic example of how serious are the effects of the absence of a settlement of this problem.

202. This session is the direct consequence of the outcome of the meetings held by the Security Council in April last. The Council was prevented from discharging its fundamental responsibility, flowing from the Charter of the United Nations, at that time. Indeed, it is known that by their veto three permanent members of the Council prevented it from adopting effective measures to put an end to the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa.

203. We hope that this session will reflect the will of the international community more adequately than did the meetings of the Council and that it will, with all the necessary firmness, ensure the implementation of decisions so far taken by the United Nations on the subject of Namibia and, with the requisite determination, show that those decisions must be put into effect.

204. The existence of an international consensus on the imperative need for Namibia to be allowed to accede to genuine independence leaves no room for doubt. Fifteen years after the adoption of General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI), which put an end to South Africa's Mandate over Namibia, the international community is still compelled to demand implementation of its decisions. Need I recall that one year after the vote on that resolution the United Nations established the Council for Namibia and gave it the responsibility of administering the Territory until its independence?

205. The United Nations has adopted dozens of resolutions on Namibia confirming the inalienable right of the Namibian people to self-determination and

independence. It has recognized the legitimacy of the struggle of the Namibian people against the illegal occupation of its country by all means and under the leadership of its sole authentic representative, SWAPO.

206. Today, three years after the vote on Security Council resolution 435 (1978), we are bound to note that the United Nations plan for Namibian independence has not been implemented. What is worse, we note the extremely unreasonable and dangerous attempts to side-step or even to annul that plan, which nevertheless is the only agreed basis for Namibian independence.

207. No one can challenge the legitimacy of the struggle of the Namibian people, even less attempt to alter or limit its purposes—and that includes the racist régime of South Africa. The puppet régime installed in Namibia as a result of rigged elections has been rejected. Since it does not enjoy any support among the Namibian people, it is in the process of disintegrating.

208. South Africa continues its frenzied exploitation of the natural resources of Namibia with the complicity of corporations from Western countries, which manifestly deem it more important to amass profits than to concern themselves with decisions of the Security Council and General Assembly. Through its exploitation of Namibian uranium, South Africa is pursuing the development of its nuclear technology for military purposes. It obstinately persists in its attempts to break the national unity of Namibia by detaching Walvis Bay and the off-shore islands from Namibian territory.

209. What is more, South Africa pursues its policy of racism and *apartheid* without any restraint against the majority of the populations of Namibia and South Africa, whose most elementary human rights it denies. We are witnessing attempts to abrogate the United Nations plan endorsed in Security Council resolution 435 (1978) on the pretext that it would be unacceptable to South Africa.

210. Instead of effectively using its influence over South Africa to persuade it to implement the agreed plan, the group of Western countries now seeks to complement and modify it so that in due course it may be more acceptable to the racist régime. In so doing it overlooks the fact that, in view of the true intentions of South Africa, what is acceptable to that country could not be acceptable to the entire international community and that those attempts can only be construed as efforts to depart from the international consensus on Namibia.

211. South Africa, seeking to prolong its occupation of Namibia, endeavours to exploit the present status of international relations and to have people believe that the problem of Namibia is part of the East-West confrontation. It is regrettable that attempts of that kind find a response in certain countries. In point of fact there is no doubt that the question of the self-determination of a people within the meaning of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) cannot be used in the context of bloc confrontation and that those attempts are doomed to failure.

212. South Africa continues its wrongful use of the Territory of Namibia as a spring-board from which to perpetrate its acts of aggression against its independent African neighbours. Having recourse to State terrorism, it seeks to undermine the stability of those countries and to weaken their resistance to its permanent aggression and to its racist policy. The aggression against Angola, which is being pursued with increased brutality, causing enormous loss of human life and material damage, is but one of the many acts of aggression perpetrated by South Africa against neighbouring States. The Security Council was unable to halt the new aggression against Angola. The outcome of its debates is of profound concern to all the non-aligned countries because it is a grave injustice towards the people of Angola, whose devotion to liberty is well known.

213. South Africa's aggressive conduct seriously threatens international peace and security. To tolerate the persistent occupation of Namibia by South Africa and its acts of aggression against neighbouring African States is to place peace and security in southern Africa and throughout the entire world in extreme jeopardy. Bearing in mind the tensions characteristic of international relations today, the policy of South Africa is likely to provoke in the region a conflict whose effects would go far beyond the present framework by giving rise to direct interference by parties from outside the region.

214. We are gravely concerned by this turn of events. The United Nations cannot allow this situation to be prolonged indefinitely or permit the utilization of new pretexts to defer and actually endanger Namibia's accession to independence. A people that has for years been fighting for its independence should not, cannot and will not be denied the fruits of its struggle for liberation.

215. Since their constituent Conference held 20 years ago at Belgrade, the non-aligned countries have given priority to the abolition of colonialism throughout the world. That priority has been maintained up to the present time. Through their decisions at Algiers and New Delhi, they have reaffirmed their unreserved support for the legitimate demand of the African States for the independence and liberation of Namibia, and in this respect they have insisted on the need to adopt effective measures in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations. It is now up to the General Assembly to reaffirm the will of the Organization not to allow the present situation to continue and, in accordance with the Charter, to adopt measures to put an end once and for all to the occupation of Namibia. Any further procrastination would only prolong the sufferings of the Namibian people and win time for South Africa to impose its "internal settlement".

216. As we see it, it is the duty of the General Assembly to reaffirm that Namibia is the direct responsibility of the United Nations and that any solutions outside the context of the United Nations are unacceptable. It must ensure realization of the inalienable right of the Namibian people to self-determination, freedom and independence, in accordance with the decisions so far taken by the United Nations, and reaffirm its support for the only authentic representative of the Namibian people, SWAPO, which is

struggling to achieve those ends. United Nations support for SWAPO is part and parcel of efforts to apply the principles which are the very foundation of the United Nations. SWAPO has the legitimate right to resort to all means, to political and armed struggle, to win independence for Namibia. The General Assembly has the duty to call on all its members urgently and without reservation to give their support and assistance to the struggle being waged by SWAPO.

217. It is the duty of the General Assembly unequivocally to emphasize that the plan for Namibia which was adopted by the Security Council constitutes the only basis for the settlement of the Namibian problem. It must set aside all attempts designed to alter or sidestep it, while energetically working for its implementation as soon as possible. It is essential that that end to take a decision on the adoption of effective measures against the racist South African régime. The only way to compel South Africa to implement Security Council resolution 435 (1978) is for the entire international community to boycott all relations with South Africa. The General Assembly must once and for all confirm that, because of the policy it pursues, South Africa is banished from the international community and that it will be so as long as it practises such a policy.

218. The United Nations likewise has responsibilities towards the front-line States which are constantly exposed to South Africa's acts of aggression. Accordingly, the international community should urgently supply those countries with real and effective assistance.

219. The countries of southern Africa have the right to oppose South African aggression by all means in the defence of their independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity.

220. South Africa's acts of violence and aggression can no longer be tolerated. The non-aligned countries and especially the African States can no longer allow the South African racist régime thus to defy them.

221. Yugoslavia will support all the decisions that the General Assembly may take to that end in this session. My country maintains no relations whatsoever with South Africa. In that connection, an appropriate decision by the General Assembly would only confirm the position to which Yugoslavia strictly adheres. My country will also continue, within the limits of its possibilities, unreservedly to support and assist SWAPO in its just struggle for the self-determination of the people of Namibia, as well as supporting and assisting the front-line States victims of South African aggression. In doing that we are inspired by the principles of the United Nations Charter, as well as by the principles of solidarity within the context of the Non-Aligned Movement.

222. Mr. FLORIN (German Democratic Republic) (*interpretation from Russian*): I should like to congratulate Mr. von Wechmar on his presidency of this eighth emergency special session of the General Assembly. I wish him success in those responsible activities.

223. The people of Namibia will certainly win their independence and will exercise their right to self-

determination. We are firmly convinced that the last colonial régime on the continent of Africa will be eliminated too. The laws governing the development of human society will make their weight felt in respect of Namibia also.

224. No Member of the United Nations denies that fact that at the present time Namibia is being illegally occupied by South Africa. The question is: how can this occupation of the Territory of Namibia which runs counter to international law be ended? For many years, as is known, there have been unequivocal decisions adopted by the General Assembly and by the Security Council on Namibia. I would remind representatives in particular of General Assembly resolutions 2145 (XXI) and 3111 (XXVIII) and Security Council resolution 385 (1976). Nevertheless, the racist régime of Pretoria continues to disregard the decisions adopted by the international Organization and still denies the people of Namibia their inalienable right to self-determination.

225. In order to guarantee the implementation of United Nations decisions the Security Council should long ago have adopted a decision on measures which would have compelled South Africa to put an end to its illegal occupation of Namibia; but that has for many years been made impossible by the imperialist States, whose monopolies are not concerned about a genuinely independent Namibia because their colonial plundering brings them many millions in profits. Under the pressure of the changes which have recently occurred in the world the United Nations reached an agreement in Security Council resolution 435 (1978), the implementation of which should open Namibia's way to independence.

226. SWAPO, which has been recognized by the United Nations and by the overwhelming majority of its Members as the legitimate representative of the struggling people of Namibia, has demonstrated a high sense of responsibility and statesmanship in the negotiations. The readiness to compromise which SWAPO has demonstrated during the negotiating process has been noted many times by competent people, but South Africa and its advocates have erected ever more obstacles and Security Council resolution 435 (1978) is threatened with the same fate as has befallen previous resolutions.

227. Three years have passed since the adoption of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). A sober evaluation shows that not a single step has been taken to implement Namibia's independence. Because the Security Council has not thus far adopted any enforcement measure, the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa still goes on. A group of Western States has been obstinately resisting the imposition, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, of enforcement measures against the racist régime. Without authorization from anyone, that group has been involving itself in activities outside the United Nations not aimed at the implementation of Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978) and not in accordance with General Assembly resolutions, but, rather, in the interests of the Pretoria régime. International monopolies have been trying to set up a puppet régime which would enable them in the future to exploit the African population and to plunder Namibia's natural resources. They want South Africa

to continue in the future to abuse Namibia and to use it as a spring-board against other African States. This kind of activity is impossible within the context of the United Nations, since the majority of States have supported sanctions against South Africa and strongly condemned any attempts to bring about a so-called "internal settlement." That is why attempts are being made to come to an agreement outside the United Nations. All manoeuvres to circumvent the United Nations and legitimize the puppets of South Africa by unlawful means, whatever form they may take, should be decisively put down.

228. Recently representatives of Western States have given assurances that they intended to keep resolution 435 (1978) as a basis, but supposedly some new proposals are necessary. There is no longer any question of a speedy implementation of resolution 435 (1978). They are shamefacedly silent about the nature of these so-called "new proposals". According to what appears in the press, it seems that there is an attempt to establish certain rules which would impose on the people of Namibia obligations running counter to their right to self-determination and satisfying the interests of South Africa as well as those of the imperialist monopolies. If United Nations resolutions were implemented, Namibia would in consequence become an independent State and enter the international community as a non-aligned State and the people of Namibia would be able to resolve its internal affairs as it deemed fit. These so-called "new proposals" are needed to emasculate resolution 435 (1978) and to void it of any real meaning. The opponents of independence for Namibia went to gain time, in the hope that they will still be able to impose a puppet régime on the Namibian people.

229. Officials of the United States Administration have been talking about a new "regional strategy" for southern Africa. One official statement, which appeared in *The New York Times* of 30 August this year, says:

"The United States also seeks to build a more constructive relationship with South Africa, one based on shared interests, persuasion and improved communication."

230. This "more constructive relationship" would be not merely with any State, but with a Fascist and racist régime which has been illegally occupying Namibia and perpetrating acts of aggression against neighbouring sovereign States.

231. It is frankly admitted that it is exclusively the economic, political and strategic interests of the United States which are the decisive factor. In vain do we look for anything about the recognition of the legitimate interests of the peoples of that region, in particular the interests of Namibia, as enshrined, for example, in Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia,⁸ enacted by the United Nations Council for Namibia. We should not be surprised about this, for when the profits of monopolies are at stake, imperialist policies ruthlessly sweep aside the interests of peoples. We heard in the Security Council horrendous words spoken by the United States representative, who said:

"There is little doubt that South Africa's resistance to granting the people of Namibia the

right to self-determination—as the Council had called on it to do—is a basis for the tension and instability which exist in the region today.”¹³

232. This is the justification for South Africa's occupation of the Territory of Namibia. South Africa is being encouraged to continue its policy of disregarding the decisions of the Organization and its policy of aggression against sovereign States. The tension and instability in southern Africa are the result of the policy of the racist régime of Pretoria. South Africa itself bears the responsibility for this.

233. The following point is likewise true: that, while the representatives of the United States talk about an ostensible concern for peace in southern Africa, the ruling circles of that country are in fact doing their utmost to implement their policy of confrontation, whereby they increase tension throughout the world, including southern Africa. With the assistance of the United States and other imperialist countries, South Africa has become the biggest arms producer in the Southern Hemisphere. The creation of a nuclear potential by the racists has taken on dangerous proportions. Document A/AC.109/660, dated 15 June 1981, gives a graphic picture of how, contrary to the United Nations embargoes, the sale of military *matériel* to South Africa continues unabated. The statement published on 26 August this year by the Special Committee against *Apartheid* mentioned intensified efforts to establish a so-called “south Atlantic pact”, whereby the area of operations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization [NATO] would be expanded. It is no mere chance that NATO naval manoeuvres have been extended to the South Atlantic—I refer to “Ocean Venture 81”.

234. The United States has openly acknowledged its allegiance to the aggressive policy of the racist régime of Pretoria and recently it used its veto in the Security Council. These policies do not serve the cause of peace or assist a solution of the problems of southern Africa.

235. The German Democratic Republic shares the concern of the African and other peoples regarding the exacerbation of the situation within and around Namibia created as a result of the policy of aggression and occupation pursued by the *apartheid* régime and also because the United States and other NATO States are supporting that régime. Here I would emphasize that the German Democratic Republic, along with many other States, strongly condemns South Africa's large-scale aggression against the People's Republic of Angola, which, through a gross violation of international law, led to the occupation of Angolan territory. We hope that this recent act of aggression by South Africa and the heroic struggle of the people of Angola in defence of their homeland will force those in Power in certain capitals of the world to rethink their positions.

236. The discussion in the Security Council and the voting on the draft resolution submitted by the non-aligned member States of that supreme United Nations body have shown the influence of the true facts. “Cold-war” entrenchment only leads to isolation.

237. In order to prevent further dangerous developments in southern Africa and in order to attain independence in Namibia, which must include Walvis Bay

in its territory, sanctions must be imposed on South Africa in accordance with Charter VII of the Charter. In particular, the arms embargo must be tightened and an oil embargo must be imposed, as well as comprehensive economic sanctions. In spite of the will of South Africa, Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978) must be implemented. Any country still supporting South Africa must be called upon to change its position in the interests of the peace and security of peoples. South Africa must put an end to its occupation of the Territory of Namibia. No one can deprive the United Nations—in particular, the Security Council and the United Nations Council for Namibia, which is the organ administering Namibia until it attains independence—of its responsibility.

238. The position of the German Democratic Republic with regard to the people of Namibia and its legitimate demands is well known. Only a few weeks ago a delegation from the United Nations Council for Namibia visited the capital of our Republic, Berlin, where it was able to see for itself the firm solidarity of our people and Government with the people of Namibia. We provide all-round support to the people of Namibia and its leader, SWAPO, which is waging an all-out struggle for the freedom and independence of its country and which, if no other way is left for it, will continue the armed struggle. The way to achieve a solution of the problem of Namibia is to enforce implementation of the appropriate resolutions, as provided for in the Charter of the United Nations. The delegation of the German Democratic Republic calls insistently for such action.

239. Allow me to conclude with the words of the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany and Chairman of the Council of State of the German Democratic Republic, Erich Honecker, in his message to the eighth emergency special session of the General Assembly, dealing with the question of Namibia:

“The German Democratic Republic has always supported the struggle waged at the cost of a great many sacrifices by the Namibian people under the leadership of its sole and authentic representative, SWAPO, and it will continue to do so.” [A/ES-8/8, annex.]

240. Mr. PRADHAN (Bhutan): My delegation would like to join previous speakers who have thanked the President of the General Assembly and the Secretary-General for having convened this emergency special session to deal with the question of Namibia. We are also very happy to see Mr. von Wechmar preside over our deliberations once again. We are confident that he will conduct the work of this session with his usual skill and efficiency.

241. It is most disheartening that the international community has so far not been able to solve the problem of Namibia, in spite of the intensive efforts that have been made by the United Nations, the Non-Aligned Movement, OAU and the Western countries to bring about Namibia's independence. We are now meeting in this emergency special session to attempt once again to find a solution to the issue at hand and thereby avoid an imminent and more widespread confrontation that would jeopardize international peace and security. At this session we find that there

is a sense of greater urgency in the international community with regard to bringing about the speedy independence of Namibia. We, too, have come to this session with a renewed determination to attain that objective.

242. After the termination of South Africa's Mandate over the international Territory of Namibia in 1966, the General Assembly placed the Territory under the United Nations Council for Namibia with the objective of taking the required steps towards the Territory's independence. The Council, which is the only legal Administering Authority, has, however, been unable to fulfil its mandate so far. Its efforts, backed by the decisions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, have been thwarted by South Africa's refusal thus far to withdraw its forces of occupation from Namibia.

243. The motives of South Africa—judging from its activities in relation to Namibia—seem to be contrary to the objectives of decolonization of the international Territory. To begin with, South Africa has rejected all pertinent resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. Overwhelming international opinion has been ignored. The political activities of SWAPO, we understand, are being suppressed and its leaders and officials are constantly being harassed and imprisoned. The policy of *apartheid* and bantustanization, imposed in South Africa itself, has been extended into the international Territory. The valuable natural resources of Namibia are being exploited, in spite of the 1974 Decree No. 1 of the United Nations Council for Namibia.⁸ Those activities of South Africa, along with its massive military build-up, can only be catering to the objective of retaining South Africa's hold on the international Territory of Namibia. That would mean that the Namibian people would continue to be deprived of freedom and independence.

244. Added to this is the recent South African invasion of Angola. This latest action brings into sharper focus the true intentions of South Africa. South Africa seems bent on taking advantage of the support it is at present receiving to destroy all opposition, in particular that of SWAPO, so as further to perpetuate its hold on Namibia. I take this opportunity to denounce once again South Africa's act of aggression against Angola and to add our voice to the demand for the immediate withdrawal of all South African forces from Angolan territory.

245. The already difficult and complex situation in southern Africa has also been made more problematic owing to big-Power rivalries in the subregion. The Powers concerned must try to prevent extraneous issues being brought into play while dealing with Namibia's independence. We must be clear that our objective is to decolonize Namibia speedily and not to settle or bring in other differences which do not contribute to the solution.

246. The United Nations cannot any longer permit such gross violations of the Charter, nor can we continue to tolerate the suppression of the legitimate rights and human dignity of the people of Namibia. We must also be clear that the international Territory of Namibia is the sole responsibility of the United Nations. South Africa therefore must be called upon

to implement immediately and without any further delay Security Council resolution 435 (1978). This resolution calls for the independence of Namibia through free elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations. The resolution was passed by the Security Council without a dissenting vote and by all Western Powers concerned. The principles which earlier dictated the formulation of the independence plan for Namibia must not now be sacrificed. The imposition of any other solution, and in particular a solution aimed at trying to satisfy narrow and racist interests, will not be acceptable to the vast majority.

247. Those countries in a position to exert a positive influence on the situation vis-à-vis Namibia must shoulder their responsibility more effectively. Otherwise they will be doing a gross injustice to the people of Namibia. Besides, maintenance of international peace and security will have been seriously jeopardized for a minority and racist cause. My delegation therefore calls upon the General Assembly at this emergency special session to take action within the framework of the Charter of the United Nations and in a manner that will gain independence for Namibia without any further delay.

248. Mr. ERNEMANN (Belgium) (*interpretation from French*): Belgium is a member of the United Nations Council for Namibia. As such it would like, during this eighth emergency special session of the General Assembly, to join its voice to those of all nations calling for an end to South Africa's occupation of Namibia and for the independence of that Territory.

249. Sir Anthony Parsons, the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom, this morning [*4th meeting*] stated the point of view of the 10 States members of the European Community regarding the question of Namibia. I will not go into the four main points of that statement in detail, but they were: that the opportunity must be offered to the people of Namibia to exercise its right to self-determination and independence; that that right must be exercised on the basis of Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978); that it is regrettable that the Geneva meeting held at the beginning of this year did not lead to the hoped-for results because of the negative attitude adopted by the Government of South Africa; and, finally, that the unilateral measures taken by the Administrator-General of Namibia and by the South African Government to bring about an internal settlement of the question of Namibia are unacceptable.

250. I should like to confine my statement to three considerations which seem relevant.

251. First, we are against recourse to violence. That principle is enshrined in Article 2 of the Charter and has thus been accepted by all States Members of the Organization. South Africa's incursions into southern Angola thus constitute inadmissible acts. We deplore and condemn them, in particular the recent incursion during which considerable means were used and which caused the loss of many human lives. That unacceptable action is liable to trigger a chain reaction, thus making a peaceful settlement of the Namibian problem more difficult and undermining the necessary dialogue between the parties concerned.

252. On 27 August last, my Government in a communiqué condemned those actions and called for the immediate withdrawal of the South African troops, because those actions constituted a violation of the sovereignty of Angola and caused much suffering for the civilian population.

253. Likewise, the supply of large amounts of weaponry to the States and forces of the region to be used in armed activities against South Africa constitutes, if not recourse to violence, at least preparation for violence and we deplore that also.

254. Secondly, any foreseeable peaceful solution requires South Africa's support. Let us be realistic. It is paradoxical that South Africa should be absent from these deliberations. Whatever may be one's aversion to the racist nature of its régime, the fact that it is not participating does not promote the cause we are defending, that is, Namibian independence.

255. Sir Anthony Parsons recalled this on 4 September in an explanation of vote on behalf of the 10 members of the European Community, saying that those States were committed to the universality of the United Nations. "We fear", he added "that the very foundation of the Organization is weakened if its constitution is not respected." [A/ES-8/PV.2, para. 60].

256. Thirdly, Belgium encourages the Western contact group to pursue its efforts to find a solution to the Namibian problem.

257. The five members of the contact group have accomplished a considerable task. We hope that, without feeling discouraged, they will pursue that task, and that they will do so together. Let them jointly pursue their dialogue with South Africa and bring their influence to bear on it in the search for ways and means to bring Namibia peacefully to independence.

258. Similarly, we encourage the front-line States and Nigeria, which have shown great foresight, and OAU in their efforts and moderation.

259. The international community has had to face a challenge for many years now. At present that challenge is particularly acute and has become exacerbated. Our responsibility for finding, peacefully, an internationally acceptable solution, under United Nations auspices and in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978), is thus all the greater.

260. Mr. BOLE (Fiji): My delegation is pleased to see Mr. von Wechmar of the Federal Republic of Germany presiding over this emergency special session of the General Assembly, which is taking place at a crucial phase in Namibia's prolonged search for genuine freedom and independence. We are confident that under his leadership our important deliberations, even at this late hour of the day, will be guided to a successful conclusion.

261. The convening of this session is indicative of the high priority which the United Nations continues to attach to the speedy decolonization of Namibia. It also affords us yet another opportunity to reaffirm our solidarity with the people of Namibia in their just demands for freedom and full equality in their own land. So as to facilitate the fruition of these legitimate

aspirations of the Namibian people, it remains the responsibility of the international community to redouble its efforts in the search for an internationally acceptable solution for the Territory. The long-unfulfilled aspirations of the Namibian people to genuine freedom and the growing tension in the region only reinforce the urgency of this task.

262. For its part, the United Nations has, over the years, undertaken numerous initiatives to break the impasse in the negotiations for Namibia's early independence. Moreover, it has adopted a series of decisions calling for the Territory's independence, particularly since the United Nations assumed direct responsibility for the decolonization of the Territory some 15 years ago. Yet, to our deep regret, all these resolutions remain unimplemented because of the intransigence of South Africa, which continues its illegal occupation of the Territory.

263. Of the several resolutions that have been adopted on the Namibian question, Security Council resolution 435 (1978), as has been stated by many delegations before me, deserves special mention, since it provides an agreed basis for an internationally acceptable settlement. It was more than two years ago that this resolution was adopted unanimously. This was followed by long and arduous consultations concerning the details and the modalities for the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), culminating eventually in the convening of a meeting on the Namibian question at Geneva last January. It was widely expected then that a satisfactory conclusion to this long-standing problem was within grasp. However, that optimism was short-lived, since South Africa was not prepared to implement that resolution. And, regrettably, there is nothing now to suggest that South Africa is willing to co-operate in the attainment of an internationally acceptable settlement for Namibia.

264. The situation has assumed crisis proportions, not only because of South Africa's failure to comply with the provisions of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), but also as a result of its increased militarization of the Territory. Moreover, it continues its deplorable military incursions into neighbouring African States. In this regard, the latest attacks by South African armed forces on southern Angola need to be firmly condemned; for no State can arrogate to itself the right to violate with impunity the territorial integrity of any other sovereign State.

265. Such armed attacks need to be totally rejected, for they heighten tension in the area and seriously undermine the prospects for a peaceful solution of the Namibian question. This, we hope, would also impress upon South Africa that its armed attacks on neighbouring States in southern Africa neither divert our attention from the urgent situation in Namibia nor weaken our resolve to press for the resolution of the question at the earliest possible time.

266. My delegation reaffirms that a negotiated solution for Namibia could be achieved in accordance with the provision of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). This view stems from the realization that that resolution enjoyed the unanimous support of the members of the Security Council. Moreover, it reflects an international consensus in which South Africa joined

during 1978. SWAPO also has indicated its willingness to implement the resolution. It is therefore for the parties directly concerned to honour the obligations that they entered into in 1978 and thereby conclude another major question of decolonization.

267. The urgent implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) is essential, since it is intended to ensure that transfer of power shall be effected through free and fair elections which are to be held under the auspices of the United Nations. Moreover, such implementation would also enable the Namibian people to participate fully and freely in the electoral processes leading to the genuine independence of the Territory. It follows, then, that SWAPO should continue to participate in all stages of the decolonization of the Territory; for my delegation maintains the position that it is for the people of a Territory to exercise freely their inalienable right to self-determination and independence in conformity with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV).

268. My delegation is aware of the efforts that are being made to facilitate the exercise of the inalienable rights provided for in resolution 1514 (XV). In this regard, we are mindful of the dedicated efforts of the Secretary-General for the decolonization of Namibia. Similarly, we have taken note of the impressive work being done by the United Nations Council for Namibia in its capacity as the legal Administering Authority for the Territory until its independence. We also recognize the important contributions being made by the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples for Namibia's early independence. Such positive efforts must be continued so that the Namibian people can enjoy genuine freedom in the shortest possible time.

269. In the ongoing search for a peaceful solution of the question, the significance of the enforcement measures laid down in the relevant provisions of the

Charter must not be overlooked. It might also be appropriate to reflect on the existing arms embargo against South Africa in order to determine whether further measures are necessary to secure the peaceful solution of the question of Namibia.

270. Finally, the emergency special session is taking place at a crucial stage in Namibia's prolonged search for freedom. Since Namibia is an international Territory, it is for the United Nations to undertake all necessary steps to facilitate the independence of a people which has been denied its freedom for too long.

The meeting rose at 7.45 p.m.

NOTES

1. *Legal Consequences for States of the Continued Presence of South Africa in Namibia (South West Africa) notwithstanding Security Council Resolution 276 (1970)*. Advisory Opinion I.C.J. Reports 1971, p. 16.
2. See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-third Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1978*, document S/12775.
3. *Ibid.*, Thirty-third Year, 2088th meeting, paras. 87-96.
4. See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-sixth Session, Supplement No. 24*, para. 67.
5. See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-sixth Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1981*, document S/14458, annex.
6. A/CONF.107/8, sect. X.
7. See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-sixth Session, Supplement No. 24*, para. 222.
8. *Ibid.*, Thirty-fifth Session, Supplement No. 24, vol. I, annex II.
9. *Ibid.*, Twenty-fourth Session, Annexes, agenda item 106, document A/7754.
10. See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-third Year, 2082nd meeting*, para. 252.
11. *Ibid.*, para. 274.
12. See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-sixth Session, Supplement No. 24*, para. 705, sect. 1 (a).
13. See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-sixth Year, 2300th meeting*.

