



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

AGENDA ITEM 5

Question of Namibia (continued):

1. Mr. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): Mr. President, permit me first to welcome you to the important post of President of the eighth emergency special session of the General Assembly and to express the hope that, under your guidance, the session will be able to carry out the responsible and important tasks facing it.
2. The convening of this emergency special session on Namibia clearly indicates that an overwhelming majority of the Members of the United Nations have recognized the urgent nature of this problem. Naturally the session has aroused great interest in international circles. This interest has been clearly demonstrated by the very fact that eminent statesmen from a number of countries are attending it, particularly from the African countries. The session is expected to produce specific decisions aimed at a just and speedy settlement of the Namibian problem and it should live up to these hopes.
3. It is not an easy task we have to tackle, particularly since it has to be dealt with in extremely unfavourable international circumstances. As is well known, certain circles in the West, and primarily in the United States, have been deliberately stepping up political tension and intentionally blocking the functioning of the machinery whose purpose is to promote the settlement of conflicts by political means, openly pushing mankind in the direction of an acceleration of the arms race and increasing the military danger in the world. To the chain of actions along these dangerous lines new links have been added, ranging from pretensions to arbitrarily declaring certain parts of the world as coming within the sphere of their "vital interests" to gross demonstrations of force and attempts to "teach lessons" to other countries and peoples, and now to the ominous decision to start the full-scale manufacture of neutron weapons with the intention of locating them on the territories of other countries.
4. The growing aggressiveness of the racist régime in South Africa is an integral part of the general activity among the most adventurist forces in the world. The racists in Pretoria are attempting to use the actions of aggressive international circles to help to preserve and strengthen their inhuman régime in the southern part of Africa.
5. The state of affairs as it relates to the question of Namibia has in fact reached a critical point, fully justifying the convening of an emergency special session to consider it.
6. The crux of the matter is quite well known.
7. The Republic of South Africa, in defiance of all the rules of international law, the Charter of the United Nations and the clearly expressed position of the United Nations, continues to occupy Namibia and to maintain its administration there, grossly flouting the inalienable rights of the Namibian people to freedom, independence and national self-determination. It practises a policy of racial terror with regard to the Namibian people and uses Namibian territory to perpetrate systematic acts of aggression against independent States of Africa. All this is shown with abundant clarity in the results of the numerous debates on the Namibian problem which have taken place in various organs of the United Nations, including the General Assembly and the Security Council, over the past 15 years—and here I include the statements made by representatives at the present session of the General Assembly, particularly the statement made by the leader of the delegation of the South West Africa People's Organization [SWAPO], Mr. Mueshikange [3rd meeting].
8. Events this year have shown that the rulers in Pretoria have set their sights on stepping up their dangerous and unlawful actions in Namibia on all fronts. Obviously what they are counting on is being able to keep Namibia under their control for an indefinite period.
9. Further military units, as well as bands of mercenaries, have been transferred from the Republic of South Africa to Namibia. There has been an all-out campaign to recruit black Namibians into the South African army and police force, and now total South African troops strength in Namibia is, according to present estimates, in excess of 100,000 men and officers. This means that in this punitive expedition there is more than one soldier for each 10 inhabitants of Namibia.
10. The stepping up of armed forces and armaments in Namibia has been accompanied by further repression of the indigenous African population. The chief target of that repression is SWAPO, which enjoys broad support from the Namibian people and has been recognized internationally as its sole legitimate representative. They are aware in Pretoria, of course, that were there to be a free expression of will on the part of the Namibian people, there is no doubt that victory would go to SWAPO. Therefore, in the actions undertaken by the South African authorities against SWAPO,

we can see a very clear intention not to allow genuinely democratic elections to be held in Namibia, in other words, not to implement one of the most important components of a political settlement in Namibia.

11. Even more dangerous is the systematic utilization of Namibia by the South African régime as a springboard in carrying out its acts of aggression against neighbouring sovereign African States, in particular against the People's Republic of Angola. Evidence of this is seen in the armed invasion of Angola by South African forces, which continues to this day. Pretoria has virtually adopted a course of an undeclared war against neighbouring sovereign States; using the same manoeuvres and methods that have long been used by Israel in the Middle East. The similarity of the *modus operandi* employed by South Africa and by Israel in their actions is by no means fortuitous. Here we can see the same aggressive aspirations, the same ideological basis and also, let it be said, the same protectors.

12. It would be a mistake to regard South Africa's aggressive actions against neighbouring countries as a purely transient phenomenon. This wager on force derives from the very nature of the racist system in South Africa, a system that can only exist on the basis of brute force.

13. In the light of recent events, it is particularly clear how right the United Nations was in describing the existing régime in South Africa and its policies as constituting a direct threat to peace, and stating that to remove it urgent measures were necessary pursuant to Chapter VII of the Charter of the Organization. The application of sanctions against South Africa—meaning mandatory, comprehensive and effective sanctions—has become absolutely essential. Not only is Pretoria throwing down the gauntlet to the United Nations in the matter of decolonization and brazenly ignoring the legitimate right of the United Nations to determine the fate of Namibia in accordance with the aspirations of its people, but South Africa has also become a source of growing danger to the world and to peace and security in the African continent. If the escalation of the racist régime's aggressive actions continues, the international community will inevitably be faced with fresh military conflicts. There will be a direct danger that those conflicts will get out of control and that other States will become involved in them. Failure to rebuff South Africa would be tantamount to failure to perform the prime duty incumbent on Members, namely, to safeguard general peace.

14. In speaking about the source of South Africa's aggressiveness we should in particular underscore the significance of the comprehensive support—financial, economic, military, political and diplomatic—that is given to South Africa by the United States and by several other members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization [NATO]. Those countries give the African racists virtually everything, from loans and credits, to computers, armaments and nuclear technology. Some Western leaders have quite openly and without mincing words included racist South Africa among the countries that are their friends and have given them a place of growing importance in the framework of their so-called new regional strategy in the southern part of Africa. The practical purport of

these new arrangements was particularly evident in the course of the Security Council meeting that was held on 31 August this year,¹ when the United States vetoed a draft resolution condemning the military aggression of South Africa against the People's Republic of Angola and demanding the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of South African troops from the territory of Angola. The consequences of the adoption of such a position by the United States are quite obvious. This position has been responsible to a large degree for the fact that even now, during the progress of this emergency special session, blood continues to be shed in Angola, and the South African armed forces continue to perpetuate atrocities there. These are the real fruits of the new "regional strategy" of the United States in southern Africa.

15. The reasons for the direct support given by the United States and other Western countries to the actions of the South African régime are well known. They have been frequently set forth in forums of the United Nations. Here we can discern a mutuality of interests. Essentially, this is a special kind of alliance between the racists and the most aggressive circles in the West together with their powerful transnational corporations, an alliance that is based on the most pitiless exploitation and suppression of the Africans and other under-privileged groups of the population.

16. What I have said is fully applicable to Namibia. Here we can see the clear intention to regard that Territory as a sort of "bottomless pit filled with valuable minerals", and southern Africa as a sort of "mineral-laden Persian Gulf." The United States already views Namibia purely and simply through the prism of its so-called "vital interests".

17. We should in particular dwell on the direct political and diplomatic complicity of the United States and other members of the so-called "contact group" of Western Powers in the policy of sabotage that is being practised by Pretoria against United Nations efforts to achieve a just Namibian settlement.

18. The course taken by those States in recent years is strewn with broken promises. As long as nine years ago, those countries, when objecting to the adoption of effective steps against South Africa, assured the United Nations that they would be able to persuade that country to grant independence to Namibia and that they needed only half a year in order to achieve genuine progress along those lines.

19. Several years passed and new promises were heard: the Western Powers started to declare that they would secure Pretoria's implementation of the United Nations plan, and that they would not need so very much time for its implementation.

20. But what actually happened when Pretoria broke off the Geneva talks on Namibia and refused to implement the resolutions of the United Nations and when the need to impose comprehensive sanctions against South Africa became a very urgent matter? The Western Powers took the side of the South African régime. The application of sanctions, as we know, was blocked as a result of the triple veto cast by the United States, the United Kingdom and France. In other words, South Africa remained unpunished, even after very serious warnings had been given by the United Nations. In the political sense, that "triple

veto" was the concentrated expression of the fact that the Western Powers were condoning the racists' actions—an expression of their readiness to serve their own selfish interests, to neglect the interests of the just cause of the Namibian people and to disregard the authority of the United Nations and its fundamental resolutions.

21. Unfortunately, the ambiguous manoeuvres going on around Namibia have not stopped. Again and again, as if to mock common sense, new promises are being given about negotiating with Pretoria, and "bringing it to reason". The members of the Western contact group keep putting out feelers, but in essence the aim is simply to blur the formulation in United Nations decisions of the basis for a Namibian settlement and to exert pressure, not on South Africa, but rather on SWAPO and on African and other non-aligned countries, to wring further concessions from them in order to serve the urgings of Pretoria; and that is precisely the purpose of the American "ideas" regarding the application of the so-called "Lancaster House model" to the Namibian question—namely, to elaborate a constitution for Namibia and, in particular, special guarantees for the white minority even before independence is granted. Another so-called idea has been put forward relating the problem of Namibia to events in Angola that are completely unconnected with it, and fall within the exclusive purview of the sovereign Government of the People's Republic of Angola. We can only regard such linkage as an obvious attempt to complicate and to protract any solution to the Namibian problem and to pursue in international relations a policy of imperialist diktat and blunt intervention in the internal affairs of sovereign States.

22. Now some in the West are saying that some tangible progress towards a Namibian settlement has finally been achieved and that, once again, we have to rely on the "good offices" of the Western States. Statements along these lines were recently made by the Secretary of State of the United States. But the truth is that a completely different statement was made in Pretoria: that no progress had been achieved, in fact, nor was any progress foreseen. Apparently Pretoria was much closer to the truth, and the allegation of so-called "progress", obviously, was made in order to influence the work being carried on at this emergency special session on Namibia.

23. In addition, more and more frequent efforts have been made to distort the very substance of the Namibian conflict by representing it as one of the manifestations of a mythical "Soviet threat". An attempt is being made to blur the fact that this is essentially a problem of the decolonization of the country—of granting the Namibian people its inalienable right to freedom and independence.

24. The root-cause of the conflict in Namibia is the continuing illegal occupation of the country by the racist South African régime, and as long as the racists stubbornly continue to uphold this position and the Western Powers continue to support them, the present conflict will go on. It would be naïve and indeed pointless to expect the people of Namibia to acquiesce to alien domination and to give up their struggle.

25. As regards the form this struggle takes, SWAPO has never rejected peaceful ways and means of achieving independence. Recourse to armed struggle became necessary only after all peaceful means had been exhausted. It is South Africa, with the blessing of the Western Powers, which has constantly created obstacles to a peaceful settlement and is still doing so. In such circumstances, how can one seriously argue about equal responsibility for the "violence" which has occurred, or justify the State terrorism of Pretoria, while at the same time hypocritically branding as "terrorists" people who are struggling for their freedom and independence?

26. In this connection, the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Soviet Union, Mr. L. I. Brezhnev, said with complete clarity the following:

"In demonstrating their full contempt for the rights and aspirations of peoples they are trying to depict the liberation struggle of the popular masses as a demonstration of 'terrorism'. They have set as their aim to achieve the unachievable, to erect a barrier to progressive changes in the world and to assign to themselves the role of controlling the fates of peoples."

27. Incidentally, this is by no means new. Up to quite recently, in South Africa, and in the West, "terrorists" was the name given to some of those who are now leaders of former British, French and Portuguese colonies, including, up till 1980, the present leaders of independent Zimbabwe. Now they have to be given a different name. Sooner or later, the same thing is going to happen in Namibia, because the victory of the people of Namibia cannot be averted. Reason would dictate that the most correct course would be to recognize the inevitable and, without any further prevarication, proceed to a just settlement. This, we are deeply convinced, would be in consonance with the interests of all peoples, including those of the white minority in southern Africa.

28. The position of the Soviet Union on the question of Namibia is clear and consistent: we do not seek any particular rights or privileges for ourselves, be it in Namibia or in Africa as a whole. We believe that the long-suffering people of Namibia, as well as other peoples still under the domination of colonizers and racists, should immediately achieve freedom and independence and have an opportunity for independent national development.

29. The Soviet Union considers that, as regards giving assistance to the national liberation of peoples, there is in the United Nations no more urgent task at the present time than to guarantee the genuine independence of the Namibian people, whose sole and legitimate representative is SWAPO.

30. We favour the quickest solution of the problem of Namibia based on the preservation of the unity and territorial integrity of Namibia, including Walvis Bay. We believe that the South African troops and administration should be completely withdrawn from Namibia and that full authority and power should be transferred to the people of Namibia, represented by SWAPO. We are prepared to make our contribution to reaching a just political settlement under the aegis

of the United Nations. Such a settlement, we believe, will be possible if an immediate end is put to the constant delays and ambiguities. The arrogant racists must be resolutely rebuffed by making use of the opportunities offered by the Charter of the United Nations, and the strictest sanctions should be applied against South Africa, pursuant to Chapter VII thereof.

31. Mr. THUNBORG (Sweden): Despite the fact that the question of Namibia has attracted considerably increased attention from the United Nations this year, it seems more evident than ever before that we find ourselves in a dangerous impasse in our efforts to bring about the fundamental change that the Organization has promised the population of Namibia for so long. The stalemate in the situation was sadly demonstrated during the series of Security Council meetings on Namibia held last April. Thereafter the Pretoria régime defiantly increased its price and added to its conditions for Namibian independence, thus gravely jeopardizing the future of the United Nations plan approved by Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and unanimously supported by the General Assembly.

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

33. The Swedish Government views with the deepest concern the recent escalation of Pretoria's efforts to destabilize Angola by armed attacks against the southern parts of that independent and sovereign country. Not only have these attacks—which we have categorically condemned—meant a brutal increase of the human suffering and material destruction in the area: in addition, by its flagrant violation of international law and the Charter of the United Nations, South Africa seems determined to turn the region into an area of big-Power rivalry, in a calculated effort to gain the sympathy and protection of one of the super-Powers. This dangerous development must be prevented by the international community. New and urgent efforts to establish peace and stability in the region are consequently demanded of the United Nations as the guardian of international peace and security.

34. Against that background the Swedish Government deplores the fact that last week the Security Council was unable to adopt a draft resolution that would have condemned the South African aggression against Angola. The United Nations has a paramount obligation to assert the principle of the non-use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any Member country, be it Kampuchea, Afghanistan or Angola.

35. In the present crisis not only is the future of Namibia and its population at stake, together with the future of SWAPO as the popular organization fighting for its independence and the future of Namibia's already independent neighbours, in particular Angola; in addition, the present stalemate in

the negotiations on the independence of Namibia is harmful to the very efforts to assert international law and to solve conflicts peacefully within an international framework such as the United Nations which, furthermore, has a particular legal and political responsibility to bring about the independence of Namibia.

36. In fact, the prevailing stalemate has made it possible for South Africa to launch a virtual campaign against the United Nations which in no uncertain terms exposes Pretoria's basic attitude to the negotiations on the independence of Namibia. Clearly, a single Member's accusations of partiality levelled against the Organization's unanimous verdict must be regarded as an absurdity. The stand of the United Nations on the question of Namibia represents the verdict of international law on this subject and can seem partial only to a Government which is aggressively defying that verdict.

37. In the context of this emergency special session, there is reason to try to assess the present status of the negotiations on Namibia against their factual background. First, it can be noted that the United Nations made a certain concession—owing to the *de facto* situation—to the Government of the Republic of South Africa by initiating a process of negotiations on the transition of Namibia to independence more than three years ago. The United Nations was then criticized as a matter of principle by some parties for negotiating with an illegal occupant and, accordingly, charged with being partial to the Pretoria régime for doing so.

38. It should be emphasized again today that the United Nations plan for Namibia was adopted with the aim of securing a peaceful and democratic transition and of minimizing the human suffering in Namibia and in the border areas. The objective was never to negotiate about the principles of independence, namely, self-determination and basic political rights, which are embodied in the very Charter of the United Nations. In the present state of stalemate and insecurity about the future of the negotiating process, it should be made clear that the United Nations has a firm basis of principles for these negotiations, laid down in Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which consequently cannot and will not be compromised. The most fundamental of those principles proclaims the inalienable right of the population of Namibia to decide the future of its own country. Thus, no doubt should persist about the Organization's having a very clear basis—a bottom line—for its negotiations, whereas the illegal occupant has never made any public commitment, trying merely to prolong its occupation of the Territory.

39. These are the facts which the negotiating parties, including the Western contact group, have to face today. Since the contact group has a particular role to play in this context, we urge its members most strongly to exert their considerable influence to move the negotiations ahead towards the implementation of the United Nations plan. Confrontation should not take place among parties that promote this plan—only, to the extent necessary, with the party that is defying it. The present situation in southern Africa indicates that no fundamental reassessment will take place in Pretoria unless the Security Council itself—in which the most influential members of the Western contact group are represented—adopts effective measures to

achieve the implementation of the United Nations plan, already long overdue.

40. Keeping in mind the prevailing tragic situation in Namibia itself, the repressive attacks against SWAPO as a popular political movement and South Africa's continuous and escalating infringements of the sovereignty of Angola, the Swedish Government urges the Security Council to convene again to contemplate appropriate means to address the situation in that region, which, in the view of my Government, constitutes a serious and increasing threat to international peace and security. In choosing this course of action we would not be failing to live up to our long-standing obligation to the people of Namibia.

41. The current emergency special session demonstrates that the question of Namibia is no longer only an issue of decolonization which has taken unprecedented efforts and time to resolve. The question of Namibia has become a touchstone of the determination of the international community to uphold the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and international peace itself.

42. Mr. ABULHASSAN (Kuwait) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Mr. President, I am happy, in assuming my duties as Permanent Representative of Kuwait to the United Nations, to express my whole-hearted appreciation for the excellent manner in which you have guided the work of the General Assembly. Your wealth of experience and your enlightened wisdom are a support for the Assembly in dealing with the many matters before it. We are certain that you will guide the work of this emergency special session successfully, particularly since you earlier presided over a General Assembly session on this same matter.

43. Almost three years have passed since the Security Council adopted resolution 435 (1978). That decision was described by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Kuwait, who was participating in the work of the Council at the time, as a historic resolution which constituted a new era, as well as an event which gave rise to satisfaction and allowed us all to concentrate on the transition to independence. He also described that resolution as an event which inspired us with confidence in a future in which Namibia would achieve freedom, self-determination and independence.

44. Three years have passed and the international community is still tossing in the wake of Council resolution 435 (1978). During the last nine months, we have witnessed three series of meetings in this building to deal with the question of Namibia, not to mention the meetings of the Organization of African Unity [OAU] and the meeting of the Non-Aligned Movement on the subject. The last of those series of meetings was that held by the Security Council at the end of April during which the three Western permanent members of the Council used their right of veto to defeat a draft resolution which called for the implementation of the United Nations plan for the peaceful solution of the question of Namibia.

45. We recall the period during which we adopted Security Council resolution 435 (1978), and we now wonder what happened to that settlement plan. We are no closer to the settlement than we were then, but rather further removed from it. In fact, we are at a crossroads.

46. The main reason we are still here now, after three years, is South Africa's defiance of the international community and its expressed will—a defiance based upon an attachment to a racist ideology. That defiance is demonstrated by its opposition to every effort made to overcome obstacles, its opposition to the international community's will and even to what the five Western countries have agreed upon. At each crossroad we are faced with new demands, new excuses. The latest defiance was South Africa's demand for the creation of an atmosphere of confidence, as though it were conducting itself in any manner conducive to confidence. We have been witnesses during the last decades to a policy of illegal occupation of Namibia, of oppression of its people, looting of its resources, and of repeated acts of aggression against the neighbouring African States. Such a policy is as far as possible from creating any climate of confidence. If that is the latest pretext among all South Africa's demands, it would be better for us to begin at the beginning and to question the very policy of South Africa.

47. South Africa has embarked upon, if not maintained, its policy because of the silence of the Western States. They have offered South Africa everything so that it could renounce the implementation of the settlement. The refusal by the Western Powers to take decisive measures and to oppose the delaying tactics of South Africa has encouraged the latter to maintain its stubborn refusal of the peaceful settlement. We consider that the delay is due to the failure of the five Western countries to adopt a positive, firm attitude and to bring pressure to bear on South Africa, and, in particular, to the new administration in the United States, which is close to the South African position for strategic and economic reasons. We consider that all this encourages South Africa in its obstinacy, its defiance, its repeated acts of aggression against neighbouring African States and its delays in respect of every attempt made to settle the Namibian question.

48. We commend the priority given recently by the Western Powers to the settlement of the conflict, but we consider that their efforts must be concerted, so as to prevent events which spell total collapse. The most recent example was the flagrant aggression by South Africa against Angola and the continuing occupation of certain parts of Angola. The Western States in general, and the United States of America in particular, have the duty always to bear in mind that the settlement plan for Namibia was the result of lengthy and difficult negotiations, of the reconciliation of seemingly irreconcilable positions and of concerted efforts by diverse parties, in view of the necessity to go ahead with the implementation of the plan. We urge that that plan be implemented without changes and without prevarication, and here the responsibility of the Western States is very clear.

49. The responsibility of the Western States is a historical responsibility, especially since it is one which they themselves have chosen and has now been undertaken by the United Nations. That responsibility did not end with Security Council resolution 435 (1978), but requires continued devotion and intensive efforts to bring about a settlement. The African States for their part have assumed their responsibility and have worked towards a political settlement, thus

giving proof of their peaceful intentions. Likewise, SWAPO, the only genuine representative of the Namibian people, has proved its political maturity at various stages of the struggle. But we, together with the African States, are convinced that, for that commitment to bear fruit, it must be backed up by the exertion of pressure through embargoes and the armed struggle. A total boycott of South Africa is necessary, we must consolidate the armed struggle being waged by the Namibian people under the leadership of SWAPO. We fully support those measures parallel with the peaceful settlement.

50. We consider it necessary to reject fallacious allegations that we have been hearing recently, particularly from the Western States, to the effect that the Namibian struggle is part of the East-West conflict and we refuse to link that struggle to strategic considerations that are foreign to the national quest for freedom, independence and self-determination. Western leaders have always distorted the national struggle of peoples under the yoke of occupation and colonialism, as we know too well in the Middle East. They describe it as terrorism, always misunderstanding its nature and scope and trying to use it for their own strategic purposes. We reject those attempts and we call on all those States, the standard-bearers of democracy and freedom, particularly the United States of America, to secure justice and restore those principles, join our ranks and commit themselves to a balanced policy.

51. We find that there is a close link in objectives, strategy and thinking between the racist South African régime and that of Israel. The conduct of both régimes reflects total scorn for the international community, its aims and its ideals, as represented in the Organization, and we are convinced that if the international community had succeeded in decreeing Draconian sanctions against Israel, in view of its refusal to withdraw from the occupied Arab territories and to grant the Palestinian people its right to self-determination by returning its territory and allowing it to establish an independent State in all its territory, and in view of Israel's repeated attacks on Lebanon, South Africa would never have dared to adopt similar behaviour and defy the General Assembly's resolutions on Namibia. How eloquent is the Arab proverb that says: "He who fears no punishment will act brazenly".

52. Kuwait appreciates the vanguard role played by SWAPO and we give that organization our full support. We affirm our solidarity and support for the African States, in particular the front-line States. Kuwait also wishes to pay a tribute to the role played by the United Nations Council for Namibia and its serious efforts to arrive at a peaceful settlement.

53. Since the beginning of the 1960s, Kuwait has been among the first countries to impose an embargo on any economic and commercial co-operation, direct or otherwise, with South Africa because Kuwait was and is still convinced that isolation and sanctions are two weapons which, if applied by all collectively, would have yielded fruitful results for international peace and security. Accordingly, Kuwait invites those States that still maintain trade and direct or indirect relations with South Africa to cease their co-operation in order to safeguard peace, to fulfil the aspirations of

peoples and to support the equitable principles of freedom and independence.

54. We would wish this session to lead to the realization of the hopes placed in it by the implementation of a positive policy that will bring the international community closer to its common objective, namely the peaceful settlement of the Namibian problem.

55. Mr. SLIM (Tunisia) (*interpretation from French*): On 30 April 1981, after a debate that lasted more than a week and was described as historic and exceptional both because of the level of participation and because of the interest it aroused, the Security Council, the supreme body of the United Nations charged with maintaining international peace and security, found it impossible to take the measures which the attitude of persistent defiance on the part of South Africa required of it.

56. During those deliberations on the situation in Namibia, a general consensus emerged that the Security Council should be requested to perform its duty and to find in the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations the most appropriate ways of ensuring the strict application of the fundamental principles enshrined in the Organization. I am referring to those elementary principles that we call self-determination, independence, freedom and justice.

57. As an African member of the Security Council, Tunisia witnessed the efforts made in the Council itself to make that global consensus a reality. Unfortunately there was an unshakable desire to block that work; the efforts came to naught, and, because of what might be called a weighted vote, the Security Council was reduced to paralysis.

58. Therefore, at this emergency special session, we are once again meeting to consider the situation in Namibia, with the hope that this time it will be possible for the global consensus to materialize.

59. Our hope is not based solely on the broader opportunity provided by the Assembly for the international community to voice its consensus. It is based above all on the fact that those who in April last made use of their weighted vote must by now have seen that their negative attitude at that time, far from promoting a peaceful solution to the problems of southern Africa, has on the contrary further encouraged the racist Pretoria régime in its defiance and arrogance, in its policies of oppression and repression and in its acts of repeated out-and-out aggression against neighbouring sovereign and independent States.

60. Thus what Africa told the Security Council in April last, when assessing and analysing the situation in Namibia, remains completely valid. But today the matter is even more acute, much more serious, much more urgent. The situation in Namibia and the rest of southern Africa is no longer simply a threat to international peace and security. It is, quite obviously, as defined in Article 39 of the Charter, a breach of international peace.

61. The act of flagrant aggression against the Republic of Angola just committed by South Africa from the Territory of Namibia, with all the suffering, death and destruction that followed in its wake, provides additional proof that the situation in that part of the

world has reached a degree of gravity that may well seriously compromise any hope for a peaceful solution. The defiance and the provocations indulged in by the outlawed *apartheid* régime against the black majority in South Africa, against Namibia and the front-line States, against the international community and the United Nations, are deliberate and intended to put to a severe test the reaffirmed desire of SWAPO to accept an agreement for the settlement of the Namibian problem through the peaceful means of negotiation.

62. Our patience, and that of the people of Namibia and of its sole and authentic representative, SWAPO, the patience of Africa and of the international community which cherishes peace and freedom—all have their limits. However, some, without any sense of proportion, still dare to call for patience and discourage haste!

63. But South Africa has now been occupying Namibia for more than 60 years; it is more than 35 years since the General Assembly rejected South Africa's initial attempt to annex the Territory of Namibia; it is more than 30 years since the International Court of Justice summoned the Pretoria régime to submit to the supervision and control of the General Assembly with respect to its administration of Namibia. It is now more than 15 years since the termination of South Africa's Mandate over the Territory of Namibia was officially proclaimed; it is more than 11 years since the Security Council confirmed the unlawful nature of the South African presence in Namibia; it is more than 10 years since the International Court of Justice declared that South Africa had the duty to withdraw immediately from Namibia and to terminate its occupation of the Territory. It is more than five years since the Security Council declared that it was imperative for free elections to be organized, under United Nations supervision and control, for the whole of Namibia as one single political entity. It is now three years since a plan for the settlement of the question of Namibia through peaceful negotiation was adopted by the international community; and it is more than two years since South Africa assured the Secretary-General of its willingness to co-operate in the speedy implementation of the settlement plan which had been endorsed by Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

64. What has become of all those resolutions, decisions and good intentions? Throughout this long history of events, South Africa's attitude has been marked by disconcerting fluctuations. Defiance, arrogance and provocation have been swiftly followed by evasion, delays and unobvious manoeuvres the undeclared purpose of which was merely to gain even more time in order to perpetuate South African domination over Namibia and to continue the exploitation of its manpower and resources. The latest episode was the Geneva meeting, held from 7 to 14 January 1981, under the sponsorship of the Secretary-General, whose efforts and dedication in this matter, as in others, deserve our tribute and gratitude. It brought together all the parties to the conflict in order to consider the implementation of the plan for Namibia which had been previously accepted by all. As a result of the responsible attitude taken by SWAPO as well as the joint action of the front-line countries and the Western contact group, the racist régime of Pretoria, in a last-

ditch stand, could find nothing better to do than to declare that it was as yet premature to proceed with the implementation of the peace process contained in resolution 435 (1978).

65. That declaration, which was a direct act of defiance to all those who were present at Geneva, revealed the real intentions of the racist régime of Pretoria to those who still had any doubts about them and strained the legendary patience of Africa to the breaking-point. But what of the patience of those who bear the prime responsibility in this matter, if only because they were the initiators of the United Nations peace plan which was endorsed by the Security Council more than three years ago? Have they realized that the patience that they were still advocating last April has since resulted in a very marked deterioration of the situation in the area, with an incalculable loss of life and material damage, in Namibia, in Angola and elsewhere?

66. In the masterly statement which he made on 4 September this year from this rostrum, speaking on behalf of Africa, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Kenya, Mr. Robert Ouko, summed up the general feeling of the peoples of Africa in very simple terms when he asked: "When is enough, enough?" [3rd meeting, para. 8]. He went on to say: "We are not asking South Africa to grant independence to Namibia... We are asking it to get out" [*ibid.*, para. 10].

67. That request is the same one that the people of Namibia would have voiced if they had had an opportunity to express themselves freely and democratically. That explains why the racist segregationist régime in South Africa has hitherto acted in such a way as to prevent the people of Namibia from making its voice heard, as was advocated in Security Council resolution 435 (1978); it is precisely for that reason that, guided by democratic principles, we for our part reaffirm our support for that resolution which we consider the sole possible basis for a negotiated settlement of the Namibian problem. In that connection we make the most pressing appeal for its immediate and unconditional implementation without reservation or amendment.

68. The Tunisian delegation has no doubt that is in the same spirit and for the same reasons that SWAPO agreed to go along with the Organization's peace plan. SWAPO, which has provided abundant proof of its keen sense of responsibility and realism, has undeniably made considerable concessions to demonstrate its adherence to Security Council resolution 435 (1978) whose timetable for implementation, we should recall, is one of the elements of the compromise. But SWAPO, whose legitimate and sacred struggle Tunisia wishes once again to hail and to which we should like to reiterate our solidarity and active support—SWAPO, which embodies the profound aspirations of the people of Namibia—has also provided proof of its courage and resolve to achieve the independence of its country through negotiation or any other means.

69. It is up to us in the Assembly to see to it that the people of Namibia are not forced to resort to the only means available to those stricken with disillusionment and despair.

70. Thus we voice the hope, Mr. President, that with your wise authority and your skill, we shall be in a position to achieve the broadest possible, if not the unanimous, support among the members of the Assembly for a draft resolution which will be voted upon at the end of this debate. The subject before us brooks no reservations or hesitation, because what is at stake is the fate of an entire people that is still suffering under the yoke of the most despicable and oppressive colonialism which utterly despises international legality and commonly accepted laws.

71. It is up to us, pursuant to our relevant resolutions, and up to the United Nations Council for Namibia—whose President, my friend Mr. Paul Lusaka, I should like to thank here, as well as his associates, for the laudable efforts they continue to make,—to lead the Territory of Namibia to independence. It is to be hoped that we shall be equal to our responsibilities and meet the expectations of the world in this unanimous effort.

72. However, my delegation harbours no hope that South Africa will by itself bow to any consensus emerging from the international community. My delegation remains convinced that the only way to exert genuine pressure is further to isolate the racist régime of Pretoria, since that would deprive South Africa of the means to conduct its policies and of the assurance of impunity which it has thus far enjoyed. That would put an end to the indulgence that certain Member States continue to show it, despite the sacred principles which they have depicted themselves as defending. It is time for us to realize that any step taken by Organization against South Africa must necessarily be accompanied by machinery comprising mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations. It is with this proviso and with this proviso alone that our Organization will be able to end the arrogance and the continued defiance of South Africa which it has been subjected to since its creation.

73. Mr. RABETAFIKA (Madagascar) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, my delegation is pleased that you have once again been called upon to guide our deliberations on the question of Namibia, confident as we are that you are most willing to lend us your experience, wisdom and perspicacity in the search for a solution in keeping with legality and justice.

74. The Democratic Republic of Madagascar is proud to be one of the countries which do not accept the notion that the occupation of Namibia can confer any right at all on the South Africa régime, let alone the right to be concerned with the political and constitutional future of the Namibian people. The right of that people to self-determination and independence, which has been recognized both by specific resolutions and by the Declaration on the granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples contained in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), cannot be denied, opposed or limited by the racist régime. Moreover, in reaffirming the legal responsibility of the United Nations in respect of Namibia, Security Council resolution 435 (1978) excludes any claim to the contrary by South Africa.

75. In terms of these positions of principle, what, then, is the significance of the request addressed by

the Security Council to South Africa to co-operate immediately in the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), which further specifies that the objective sought is the withdrawal of the South African administration from Namibia and the transfer of power to the Namibian people with United Nations assistance?

76. In our opinion, this offer of co-operation was a political act dictated by circumstances which could not and did not commit the Organization irrevocably, in as much as there is reticence or even refusal to co-operate on the part of the racist régime. We were certainly mistaken in counting on the goodwill and political intelligence of that régime; however, at no time was it our intention to confer on it *de jure* or *de facto* the power to influence the evolution and conclusion of the process for independence of Namibia.

77. One could analyse at length the question of whether South African co-operation in the implementation of Council resolution 435 (1978) constitutes a necessary and sufficient condition. But no one can validly maintain that the absence of this co-operation should in practice be reflected in a denial of the inalienable national rights of the Namibian people and the usurpation of those rights for the benefit of a privileged and protected minority.

78. After the failure of the Geneva meeting in January 1981, the group of African States at the United Nations arrived at the conclusion that South Africa, by refusing to agree in principle to a cease-fire, had given warning that it was not prepared to implement the United Nations plan and that, therefore, the time had come to exert on that racist régime sufficient pressure to break its opposition to a process of evolution which had become inevitable.

79. That decision could not be carried out. Once again the policy of sanctions that was proposed came to naught as a result of the vetoes of three permanent members of the Security Council, which in other circumstances and quite outside the Security Council had nevertheless shown a willingness to have recourse to economic and other sanctions as an instrument of their foreign policy.

80. The confusion and uncertainty caused by the Geneva failure and the triple veto in the Security Council, far from having been cleared up, have been intensified these last months by indications that cast doubt on any chances of success for the United Nations plan or even of its holding together.

81. Meanwhile, in accordance with a doubtless pre-determined plan, the South African authorities decided to use the international Territory of Namibia to launch a new large-scale act of military aggression against the Republic of Angola. This premeditated and unprovoked invasion committed in violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Angola aroused general indignation.

82. Had it not been for the veto of one Power whose strategic interests are served by its indulgence towards South Africa, the Security Council would have condemned this aggression, which, to put it mildly, in no way contributed to the solution of the problems in southern Africa and, in particular, Namibia. On the contrary, the invasion of Angola convincingly has lent credibility to the idea that the racist régime was against

the settlement of these questions, as demonstrated by its attempt to eliminate SWAPO politically and physically and to destabilize those African Governments so bold as to give their support for the genuine independence of Namibia.

83. Faced with a situation which is constantly deteriorating and which no longer allows for any illusions about possible South African co-operation in the process of the independence of Namibia, it might appear futile and consequently even irrelevant to try to reduce the dimensions of the problem to placing trust in the racist régime, which has an impressive military infrastructure and whose self-confidence verges on arrogance in the certainty that it enjoys the strategic support of the imperialist Powers and absolute impunity in the Security Council.

84. Therefore a choice has to be made concerning the course we have to follow. Such a choice has been proposed by Mr. Didier Ratsiraka, President of the Democratic Republic of Madagascar, in the message he addressed on 30 August 1981 to the Secretary-General, which has been issued as a document of this session. I shall read some extracts from it:

“On the eve of the emergency special session of the United Nations General Assembly on Namibia, South Africa continues to defy international opinion, and that of Africa in particular, by attacking the People’s Republic of Angola.

“Verbal condemnation of South Africa no longer suffices.

“The judgement of history will condemn us without appeal if we do not act.

“ ...

“Today, we can no longer remain silent and feel obliged to put forward the following proposals: the emergency special session of the General Assembly on Namibia should take the decision to apply Security Council resolution 435 (1978) immediately and without any amendment; or the United Nations Council for Namibia should solemnly and unilaterally proclaim the independence of Namibia under the auspices of SWAPO, accepted and recognized by the international community as the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people.

“The United Nations Council for Namibia is empowered to issue such a proclamation, since it is the Council which is entrusted with the administration of the Territory of Namibia; it is also empowered to legislate and issue decrees. That is why we put forward the proposal that the United Nations Council for Namibia solemnly proclaim the independence of Namibia.”²

85. Allow me to make some comments in order to clarify the position of my Government, in case that be needed. In the first place, the Government of the Democratic Republic of Madagascar recognizes that, three years after the adoption of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), some countries may still insist on maintaining in force what we have agreed to call the United Nations plan. But then we say that it has to be implemented immediately and in full.

86. No one can in fact accept the possibility that SWAPO, and through it the Namibian people, should

remain indefinitely a prisoner to that formula. No one can accept the possibility that the existence of that plan should become an end in itself. No one can believe that certain Western countries could indefinitely take cover behind this convenient procedure to evade their responsibility, thus avoiding a choice between recourse to the sanctions provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter and the need to exercise effective pressure on South Africa so as to bring it to reason. If it were otherwise and if the Powers in question could act thus in the expectation of obtaining the best of two worlds, the major concessions agreed to by SWAPO at the time of signing the Western plan would have been in vain.

87. After all, the revival of that plan cannot depend on additional concessions of a permanent nature by SWAPO requiring it—irony of ironies—to pay a useless ransom to the racist régime, whose conduct and arrogance prove that it hardly needs—and I must emphasize this—a hypothetical act of trust. The success of the plan can come about only from a reaffirmation of the authority of the Security Council, but this too, as we have seen, depends on the willingness of certain of its permanent members.

88. Secondly, in advocating the possibility that the United Nations Council for Namibia, which is the legal Administering Authority for the Territory, should proclaim the independence of Namibia, my Government is guided by the conviction that there can be no legal or political obstacle to such a proclamation and that, among the various realities of the situation, the identification of SWAPO with the legitimate aspirations of the Namibian people is the only one which matters and which in the end will prevail.

89. No one can honestly doubt the victory of SWAPO in any electoral consultation organized in Namibia under United Nations supervision. It has been reported by the Western press, those organs which can hardly be suspected of sympathy with that movement, that the racist régime would have preferred to have the Geneva meeting fail rather than face SWAPO in an honest electoral contest under international control. This, it seems to us, is the most deserved tribute that can be paid to SWAPO and also the best way of proving that the General Assembly was right in recognizing it as the only legitimate representative of the Namibian people.

90. The justice of the cause that SWAPO defends, the spirit of sacrifice of its fighters and the political maturity of its leaders have earned SWAPO the benefit of having a continually growing international audience. The results it has obtained in the country and in the field are remarkable, as regards popular mobilization and the intensification of the struggle. The Namibian people’s will for liberation is now irreversible, despite the atrocities and repressions inflicted upon it by the illegal occupiers.

91. To proclaim the independence of Namibia at this stage would in no way mean precipitating matters, since it is only too true that we have already waited too long—both the Namibian people and our own Organization. Nor would this be a meaningless gesture. Bringing SWAPO to power would constitute a regularization, a consecration in keeping with the reality of its political powers and a reaffirmation of the

confidence placed in it by the Namibian people and by the community of nations.

92. The proposal submitted by the Government of the Democratic Republic of Madagascar, which I have just explained, reconciles law and politics.

93. As far as law is concerned, the United Nations is in no way bound to call on South Africa to co-operate in bringing Namibia to independence.

94. Politically, South Africa shows no inclination to co-operate in the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), and the members of the Western contact group do not seem to be prepared in any way to compel it to do so.

95. Therefore, the only conclusion that can be drawn and that must be expressed in the clearest and most solemn terms possible is that the independence of Namibia will be achieved without the co-operation of South Africa and, if necessary, against its wishes.

96. We know that this position may not meet with the agreement of all countries and still less with the racist régime and its allies which have long complacently obstructed any such procedure and systematically sown confusion by introducing into debates and negotiations on Namibia considerations that are supposedly within its context but actually derive from the cold war period. For our part, we see no other way that will bring us out of this deadlock and do justice to the legitimate aspirations and rights of the Namibian people, which has itself, through its sufferings and battles, sufficiently borne witness before the international community.

97. Our proposal is not intended to complicate a situation that others have sought to render inextricable. On the contrary, our intention is to dissociate the question of Namibia from considerations alien to the solution of this typical decolonization problem. Our intention is to assist the Assembly in taking its decisions with a clear mind and with the determination that the circumstances require.

98. Mr. AHOUANOGBO (Benin) (*interpretation from French*): By the adoption in 1966 of resolution 2145 (XXI), which terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia, the General Assembly declared illegal the presence of South Africa in Namibia and placed that Territory under the direct responsibility of the United Nations. Since 1966, therefore, it has been the historic mandate of the Organization to protect the rights and interests of Namibia, namely, first of all to enable the people of Namibia to exercise as swiftly as possible its right to self-determination, to freedom and national independence, by having South Africa withdraw from that Territory and then to preserve its territorial integrity and sovereignty.

99. It is against this background that, following the adoption of Security Council resolution 385 (1976), five Western members of the Council—Canada, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, the United Kingdom and the United States—undertook to draft a proposed settlement for the Namibian situation that would be internationally acceptable and designed to bring the Territory to independence. The proposal presented by the Western contact group and accepted by SWAPO and South Africa has been rendered inoperative because South Africa has raised objections

to the administrative arrangements pertaining to the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

100. Furthermore, SWAPO and South Africa met in Geneva in January 1981 under the aegis of the United Nations to consider the administrative arrangements for the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). During that meeting, SWAPO declared its readiness immediately to sign a cease-fire agreement, but unfortunately that meeting also failed because of South Africa's hostility to the very concept of an independent Namibia.

101. Following on the failure of the Geneva meeting, which had been organized at the initiative of the United Nations in order to ensure implementation of a negotiated settlement of the Namibian problem, the African countries in OAU requested an emergency meeting of the Security Council in order to prescribe comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa. However, despite the desire of the international community to impose mandatory and comprehensive sanctions against South Africa in view of the threat that that régime represented to international peace and security, the Council failed to act in accordance with its mandate and did not impose any sanctions because of the vetoes cast by the three Western Permanent members.

102. At present South Africa is indulging in a further series of acts of aggression against the Namibian people and independent African States. It has increased its threats and acts of subversion and aggression against Zambia, Mozambique, Botswana and Angola. In this connection it should be recalled that the Security Council met from 28 to 31 August 1981 to consider the most recent act of aggression perpetrated by South Africa against the People's Republic of Angola. But once again, because of the veto cast by the United States of America, the Council was unable to discharge its responsibilities for the maintenance of international peace and security.

103. In light of the foregoing and in view of the situation that is so perilous for peace itself, OAU and the Non-Aligned Movement requested the convening of the present session of the Assembly to make the entire international community aware of its responsibilities.

104. Since the termination of South Africa's Mandate, the General Assembly and the Security Council have adopted numerous resolutions demanding that South Africa withdraw from Namibia. Since 1966 the United Nations has itself assumed the direct responsibility of the Territory, acting through the United Nations Council for Namibia, in order to bring the process of liberation to a successful conclusion. An international consensus has thus emerged confirming, *inter alia*, the illegality of South Africa's occupation of Namibia, the inalienable right of the people of that Territory to independence and the legitimacy of its anti-colonialist struggle, as well as the exclusive representivity of its national liberation organization SWAPO.

105. In an advisory opinion handed down on 21 June 1971,³ the International Court of Justice declared that the continued presence of South Africa in Namibia was illegal and that it was the duty of South

Africa to withdraw immediately from Namibia. But South Africa has obstinately refused to bow to the repeated injunctions of the international community, thus nipping in the bud any negotiating process to reach a settlement of the Namibian question.

106. The failure of the proposed settlement presented by the Western contact group and the failure of the Geneva meeting that was convened at the initiative of the United Nations demonstrate, were there any need to do so, the complete recalcitrance of South Africa and its hostility to the achievement of independence for Namibia.

107. But the arrogant defiance with which the racist *apartheid* régime has faced the international community, by trampling underfoot the pertinent resolutions of our Organization, can be seen to be rooted in the benevolent support that it has always received from certain Western Powers. These latter have always openly supported the policy of South Africa towards Namibia and have encouraged that country to continue its illegal occupation of the Territory as well as the war that it is waging against the Namibian people and against the African States. Indeed, the five Powers which made up the original Western contact group share, to various degrees, a common cause in Namibia with the Pretoria colonial occupation régime. In the report submitted to the General Assembly at its thirty-fifth session by the United Nations Council for Namibia, we read the following:

“Latest available information indicates that there are as many as 88 transnational corporations operating in Namibia. Of this number, 35 are based in South Africa, 25 in the United Kingdom, 15 in the United States, 8 in the Federal Republic of Germany, 3 in France and 2 in Canada.”⁴

108. Elsewhere in the same report we read that the Rössing Uranium, Ltd., a transnational corporation, which is responsible for the illegal mining of Namibian uranium, is made up of British, American, French, German and Canadian capital.

109. Militarily and strategically, the support of the Western Powers for the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa is part and parcel of a comprehensive strategy to encircle Africa and to control neighbouring sea routes for the supply of oil and other raw materials essential to the capitalist economy. It should be emphasized that these western Powers, which are the mainstays of the racist régime in Pretoria, must be made to understand that in the past they themselves had failed in their expansionist and colonialist adventures, and that, at present, its intolerable colonialism in Namibia is inevitably doomed to failure. Willingly or by force, they will eventually have to withdraw from that Territory, under even more humiliating circumstances, because despite the might of their death-dealing war-machine, the Pretoria racists will never be able to crush the determination of the Namibians to attain total liberation and independence.

110. In this connection, history has borne out that, whatever happens, a people which is determined always emerges victorious when it takes up arms in a national liberation struggle. It is no accident that SWAPO became the sole, authentic representative of the Namibian people: it did so because of its representivity, skill in combat and hard work. The General

Assembly, in recognizing SWAPO as the sole, authentic representative of the Namibian people, was doing no more than endorsing the choice which had been made by the Namibian people. And SWAPO is each individual Namibian.

111. It should also be recalled that in 1977, when the five Western Powers set up a contact group to facilitate the process of the liberation of Namibia, my country, the People's Republic of Benin, like SWAPO itself, was one of those who clearly voiced their scepticism, seeing in that concerted action another manoeuvre on the part of the forces of imperialism and domination to delay the decolonization of Namibia and to crush the armed struggle of SWAPO in the field. Despite that scepticism, SWAPO co-operated fully throughout the whole negotiating process, thus demonstrating its political maturity, its lofty sense of responsibility and its unflagging desire to reach a settlement of the Namibian question by the peaceful means of negotiation.

112. But despite the concessions made by SWAPO and the co-operation which it demonstrated throughout the negotiating process, the delaying tactics of South Africa made the proposals of the Western contact group inoperative, and Pretoria's categorical refusal to implement the United Nations plan led to the failure of the Geneva meeting.

113. Today the international community has seen the failure of the Western contact group's plan, which was designed to provide an acceptable formula for a peaceful transition on the international scene leading to the independence of Namibia. Certain members of the Western contact group have shown a degree of goodwill, but still they failed. Others, however, have displayed political myopia by clinging to short-term interests. In this context, they strive to present SWAPO as an organization of terrorists and blood-thirsty outlaws. Such behaviour is a clear indication of bad faith, and this bad faith explains the attitude of the Pretoria leaders. With the support of its Western patrons, South Africa is doing everything it can to stymie the present negotiating process, because it is more than ever convinced that, if free elections were to be held at the present time in Namibia, SWAPO would meet all the necessary conditions for emerging victorious.

114. South Africa and some of its masters who encourage it to block any process that might lead to Namibian independence are displaying political blindness; they prefer the *status quo* in order to step up their pillaging of the natural wealth of Namibia, thus meeting their own short-term selfish interests, to the detriment of a more intelligent vision of the future.

115. We can now state, without risk of contradiction, that the entire international community is disappointed. It is disappointed because it had placed its hopes in the very people who volunteered to facilitate a process that might lead Namibia to independence. It is disappointed because it had placed its trust in them. It is disappointed because it had given them so much time.

116. Throughout this whole period, SWAPO, Africa and the Non-Aligned Movement had placed their trust in those who had promised to do everything in their power to lead Namibia to independence. SWAPO

had expressed clear scepticism, since it knew better than anyone else the deceit and duplicity of its enemies, but it went along with the negotiating process because of its political maturity and lofty sense of responsibility, and, above all, because it had been encouraged by its friends who were eager to reach a settlement of the Namibian problem by means of peaceful negotiation.

117. Throughout that time, South Africa's delaying tactics and its sham adherence to United Nations initiatives ill concealed the procrastinating tactics which the leaders of Pretoria calculated would lull the vigilance of the international community. These delaying tactics are significantly illustrated by the use of the so-called "Council of Ministers" at Windhoek, following on sham elections, in violation of United Nations resolutions—particularly Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 431 (1978).

118. During that same period, South Africa, still encouraged by its patrons, was making use of the available time to step up its pillage of Namibia's resources to benefit the economic interests of South Africa and other foreign economic interests, in violation of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the National Resources of Namibia,⁵ enacted by the United Nations Council for Namibia.

119. Also during the same period of time, we have witnessed the reinforcement by South Africa of its military forces and police in Namibia, the establishment of new bases and the renovation of former ones, for the obvious purpose of perpetuating its presence in Namibia; we have witnessed the strengthening of the police State in all its components and the overt acts of aggression against Namibia's neighbours. The latest aggression by South Africa against the People's Republic of Angola was a premeditated act designed to sow confusion and thus distract the attention of the international community from the real purposes of the present session.

120. May I take this opportunity, on behalf of my Government and of the people's Republic of Benin, to pay a tribute to the memory of the valiant sons of Angola who made the supreme sacrifice in defence of their homeland.

121. In view of what I have just said, it must be concluded that Africa has been stabbed in the back and that this eighth emergency special session gives us an opportunity to call the international community to witness the treachery and complicity of those who support South Africa in its policy of repression of the Namibian people and its repeated acts of aggression against neighbouring countries. But it should be clear that every drop of Namibian or Angolan blood that flows because of the bullets of the Pretoria racists is a debt of blood contracted with Africa as a whole; and history has taught us that such a debt—particularly of blood—will be paid sooner or later. The case of Namibia has not been an exception to that universal rule.

122. Those Powers which constitute the mainstay of South Africa are, however, those with the longest experience in the field of decolonization and, for some reason, they do not perceive or refuse to perceive the importance of their mission which would undoubtedly be much more beneficial than the short-term view that they now show.

123. In this connection, it would not be superfluous to recall that those Powers, for selfish reasons, once described the leaders of the Patriotic Front of Zimbabwe as demented and irresponsible people. Today, it has turned out that some of those considered to be annoying pests by certain Western Powers are undoubtedly genuine statesmen. So what was the purpose of 15 years of pointless war? The administering Power of that time could, by responsibly and correctly handling the Rhodesian problem, have spared Zimbabwe and its sons their innumerable pointless sacrifices. What the administering Power did not see fit to do 15 years ago, it was forced to do later owing to the courage and determination of the valiant sons of Zimbabwe—and today the interests of the administering Power are not more threatened in that country than those of some others. That should serve as an example.

124. But despite all the disappointments, we continue to believe that the Western Powers still have a part to play, and despite the delay that has occurred they can still intervene effectively. It is our profound conviction that those which have so far failed still have a chance. More precisely, the United States can still prevent a generalized war from becoming a reality in that part of southern Africa by increasing international pressure on the racists and Fascists of Pretoria before it is too late, because the only way that still remains open to the subjugated people of southern Africa is armed struggle.

125. On behalf of my delegation, I should like to repeat that the United Nations bears a particular and direct responsibility for Namibia until genuine self-determination and national independence have been achieved. In this connection, my country would like to reaffirm its support of the United Nations Council for Namibia as the sole legal Administering Authority of Namibia and express our belief that the Council should be given a more important role to play during the period of transition to independence.

126. We appeal to all Powers and urge them to apply sanctions against South Africa. We make a solemn appeal to the Western Powers in general and to the United States in particular to comply with the pertinent resolutions of the United Nations.

127. The struggle of the Namibian people for independence under the leadership of their sole and authentic representative, SWAPO, has already reached a decisive stage. The People's Republic of Benin would like to reaffirm that we are fully behind the people of Namibia in its legitimate struggle and, at the same time, to appeal to all countries which love peace and justice to aid SWAPO by all available means until Namibia has been completely freed from the colonial yoke. Ready for revolution; the struggle continues.

128. Mr. RAHMAN (Bangladesh): The history of Namibia is a story of broken promises and unobserved dates and a chronicle of colonial exploitation, racism and racial discrimination based on *apartheid*.

129. Bangladesh's position on the question of Namibia is clear-cut and categorical. It is founded on our constitutional commitment, namely, "to support oppressed peoples throughout the world waging a just struggle against imperialism, colonialism and racism". It is backed by our unswerving adherence to General

Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), which contains the historic Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. It is demonstrated in our repeated reaffirmation of the inalienable rights of all peoples to self-determination, freedom and independence. It is also deeply rooted in our conviction that the process of decolonization is inevitable and the struggle for liberty and freedom inexorable. The basic question that remains in the case of Namibia is how expeditiously we can achieve this end so that the people of that Territory can rightfully pursue its destiny without further bloodshed and suffering.

130. In addressing ourselves to this question, my delegation, at the very outset, would like to underscore one fundamental premise: that the independence of Namibia can and must be achieved in accordance with the various principles embodied in the relevant resolutions of the United Nations, particularly Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978).

131. The heart of the problem is remarkable in its simplicity—a people deprived of its right to national independence and self-determination; a Territory occupied by military force.

132. Fifteen years ago the General Assembly adopted the historic resolution 2145 (XXI) which terminated the Mandate of South Africa over Namibia and placed the Territory under the direct responsibility of the United Nations. Therefore the international community, since 1966, has the unique responsibility of protecting the rights and interests of the people of Namibia. Since the termination of the Mandate, the General Assembly and the Security Council have adopted numerous resolutions demanding the withdrawal of the illegal administration and military presence of South Africa from Namibia.

133. In an advisory opinion of 21 June 1971,³ the International Court of Justice declared that the continued presence of South Africa in Namibia was illegal and that South Africa was under obligation to withdraw from Namibia immediately. The decision of the General Assembly and the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice clearly outline the juridical status of the Territory. But, unfortunately, South Africa has chosen the path of intransigence. In defiance of the relevant resolutions of the United Nations and the decision of the International Court of Justice, South Africa has refused to recognize the United Nations Council for Namibia.

134. The past history of the Territory is replete with instances of all the ills that characterize the worst form of colonialism, with the added brutality of the repressive régime of *apartheid* and its institutionalized discrimination. The logical extension of that policy has seen the systematic fragmentation of the Territory along ethnic and racial lines, as exemplified by the system of bantustanization. The Pretoria régime has made a massive deployment of its armed forces to police the Territory and to bolster its repression. Those troops are not only suppressing the struggle for liberation but have extended their acts of aggression into neighbouring territories with all the inherent dangers to international peace and security. The most recent example is South Africa's armed aggression against Angola, which took place only the other day. In fact South African troops are committing daily acts of

aggression. Thousands of Namibians engaged in their legitimate struggle for self-determination and independence have been incarcerated in gaols within South Africa and Namibia and have been condemned as terrorists. Namibia continues to be denied its economic wealth through the indiscriminate exploitation of its resources in violation of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia,⁵ enacted by the United Nations Council for Namibia.

135. Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978) remain the only basis for the peaceful transition of the Territory from colonial subjugation to independence. We want no more than the complete and unconditional implementation of those two resolutions as early as possible. In the course of the past three years, South Africa has deliberately placed one obstacle after another in the way of the implementation of the resolutions. It has raised innumerable objections to every report of the Secretary-General and, as one demand has been met, it has promptly raised a new demand, each time injecting an irrelevant or extraneous element.

136. We appreciate the readiness of the leadership of SWAPO, the true and authentic representative of the people of Namibia, to sign a cease-fire agreement and to agree on a target date for the arrival of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group and the beginning of an electoral process, supervised by the United Nations. We congratulate the front-line States on their patience, understanding and flexibility in dealing with the very difficult situation created by South Africa. The statesmanship shown by the leaders of Nigeria, Zambia, Mozambique, Tanzania, Botswana, Angola and Zimbabwe deserves to be commended. In this hour of trial we pledge ourselves to stand by them. In that connection, I should also like to pay a tribute to the Secretary-General, Mr. Kurt Waldheim, and to his able colleagues, for their efforts in paving the way to the attainment of an independent Namibia.

137. Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978) provided a practical framework for ushering in independence for the people of Namibia through a democratic and peaceful process. It goes without saying that the members of the Western contact group have a special responsibility for the speedy implementation of the plan. We cannot accept any attempt to seek a solution outside the framework of the United Nations and we can no longer condone the dilatory tactics of South Africa in impeding the implementation of the United Nations plan. We deplore all attempts by the South African authorities to impose a so-called internal solution on the people of Namibia. The international community must, as a matter of urgency, adopt effective and comprehensive measures under the Charter of the United Nations to ensure the complete isolation of South Africa and to compel it to withdraw from Namibia in accordance with United Nations resolutions.

138. We unequivocally condemn South Africa for its rapacious exploitation of and tyranny against the innocent people of Namibia, for its savage acts of aggression against Angola and SWAPO and for its wanton and flagrant disregard of international opinion and the decisions of the United Nations.

139. In 1977, the Security Council, through the adoption of its resolution 418 (1977), decided to impose an arms embargo against South Africa. The Council also established a Committee—the Security Council Committee established by resolution 421 (1977) concerning the question of South Africa—to supervise the implementation of resolution 418 (1977). That Committee was chaired by Mr. Kaiser, the representative of Bangladesh, in 1980. The report of the Committee⁶ shows how the terms of the resolution were misinterpreted and violated by some unscrupulous parties. It is unfortunate to note that, in spite of the embargo, South Africa managed to maintain a constant inflow of arms, ammunition and spare parts for its military machine. The Committee has submitted, in its report to the Security Council, recommendations for the sealing of the loopholes which might exist in Council resolution 418 (1977) in order to prevent South Africa from acquiring arms and arms-related materials from the outside world.⁷ We believe that the General Assembly must once again renew its recommendation to the Security Council to ensure strict compliance with Security Council resolutions 418 (1977) and 421 (1977).

140. Bangladesh has nothing against the people of South Africa. We are opposed to the abhorrent policy of *apartheid* practised by the minority régime of Pretoria. We wish to reiterate that, since its independence, Bangladesh has maintained no relations whatsoever with the racist régime of South Africa, political, diplomatic, cultural, economic or other.

141. We fully endorse what was stated by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Kenya and the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of OAU, Mr. Robert Ouko, from this podium early in our current deliberations. In particular, we wish to recall the last two paragraphs of his statement, in which he underlined the objective of the current emergency special session. Truly, South Africa must be made to understand that the world community is now ready to act, and to act decisively. We have the same hope as the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Kenya, namely, in his own words:

“Let this be the session which will record for posterity the determination of the United Nations to implement its own decisions and thus to discharge its legal obligations to the people of Namibia...”
[3rd meeting, para. 30].

142. We believe, and we believe this with deep conviction, that Namibia will be a free and independent sovereign State, that our brothers from SWAPO will sit side by side with us in this very forum and that South Africa cannot prevent it. The world is united in this task. The tide of history cannot be turned back. But time is of the essence; each new day increases the agony and the suffering of the people of Namibia.

143. In conclusion, I should like to say that we should not forget that it is not only South Africa that stands in the dock; it is the United Nations itself which is being tested. If we cannot face up to the challenge posed by the open rejection of our resolutions, the Charter of the United Nations and the principles embodied in it, what hope is there for any one of us? We must resolve to redouble our efforts for the speedy independence of Namibia and we must exert as much

pressure as possible on South Africa to free Namibia from its chains.

144. Mr. ROLANDIS (Cyprus): Mr. President, I should like first of all to express my pleasure and deep gratification at seeing you presiding over this emergency special session, as your qualities of leadership, competence and wisdom have been amply witnessed and greatly appreciated during the thirty-fifth session of the Assembly. My delegation extends to you its fullest support and co-operation in the discharge of your duties.

145. As a result of the failure of the Geneva pre-implementation meeting earlier this year, a failure caused in its entirety by South Africa's arrogant intransigence and duplicity, the Security Council was called upon to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa in order to ensure its immediate compliance with the resolutions and decisions of the United Nations relating to Namibia.

146. The international community's efforts to have the Security Council compel the Pretoria régime to terminate its illegal occupation of Namibia were once again impeded owing to the well known and unfortunate failure of the Security Council to act.

147. Apart from dealing a heavy blow to the aspirations not only of the Namibian people but of humanity as a whole for a world of freedom and justice, the inability of the Security Council to act posed once again the question of the very credibility of the United Nations. The forces of aggression and injustice are allowed to prevail over the principles of freedom, peace and justice because of the inability of the United Nations to ensure the implementation of its resolutions, a fact which hinders its effective functioning and erodes the very concept and even the *raison d'être* of the Organization. Thus the racist régime of South Africa is allowed to continue its illegal occupation of the Territory of Namibia and to pursue its policy of aggression and internal oppression.

148. In pursuing that policy, South Africa resorts continuously to hideous manœuvres aimed at imposing upon the Namibian people so-called constitutional arrangements in order to avoid the implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia contained in Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978).

149. It is particularly objectionable and regrettable that, in an effort to camouflage its abhorrent acts and crimes, South Africa attempts to distort the very nature of the question of Namibia. It is indeed an ironically noticeable historical habit of all those who commit aggression, occupying by force the territories of others, to resort to distortion and audaciously to direct attention to the importance of impartiality, peace and negotiations, while at the same time they continue at gunpoint to suppress and threaten their victims.

150. The question of Namibia is a clear case of colonialism, illegal foreign occupation and racism which persist in blatant violation of the rights of the Namibian people and in defiance of the very authority of the United Nations under whose direct responsibility the Territory of Namibia was placed 15 years ago. The United Nations has set itself the sacred task

of leading the Namibians to their independence, and it has a duty and an obligation to discharge its responsibilities with regard to that task.

151. My delegation would like to stress once again in this very important forum our commitment to and strong support of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, which provides the only peaceful procedure for a negotiated settlement of the question of Namibia. We stand firmly by the plan and demand its early implementation without any modification, qualification, dilution, prevarication or delay.

152. The current situation in Namibia poses a serious threat to international peace and security. The constant provocation and arrogance with which South Africa flouts the repeated appeals of the international community, together with the failure of the Security Council to impose mandatory sanctions against South Africa, conduce to the escalation of the already explosive situation in the southern African region. It is therefore imperative that something should be done, and this is a matter of urgency.

153. The terror and brutal repression inside South Africa and Namibia continue unabated. On 19 August 1981 three more freedom fighters in South Africa, members of the African National Congress, were sentenced to death by the Pretoria Supreme Court as part of the *apartheid* régime's policy of destroying all resistance. We deeply regret and deplore that latest act of the racist authorities in Pretoria and we continue to support the struggle of the black majority of South Africans for their freedom and the eradication of the abominable system of *apartheid*.

154. In Namibia, South Africa continues to organize and further elaborate its machinery of repression against the Namibian people by utilizing methods of execution, torture, detention and forced labour, denying the people their most fundamental rights and freedoms. Furthermore, South Africa continuously increases its massive military presence in Namibia, which is its means of ensuring its illegal forcible occupation of the Territory and uninterrupted exploitation of the rich natural resources of Namibia. In addition South Africa has organized and promoted puppet groups in an attempt to establish the basis for pseudo-independence of the Territory. It has unilaterally held elections that have been rejected and condemned by the United Nations. It has done so, obviously, in an attempt to create an aura of legitimacy for its puppets.

155. In order to consolidate and protract its illegal occupation of Namibia, South Africa has been constantly trying to expand its aggressive policies throughout the southern African region. Once again Cyprus expresses its vehement and unequivocal condemnation of the large-scale incursions of South Africa into neighbouring front-line States as manifested in the latest invasion of Angola by South African forces, an act of aggression contrary to all the norms and principles of international law. The Government and people of Cyprus stand solidly by the Government and people of Angola in their time of suffering and need, and demand the immediate withdrawal of the invading forces from the Territory and respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Angola.

156. The United Nations has so far exerted mainly moral pressure on South Africa through its resolutions. However, in the absence of morality on the part of that régime, no concrete results have so far been produced and an arrogant minority continues superciliously to cause frustration and disappointment for the Namibian people and the world at large.

157. As a result of this constantly deteriorating situation, suffering, exploitation and oppression continue to be the painful everyday characteristics of life for the Namibians. Despite the bitterness and frustration it creates, this situation also gives rise to a strengthened solidarity, determination and unity of the people of Namibia, as well as of the international community which consistently supports their struggle.

158. Cyprus for its part, itself struggling under conditions of gross injustice to achieve its own independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity, unity and non-alignment shall, as it has consistently done in the past, continue to support the noble cause of the people of Namibia. We fully associate ourselves with United Nations efforts for the genuine independence of a united Namibia and we subscribe to the Programme of Action on Namibia⁸ which was adopted at the extraordinary plenary meeting of the United Nations Council for Namibia in Panama in June 1981.

159. As one of the members of the United Nations Council for Namibia, Cyprus is playing its modest part in joining all those who are in the vanguard of the struggle for the liberation of Namibia and in the fight at the international level. We have participated with enthusiasm in the work of the Council and have utilized every opportunity to promote the cause of Namibia in various international forums and on missions of the Council to several countries.

160. We firmly recognize SWAPO as the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people and we trust that their hard and painful struggle will soon produce the desired result: an independent and united Namibia, with its territorial integrity intact—by that we mean Walvis Bay as well as the offshore islands. We strongly oppose all efforts aimed at an internal settlement in Namibia in defiance of Security Council resolution 439 (1978).

161. Finally, we strongly condemn the economic exploitation and plunder of the natural resources of Namibia which continue unabated in violation of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia⁵ enacted in 1974 by the United Nations Council for Namibia.

162. In conclusion, we wish to emphasize that resolutions alone cannot lead to the desired goal. It is their effective implementation that is of paramount importance. We maintain that the implementation of the United Nations plan is long overdue. It is the duty of the United Nations and especially of the Security Council to take the necessary steps and measures that would compel South Africa to put an end to the illegal occupation of the Territory of Namibia. It is pertinent to raise here the question of Article 25 of the Charter of the United Nations for, according to that Article, as confirmed by the International Court of Justice in its advisory opinion of 21 June 1971,³ all decisions of the Security Council are binding on all Member States. So it is perhaps necessary to remind

ourselves that all Members of the Organization have an obligation to effect the implementation of the decisions of the Security Council on Namibia, as indeed its decisions on any other problem of which it is seized. I recall in that respect the proposal made by the President of the Republic of Cyprus, Mr. Spyros Kyprianou, for the convening of a special session of the General Assembly devoted exclusively to the consideration of ways and means for the implementation of United Nations resolutions.

163. Cyprus stands firmly and unswervingly by the side of Namibia in the midst of its own tragedy and tribulation. With its independence and territorial integrity shattered by a foreign army of occupation, Cyprus continues its peaceful efforts in the quest of freedom, justice and vindication. We have not as yet relinquished hope, but I feel it my duty to stress from this important rostrum that developments are rather ominous and that a substantial qualitative and quantitative improvement in the proposals of the other side is imperative if progress is to be achieved.

164. Although it appears that, the world over, those who have learned to demolish principles cannot be easily converted into adherents of justice, I should like to express the wish that through international solidarity and pressure the people of Namibia, together with all others who are wronged, oppressed or trampled upon in this turbulent world, will ultimately have their freedom vindicated and their alienated rights accorded.

165. Mr. ALWAN (Iraq) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The United Nations has convened this emergency special session to consider the question of Namibia on the initiative of the non-aligned countries. That initiative reflects the priority and special interest accorded by the non-aligned countries to the question of Namibia. It likewise reflects the lack of mobility that characterizes the settlement of the crisis as a result of the position of certain Western countries, with the United States of America at their head.

166. The Co-ordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Countries held an extraordinary meeting at Algiers in April for specific consideration of the Namibian question. That resulted in a series of recommendations on the subject which marked out the path for the non-aligned countries to follow in dealing with the question within the United Nations and in other international forums.

167. The question was also the subject of substantial debate at the International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa, held in Paris last May, which resulted in the Paris Declaration on Sanctions against South Africa⁹ that contains a special paragraph on Namibia.

168. One of the main points on which agreement was reached during those meetings and at preceding ones was the need to emphasize the direct responsibility of the United Nations for Namibia, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 2248 (S-V) through the United Nations Council for Namibia, the legal Administering Authority for the Territory until it accedes to independence.

169. On this basis, an appeal was made for the convening of this emergency special session, which is

called upon not only to reaffirm the general principles at issue but also to find the means of applying the agreed principles which were adopted unanimously and to which world public opinion has rallied.

170. The General Assembly is called upon to reaffirm the inalienable right of the Namibian people to freedom and independence, under the leadership of its sole legitimate representative, SWAPO, and to render all assistance to SWAPO for the attainment of its just objectives.

171. In this respect we wish to mention the condemnation of the attempts to separate Walvis Bay from Namibia, which would violate the territorial integrity of Namibia. Safeguarding that territorial integrity is an essential responsibility of the United Nations.

172. The United Nations also has the responsibility of upholding the rights of the Namibian people over its natural resources, which are being plundered daily by the racist régime of Pretoria and by the transnational monopolistic corporations which co-operate with that régime. In particular, we would draw attention to the plunder of uranium from Namibian territory.

173. The way to a solution is quite clear; it is through the urgent implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia endorsed by Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

174. What is impeding the achievement of independence for Namibia and the accession of its people to freedom is the support given by certain Western States—in particular, the United States—to the racist régime of Pretoria; it is the co-operation between the racist Zionist régime in occupied Palestine with the South African régime. This support and co-operation is allowing the South African régime to continue its illegal occupation and to plunder the Territory of the Namibian people, to oppress that people and to commit acts of aggression against neighbouring African countries.

175. While the Western States claim that they are trying to find a solution to the Namibian problem by way of negotiations with South Africa so that Namibia can accede to independence, they have taken sides with South Africa, opposing sanctions against that régime as provided for in the Charter. The United States has gone so far as to refuse to condemn the aggression against Angola by resorting to its right of veto at the last meeting of the Security Council. Those same Western States, together with Israel, boycotted the International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa held in this regard in Paris, thus giving the green light to the Pretoria Government to continue its racist policies. The latest act of aggression against Angola, which violated all international legal systems and norms, has demonstrated the results of the policy of the Western countries that support the Pretoria régime.

176. The General Assembly is called upon to provide maximum assistance to SWAPO, the Government and the people of Angola and the front-line States in order to impose a total embargo on co-operation with South Africa and to overthrow the racist Pretoria régime. Iraq and the other Arab countries, which for their part are suffering from the aggressiveness of the racist

Zionist occupation régime of Israel, which maintains very close ties with the racist Pretoria régime, sees in the South African régime a threat to international peace and security. Iraq and the other Arab countries view with the greatest alarm the nuclear and military co-operation between Pretoria and Tel Aviv.

177. We reaffirm our solidarity with the Namibian people; we join their ranks and we support the common struggle against all racist régimes. We pledge to provide every assistance and support needed by the Namibian people and the front-line States in their struggle for the achievement of their just and legitimate aspirations.

The meeting rose at 1.25 p.m.

NOTES

1. See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-sixth Year, 2300th meeting.*
2. *Ibid.*, *Thirty-sixth Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1981*, document S/14677.
3. *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.
4. See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-fifth Session, Supplement No. 24*, vol. I, para. 358.
5. *Ibid.*, vol. I, annex II.
6. See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-fifth Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1980*, document S/14179.
7. *Ibid.*, para. 81.
8. See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-sixth Session, Supplement No. 24*, para. 222.
9. See A/CONF.107/8, sect. X.

