



CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Agenda item 27:	
Question of Namibia (<i>continued</i>):	
(a) Report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples;	
(b) Report of the United Nations Council for Namibia . . .	1765
Agenda item 3:	
Credentials of representatives to the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly (<i>concluded</i>):	
(b) Report of the Credentials Committee	1765

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

AGENDA ITEM 27

Question of Namibia (*continued*):

- (a) Report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples;
- (b) Report of the United Nations Council for Namibia

1. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the United Republic of Cameroon on a point of order.

2. Mr. AYAFOR (United Republic of Cameroon): The Assembly adjourned this morning in order to permit the Credentials Committee to examine and report to it on the illegal presence in this Hall of the racist South African delegation. We therefore formally move that the General Assembly decide not to hear the representative of South Africa before the report of the Credentials Committee has been disposed of by the Assembly.

3. The PRESIDENT: Members have heard the formal motion by the representative of the United Republic of Cameroon. I shall put that motion to the vote.

The motion was adopted by 113 votes to 23, with 1 abstention.

AGENDA ITEM 3

Credentials of representatives to the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly (*concluded*):*

(b) Report of the Credentials Committee

4. The PRESIDENT: We shall now consider the report of the Credentials Committee.

* Resumed from the 95th meeting.

5. It will be recalled that the General Assembly was obliged to adjourn the plenary meeting this morning when the presence of representatives of the delegation of South Africa in this Hall was challenged by the representative of the United Republic of Cameroon. Accordingly, at my request the Credentials Committee held its meeting today.

6. I understand that, in view of the urgency involved, the Credentials Committee has decided that an oral report should be made to the General Assembly, on the understanding that the report will be distributed in all the languages tomorrow morning as document A/35/484/Add.2.

7. I now call on the Chairman of the Credentials Committee, Mr. Rodolfo Piza Escalante of Costa Rica to present the Committee's report.

8. Mr. PIZA ESCALANTE (Costa Rica) Chairman of the Credentials Committee (*interpretation from Spanish*): At the 102nd plenary meeting of the General Assembly this morning the presence of the delegation of South Africa in the Assembly was challenged, and the matter was referred immediately to the Credentials Committee.

9. The Credentials Committee held an urgent meeting, the views of the various delegations were heard and it was clear from the discussion that there was no consensus on the matter submitted to the Committee; therefore it was necessary to hold a vote on whether the communication presented to the Assembly and before the Committee constituted valid credentials that would enable South Africa to participate in the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly.

10. By 6 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions, the Committee decided to reject the credentials of the delegation of South Africa to the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly. The Credentials Committee also decided that, in view of the urgency of the matter, the Chairman of the Committee should make an oral presentation of the report to the General Assembly and that the written report would be issued later as document A/35/484/Add.2.

11. The Credentials Committee recommends to the General Assembly the adoption of the third report of the Credentials Committee and proposes, therefore, the following draft resolution:

"The General Assembly

Approves the third report of the Credentials Committee."

12. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the Credentials Committee as just read out by the Chairman of that Committee.

The draft resolution was adopted by 112 votes to 22, with 6 abstentions (resolution 35/4 C).

13. The PRESIDENT: Several delegations wish to explain their votes. I call first on the representative of the Netherlands, who will speak on behalf of the 10 members of the European Community.

14. I remind representatives that explanations of vote are limited to 10 minutes and should be made from their seats.

15. Mr. SCHELTEMA (Netherlands): I have the honour of speaking on behalf of the 10 member States of the European Community to explain our vote on the report of the Credentials Committee.

16. Our attitude is based on legal considerations. We note that, in the absence of any other provision, the powers of the Credentials Committee are limited by the rules of procedure of the General Assembly to a verification of facts. The Committee, therefore, cannot pass judgement on the policies of the Government whose credentials are under consideration.

17. As the Committee has rejected the credentials of a delegation for reasons that are not those provided for in the rules of procedure of the Assembly, we had no choice but to vote against the Committee's report. We firmly believe that the principle of universality must be upheld. We fear that the very foundation of the Organization is weakened if its constitution is not respected.

18. These considerations are a matter of principle to us. They do not imply that our rejection of the policies of *apartheid* by the Government of South Africa is in question. Neither does it mean that our conviction that the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa must cease has become less strong.

19. Mr. LAPOINTE (Canada) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation cannot but deplore the decision just taken by the Assembly with regard to the representation of South Africa, a full-fledged Member of the Organization. The Credentials Committee and the Assembly itself have exceeded their authority by refusing to accept the credentials which has been legally submitted by that Government. That was tantamount to denying to a Member State the exercise of its fundamental rights and privileges, one of the basic principles of the Charter, which governs us all.

20. We continue to attach the greatest importance to the principles of universality and strict adherence to the distribution of powers between the Security Council and the General Assembly as provided for in the Charter, particularly in its Articles 5 and 6. What has just been decided is in direct contradiction to those principles.

21. The question which was before us was not that of the nature of the régime in power in South Africa, which we have always condemned; it was a purely technical question regarding the credentials of a delegation of a Member State which, quite clearly, were perfectly in order.

22. Mr. KLESTIL (Austria): The negative vote Austria has just cast on the report of the Credentials Committee is based solely on the legal provisions of the Charter of the United Nations concerning the participation of Member States in the work of the

General Assembly. It does not reflect the position my Government has always taken and will continue to take on the policy of *apartheid* practised by the South African Government.

23. The Austrian Government has repeatedly expressed its condemnation of the policy of *apartheid* and of South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia. On the other hand, my Government firmly believes in the basic principle of the universality of the United Nations and it is for that reason that my delegation voted for acceptance of the credentials of the South African delegation.

24. On the basis of rule 29 of the rules of procedure, my delegation voted against the motion of the representative of the United Republic of Cameroon.

25. Mr. KIRCA (Turkey): Turkey's position vis-à-vis the policies of *apartheid* of South Africa is well known and needs no reiteration here. We have made clear our total rejection of those racist policies in all the statements we have made as well as in all the votes we have so far cast in the Organization.

26. Therefore the positive vote we have just cast for the approval of the report of the Credentials Committee and our positive vote on the motion of the United Republic of Cameroon preceding it should be interpreted strictly in the light of this sense of protest we feel at such policies of South Africa.

27. Mrs. KIRKPATRICK (United States of America): The United States believes that South Africa's credentials should not be rejected and opposes the denial of South Africa's right to participate in the General Assembly.

28. The questions of procedure involved here have substantive implications of great import to the United Nations. In 1974 the United States made plain its strong opposition to the ruling of the General Assembly¹ whereby, by rejecting the credentials of the delegation of South Africa, the General Assembly had in effect decided to refuse to allow the South African delegation to participate in its work.

29. This afternoon the United States delegation reiterates its position.

30. Involved here are the most fundamental questions of membership and the rights of membership. The fact that South Africa's intention to resume its seat today was not known is irrelevant to the exercise of these rights. Neither is it relevant that South Africa is in arrears in the payment of its financial assessments. Only the Charter of the United Nations is relevant. The provisions and requirements of the Charter should be our only guide.

31. Under the law of Articles 5 and 6 of the Charter a Member State may be suspended or expelled from the United Nations only upon the recommendation of the Security Council as confirmed by the General Assembly. Yet depriving a Member State of the right to participate in the work of the only universal parliamentary organ of the United Nations is a principal consequence of suspension and expulsion, and that is also the consequence of denying a State the right to participate in the General Assembly.

¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-ninth Session, Plenary Meetings*, 2248th and 2281st meetings.

32. Consequently, the right of participation can only be denied in accordance with Articles 5 and 6 of the Charter.

33. The Security Council has never recommended that the Assembly should suspend or expel South Africa. For this reason the General Assembly's action in 1974 was without legal foundation. On so fundamental a question as the rights of membership the passing of time has not given the Assembly a better legal basis for doing in 1981 what it did improperly in 1974.

34. No one has shown that South Africa's credentials fail to meet the requirements of the rules of procedure. To refuse to consider those credentials as required by the rules is to use the guise of credentials to try to accomplish a suspension that lies beyond the powers of the General Assembly.

35. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of Iceland, to speak on behalf of the Nordic countries.

36. Mr. TÓMASSON (Iceland): On behalf of the Nordic countries—Denmark, Finland, Norway, Sweden and Iceland—I should like to state that our vote against approval of the third report of the Credentials Committee is based on purely legal principles.

37. We wish to see all Members of the United Nations participating in and co-operating with the United Nations. The Nordic Governments have repeatedly expressed their condemnation of the policy of *apartheid* and of South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia. The question before the Committee, however, was whether the credentials under consideration fulfilled the requirements of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. In the view of our delegations, that was the case and to decide otherwise would be tantamount to suspension of membership, which, under Articles 5 and 6 of the Charter, requires a recommendation of the Security Council and a decision of the Assembly.

38. The Nordic delegations strongly support the principle of the universality of the United Nations and, since the requirements of Articles 5 and 6 of the Charter have not been met, the credentials in question should therefore have been accepted.

39. Sir Anthony PARSONS (United Kingdom): My delegation is associated with the statement of the representative of the Netherlands, made on behalf of the 10 members of the European Community.

40. In addition, on behalf of the United Kingdom, I should like to make clear that my delegation does not consider that either the Credentials Committee or the General Assembly has the right to deprive a Member State of the rights of membership contained in the Charter. The Committee has rejected the credentials of the South African delegation for reasons which are not provided for in the rules of procedure of the General Assembly or in the Charter. We were therefore obliged to vote against approval of their report.

41. My delegation attaches fundamental importance to the principle enshrined in Article 9 of the Charter, namely that the General Assembly shall consist of all the Members of the United Nations.

42. Moreover we do not believe that it is in the interests of the Organization to exclude South Africa from participation in this debate. Nor will South Africa's exclusion help to solve the problems before us.

43. Before concluding, I wish also to explain my delegation's vote on the earlier vote on the proposal that the representative of South Africa should not be heard before the Assembly considered the report of the Credentials Committee.

44. My delegation voted against that proposal. We believe that the representative of South Africa should have had the opportunity to speak, in accordance with the terms of rule 29 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. That rule states clearly that any representative to whose admission a Member has made objection shall be seated provisionally with the same rights as other representatives until the Credentials Committee has reported and the General Assembly has given its decision.

45. Mr. von STUDNITZ (Federal Republic of Germany): I should like to associate myself with the statement just made by the delegation of the Netherlands on behalf of the European Community.

46. On behalf of my delegation, I should like to give the following additional explanation, to make it quite clear. My Government has no sympathy whatsoever with South Africa's policy of *apartheid* and has always stated so in this Assembly. However, the question that the General Assembly had to decide was a matter of the application of the Charter and rules of procedure based on it. The question has been considered by the General Assembly on repeated occasions. My delegation has consistently—I refer to my delegation's statements of 12 November 1974,² 24 May 1979³ and 13 October 1980 [*35th meeting*]³—held the view, and does so today, that the competence of the Credentials Committee does not go beyond the right to examine the due form of the credentials submitted by any given Government. It is inconsistent with the provisions of the Charter to evaluate the legality and the policies of Governments which issue such credentials.

47. It was on those grounds that my delegation voted against the approval of the report of the Credentials Committee.

48. Mr. FRANCIS (New Zealand): New Zealand was unable to accept the Credentials Committee's report on South Africa. New Zealand has always upheld the principle of universality and the right of all Member States to be heard. We do not believe that it is the function of the Credentials Committee to judge the legality of Governments; in our view its function is simply to determine whether credentials are in order.

49. Our vote on this issue in no way detracts from New Zealand's firm rejection of the South African Government's racist policy of *apartheid* nor from New Zealand's opposition to South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia.

50. Mr. LEPRETTE (France) (*interpretation from French*): On behalf of the French delegation, I should like to support what was said by the representative

² *Ibid.*, 2281st meeting.

³ *Ibid.*, *Thirty-third Session, Plenary Meetings*, 99th meeting.

of the Netherlands on behalf of the countries of the European Community.

51. My delegation's position has to do with legal considerations, in particular with Articles 5, 6 and 9 of the Charter. It is consistent with positions taken in similar circumstances by the French delegation.

52. We note that, in the absence of other provisions, the powers of the Credentials Committee are limited by the rules of procedure of the General Assembly to establishing the facts, that have nothing to do with the policies of the Government concerned. The Committee having rejected the credentials of a delegation for reasons not to be found in the rules of procedure of the Assembly, we had no choice but to vote against the Committee's report. We feel that an organization which does not respect its fundamental laws renders itself vulnerable. Any of its members could one day become victims of that weakness, whereas universality is the very foundation of the United Nations.

53. We understand and respect the feelings which, at past sessions and at this session, during the work of the Credentials Committee, have moved a number of delegations in denouncing the policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa. On many occasions, and very clearly, we have expressed our rejection of the policies of *apartheid*. We consider contrary to universal respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion, as required from Member States by the Charter, a policy that, on the pretext of separate development, establishes discrimination among men for ethnic reasons.

54. It is a matter of regret that South Africa was not given the opportunity to speak before the vote.

55. Mr. DÍEZ (Chile) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The vote that was just held was not on Namibia nor on the conduct of the Republic of South Africa; it was on the implementation of the legal norms in force in the Organization. We voted against the report of the Credentials Committee because we believe that it departs from the spirit and the letter of the Charter and because it is at variance with the principle of universality of the United Nations.

56. In addition—although this was not a decisive factor in our decision—we believe that that vote will only further alienate world public opinion from our work.

57. We are sorry that in voting thus we have had to stray from the majority of the Latin American countries and our friends from Asia and Africa, with many of which we share the firm repudiation of the illegal occupation of Namibia. We are also members of the United Nations Council for Namibia. But we firmly believe that the sole hope for respect for the small and medium-sized countries is support for the rule of law—and that was the principle which guided the delegation of Chile in the vote.

58. Mr. ANDERSON (Australia): The Australian delegation voted against the proposition that South Africa should not be heard in the Assembly today and against approval of the report of the Credentials Committee. We did so on legal grounds and particu-

larly because we support the fundamental principle of universality of membership in the United Nations.

59. This vote by Australia in no way detracts from my Government's categorical rejection of the policy of *apartheid* and its no less categorical rejection of the illegal occupation of Namibia by the Government of South Africa.

60. Mr. TOMA (Samoa): Samoa's abstention does not reflect our abhorrence of South Africa's policy of *apartheid*; our opposition to that policy is total. However, it reflects Samoa's belief that the examination of every Member's credentials should be in accordance with the rules applied to all other Members, as set out in the rules of procedure of the Assembly.

61. Mr. CASCAIS (Portugal): Portugal voted against the report of the Credentials Committee because it holds the view that the credentials submitted by the South African Government meet the necessary procedural requirements. Furthermore, it is our belief that South Africa should be considered as one of the parties to the question of Namibia, as has been stressed in many resolutions of the General Assembly on this issue.

62. However, this position should in no way be misconstrued or interpreted as meaning any departure from the well-known stand of my country on the Namibian issue or from our firm condemnation of the policy of *apartheid*.

63. Mr. PIZA ESCALANTE (Costa Rica) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Costa Rica wishes to make it quite clear why it abstained in the voting on the credentials presented by the Government of South Africa both in the Credentials Committee this morning and in the plenary meeting this afternoon.

64. First, the delegation of Costa Rica has condemned and continues vigorously to condemn both the illegal and inadmissible occupation of Namibia by South Africa and the racist and inhuman *apartheid* régime imposed by the minority on the indigenous majority in South Africa. For those two reasons, not only have we voted in favour of all United Nations resolutions condemning that Government but we have in addition always advocated and we continue to advocate that the General Assembly and, above all, the Security Council should begin taking more effective measures aimed at putting an end both to the illegal occupation of Namibia and to the *apartheid* régime.

65. However, my delegation believes that with regard to the problem of the credentials of the South African delegation, due account must be taken of certain other important considerations. These considerations require that we draw a distinction between two different situations. One is the legality or illegality of the delegation—and, in general, of the present Government of South Africa—in its representation of that country in the General Assembly; the other is the occupation of Namibia by the Government of South Africa.

66. In the first case, there is the question of whether the present Government of South Africa should or should not participate in the activities of the General

Assembly as representing a State Member of the United Nations. In the second case, it is more a question of a Government—whether or not a Member of the United Nations—which stands accused of grave violations of international law.

67. With regard to the representativeness of the Government of South Africa enabling it to furnish credentials to its delegation to the General Assembly—which is in fact the only matter that can be discussed as a question of credentials—my delegation abstained in that vote because in our view there are contradictory legal arguments to consider.

68. On the one hand, in favour of the credentials of this delegation is the fact that the United Nation has not taken any of the actions legally established in the Charter and the relevant rules of procedure. Hence neither the Credentials Committee nor the question of credentials can be used in passing judgement on this matter, which also involves such important principles as that of universality of membership in the United Nations.

69. On the other hand, there is an objective fact that militates against the credentials of the South African delegation and that is that we are dealing with a Government which openly and frankly does not claim to have a representative character, for it is based on an official policy of control by a minority.

70. In this connexion the contradictory arguments could not lead us to any other decision but that of abstaining. Nevertheless, when it comes to the illegal occupation of Namibia, we wish to make clear that in that case in our view the South African Government stands accused of international violations and, as such, not necessarily as a Member of the United Nations, must be heard before a decision is taken.

AGENDA ITEM 27

Question of Namibia (*continued*)

71. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now return to the consideration of agenda item 27.

72. I call on the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, Mr. Paul J. F. Lusaka of Zambia, to continue his statement.

73. Mr. LUSAKA President of the United Nations Council for Namibia: Mr. President, you have kindly said that you would like me to continue my statement. With your indulgence and that of the General Assembly, I should like to start my statement again from the beginning.

74. However, first of all, I should like to say that I have been surprised by the amount of time spent on the procedural matter raised this morning. I would have thought that the General Assembly decision of 1974 on this matter would have been upheld; but, unfortunately, that has not been the case.

75. This session marks 35 years of the life of the Organization and during those 35 years many countries have gained independence and have taken their rightful place among the community of nations as Members of the Organization. But for Namibia, which has remained on the agenda of the Assembly for 35 years, nothing has changed. Namibia remains dominated and illegally occupied by a foreign Power, South Africa.

76. Today, as 35 years ago, when a sacred trust was bestowed upon South Africa to take steps to ensure that the Namibian people attained their independence, Namibia is still a non-independent Territory, a Non-Self-Governing Territory, an illegally occupied Territory and, worst of all, it is dominated by that most vicious régime, the régime of South Africa. Not only has the South African régime betrayed the trust bestowed upon it by the United Nations with regard to the fulfilment of the well-being of the people of Namibia and the guidance of that Territory towards independence, but South Africa, by its continued vilification and oppression of the people of Namibia, has also poured scorn upon numerous resolutions of the Organization regarding the question of Namibia.

77. Because of gross violation of the human rights of the Namibian people through the denial and impeding of the people's right to self-determination, the General Assembly, during its twenty-first regular session and its fifth special session, decided to terminate the Mandate of South Africa over Namibia and demanded the complete and unconditional withdrawal of South Africa from the Territory. Namibia was subsequently placed under the direct responsibility of the United Nations through the United Nations Council for Namibia, which was established by the General Assembly in 1967 as the sole legal Administering Authority for Namibia until independence.

78. The Council, in exercise of its *de jure* authority over Namibia, enacted Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia [A/35/24, vol. I, annex II] providing, *inter alia*, that any licence or concession granted by the South African régime is null and void; that any natural resources taken from Namibia without the Council's consent are liable to be seized and forfeited in favour of the Namibian people; that any person or corporation contravening the Decree may be held liable for damages by the future Government of an independent Namibia.

Mr. Albornoz (Ecuador), Vice-President, took the Chair.

79. At the thirty-fourth session, the General Assembly, in resolution 34/92 B of 12 December 1979, declared that the exploitation of the natural resources of Namibia by foreign economic interests in violation of the Charter of the United Nations and also of the pertinent resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council and Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia, was illegal. By that resolution, the Assembly requested the Council for Namibia to look into the question of the exploitation of Namibian uranium and to report on its findings.

80. Many resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council have been adopted with similar pronouncements, as well as the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of 1971⁴ that, the presence of South Africa in Namibia having been declared illegal, all acts of South Africa in Namibia are illegal.

⁴ 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.

81. Requested to give its interpretation of the legal consequences for Member States of the continued presence of South Africa in Namibia notwithstanding Security Council resolution 276 (1970), the International Court of Justice, in the advisory opinion of 21 June 1971, stated that South Africa's continued presence in Namibia was illegal and that it was under obligation to withdraw its administration from Namibia immediately. The Court further declared that States Members of the United Nations were under obligation to refrain from entering into economic forms of relations or dealings with South Africa in connexion with and on behalf of Namibia. The Court was very specific and categorical in its interpretation of resolution 276 (1970), which in paragraph 2 declares that "the continued presence of the South African authorities in Namibia is illegal". The Court stated that "It would be an untenable interpretation to maintain that, once such a declaration had been made by the Security Council under Article 24 of the Charter, on behalf of all Member States, those Members would be free to act in disregard of such illegality or even to recognize violations of law resulting from it." The Court stressed that "When confronted with such an internationally unlawful situation, Members of the United Nations would be expected to act in consequence of the declaration made on their behalf". It is decision the Court concluded that "the decisions made by the Security Council in paragraphs 2 and 5 of resolution 276 (1970), as related to paragraph 3 of resolution 264 (1969) and paragraph 5 of resolution 269 (1969), were adopted in conformity with the purposes and principles of the Charter and in accordance with its Articles 24 and 25". The Court emphasized that those decisions were consequently "binding on all States Members of the United Nations, which are thus under obligation to accept and carry them out".

82. Nevertheless, the régime in Pretoria has continued to defy all the relevant resolutions of the United Nations on Namibia and the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice, and it has stubbornly persisted in its illegal occupation of that Territory, with the implicit connivance of many Western States—Members of the Organization—which are engaged in trade and many other multifarious military and economic relations with South Africa. This is absurd and sinful.

83. We are therefore not surprised that South Africa has concocted other schemes such as the so-called Representative Authorities Proclamation (AG.8), which divides the people of Namibia into racially and tribally defined puppet entities which are controlled by the so-called Democratic Turnhalle Alliance [DTA], the Action Front for the Retention of Turnhalle Principles [AKTUR] and other ethnic quislings masqueraded by South Africa internal political parties in the Territory. It is through this figment of its imagination that South Africa has also labelled some structure the Council of Ministers and has arrogated unto that structure executive and administrative powers. Therein exists a conglomeration of political misfits which are constantly shepherded and paraded before the Western world as the real representatives of the people of the Territory.

84. Now what does this mean? It means that South Africa hopes through this machination to win sup-

port and possibly recognition for these misguided elements in the Territory and thereby seeks to subvert the clearly known policy decisions of the United Nations concerning this question of Namibia. Indeed, the very insistence of South Africa, during the pre-implementation talks on Namibia at Geneva, on the so-called impartiality of the United Nations had this notion of forcing recognition of the so-called internal parties as its central theme. The racist régime of South Africa is at pains in its futile efforts to create confusion within the international community by instituting stratagems which are totally alien to the clearly expressed goals of the Organization regarding a legitimate and genuine solution of the question of Namibia. This effort by the Pretoria régime to cause confusion within the Organization has been witnessed by the General Assembly both this morning and this afternoon.

85. At the beginning of the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly, South Africa, through its puppet instrument Dirk Mudge, who is a member of the clandestine *Broederbond* and so-called chairman of the DTA, sought to participate in that session's debate solely as a ploy for recognition. I understand that last week he sent a similar request to the United Nations Secretariat, asking for an invitation to be extended to the DTA to participate in this debate on an equal footing with the South West Africa People's Organization [SWAPO]. Of course, Security Council resolution 439 (1978) would take care of that. In any case, that would be totally unacceptable because it is contrary to the many resolutions of the General Assembly, including the repeated policy position of the Assembly, which recognizes SWAPO as the sole and authentic representative of the people of Namibia. Only SWAPO has been accorded a standing invitation by the General Assembly to participate in the debate on Namibia. It is only SWAPO which, through the decision of the General Assembly, enjoys the status of Permanent Observer in the Organization.

86. South Africa must not be allowed through deliberate misrepresentation, misinterpretation and innuendo to seek to gain recognition by the United Nations for its puppets, thereby subverting the proper and due recognition which SWAPO has appropriately earned by its legitimate struggle for freedom and genuine independence and with the blood and sweat of Namibian freedom fighters and many martyrs.

87. We must reject as unfounded the insistence on accusations of partiality directed against the Organization by South Africa.

88. Let us constantly remain alert to all the manoeuvres which South Africa is persistently employing not only against the people of Namibia but also against the Organization. The South African régime is today busy trying to perfect its well-known trickery in the art of political ventriloquism and political acrobatics—which means the skill of talking through a dummy and the art of the somersault.

89. It is almost three years now since South Africa gave the impression of having accepted the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia. But throughout this period South Africa has sought to introduce a number of elements that are not germane to the expressly stated purpose of the plan and has

furthermore placed road blocks on the way towards the smooth implementation of the plan by attacking and killing as well as maiming refugees in SWAPO camps and committing acts of aggression against independent African States. The latest of these acts—only a few weeks ago—was against Mozambique.

90. Moreover, in an effort to create confusion and other difficulties during the period of the implementation of the plan, South Africa has embarked upon the process of the transformation of its illegal army in Namibia into the so-called South West Africa Territorial Force. That clearly means that South Africa intends to garrison its army permanently in Namibia under the sinister guise that it is a Namibian force, thereby subverting the intended purpose of the United Nations plan for the total withdrawal of all South African army personnel at the date of independence. Secondly, by conscripting and training additional tribal armies in the Territory, South Africa seeks to create a climate of civil war and inject it into what is genuinely a struggle by SWAPO for an inalienable right of a people to self-determination and independence. All these calculated machinations of that racist and illegal occupation régime in Namibia are as deplorable as they are abominable and deserve the condemnation of the entire international community without equivocation.

91. Throughout this period of talks in which South Africa continued to play a political hide-and-seek game with all the parties concerned, SWAPO consistently exhibited rare qualities of statesmanship by making the necessary concessions which would have facilitated the speedy implementation of the United Nations plan.

92. Even in Geneva, during the pre-implementation talks on Namibia, the President of SWAPO, Mr. Sam Nujoma, declared publicly that his organization was ready to sign a cease-fire agreement with South Africa. It is South Africa which rejected that offer and deliberately caused the collapse of the Geneva talks on Namibia.

93. The United Nations Council for Namibia commends the Secretary-General of the United Nations and his staff. It also commends SWAPO, the Organization of African Unity [OAU] and the front-line States and Nigeria for their patience, co-operation and steadfastness in this regard.

94. But South Africa, with its own misconceived illusions of racist grandeur, must never understand all these painstaking efforts which have gone into this exercise to mean that the international community is letting down its guard and relaxing the vigilance which it has always maintained. The international community and especially the five Western States—namely, Canada, the Federal Republic of Germany, France, the United Kingdom and the United States—must either start or continue, as the case may be, to put more pressure on the South African régime to comply with the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council on Namibia until the Territory is genuinely free and independent. Here, we must once more urge these Western countries which not only are trading partners and traditional allies of South Africa, but were also initiators of the ideas that ultimately culminated in the United Na-

tions plan, to flex their economic muscles and bring pressure upon the racist régime of South Africa to comply with the United Nations resolutions, thereby bringing about the implementation of the United Nations plan without any further delay.

95. The number of resolutions adopted on the subject of southern Africa—that is, Namibia and South Africa itself—since 1960 gives expression to the concern that the United Nations has manifested in dealing with a small group of white racists, backed in action by the big, Western Powers, in their oppression of the black people. The big Western Powers are behind 3 million white people who are oppressing more than 20 million non-white people in Namibia and South Africa, because of their economic, military, strategic, ideological and political relations with South Africa. But in Namibia the United Nations must assert its authority as the legal Administering Authority until the genuine independence of that Territory. The United Nations resolutions must be implemented in spite of the measures being taken by the Pretoria régime to extend and consolidate *apartheid* in Namibia. Namibia is the responsibility of the United Nations.

96. Many scholars and experts of varying degrees of international as well as academic repute have demonstrated with facts and figures during the hearings on Namibian uranium how these Western Governments—together with their multinational corporations—are in concert with the racist régime of South Africa in the plunder of the resources of Namibia. Much more outrageous and chilling among the revelations which came out in the testimony of many witnesses was that concerning the stage which South Africa has reached in its nuclear capability attained through the illegal exploitation of the Namibian uranium resources, with the collaboration of multinational corporations, including those of some Western Governments.

97. How horrendous and grim it would be if it were to happen that the people of Namibia and their neighbours in the region became victims of an atomic weapon put into the hands of mad racist South Africa by Western technology. It is time that Western countries which are collaborators of South Africa should see and acknowledge the danger which the Pretoria régime is rapidly posing to humanity in general and to the peoples of the southern African region in particular. The verbatim transcripts of the hearings on Namibian uranium—embodying testimony of experts and scholars—have already been published as a document of the United Nations Council for Namibia.

98. The Council will also be submitting to the General Assembly, as part of its report, summaries of that testimony together with our conclusions and recommendations proposing a programme of action. I must put it to the General Assembly that a concerted effort by all of us is required, in the spirit of co-operation, in order to demonstrate to the régime in Pretoria that we have come to the end of our tether over its vacillation on Namibia and a new programme of action to deal with the situation has become imperative. We must demonstrate to that intransigent régime that members of the international community are determined to act accordingly.

99. I want to emphasize the fact that South Africa must be held totally responsible for the collapse of the Geneva pre-implementation talks on Namibia. And it should now be clear to all that it is South Africa which is intransigent and has rejected once again a rare chance for a peaceful solution of the Namibian question, showing preference for a military confrontation whose consequences would be very serious indeed.

100. The front-line States and Nigeria, at their summit meeting in Lusaka on 17 February 1981, deplored the failure of the Geneva meeting and attributed that failure to racist South Africa's continued intransigence. On the other hand, they praised SWAPO for its commendable statesmanship during the talks. They concluded that with the failure of the Geneva meeting SWAPO had no alternative but to intensify the liberation war in Namibia.

101. We can no longer afford to wait for South Africa to make up its mind, because experience has taught us that wait has often meant never. We must go ahead with an action-oriented debate at this resumed session. And indeed the draft resolutions put before the General Assembly by the Council for Namibia clearly have that as a goal.

102. The Declaration adopted by Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries, held from 9 to 13 February 1981 at New Delhi, calls upon the Security Council to convene a meeting with a view to imposing a mandatory and comprehensive programme of economic sanctions against South Africa, in order to put an end to its illegal occupation of Namibia. The Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the OAU, held at Freetown from 1 to 4 July 1980, and the Committee for the Liberation of Africa, meeting at Arusha in January 1981, have also called for the same action. The Council of Ministers of the OAU, which has just met at Addis Ababa, has reiterated the call for sanctions against South Africa in April this year [see A/35/794-S/14390].

103. In our view, the General Assembly should respond to all those calls at this resumed thirty-fifth session.

104. Finally, it is my honour to introduce the annual report of the United Nations Council for Namibia. The recommendations, together with their financial implications, are contained in document A/35/24 and Corr.1 and 2, and comprise three volumes.

105. Volume I starts with the letter of transmittal and the introduction, both of which set the political tone of the Council in its perception of the crucial stage which the political situation in Namibia has now reached. This volume is further subdivided into three parts. Part one deals with the work of the Council as a policy-making organ of the United Nations, and it comprises six sections. Part two describes the work of the Council as the legal Administering Authority for Namibia and is divided into ten sections. Part three is a description of the Organization and decisions of the Council which are presented in two sections: section one describes the organization of the work of the Council, and section two contains formal statements, communiqués, resolutions and decisions of the Council covering the period under review. Volume I contains annexes to parts one, two and

three. Annex I contains the allocation of resources to the Council for 1980 within the programme budget for the biennium 1980-1981. Annex II is Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia. Annex III contains a list of official documents of the Council for Namibia.

106. Volume II, part four of the report, contains recommendations and their financial implications; it is subdivided into two sections.

107. Volume III, part five, is the report of the Council to the General Assembly on the hearings on Namibia uranium to which I have already referred in my statement. It is a self-contained report of about 100 pages, with its own recommendations and their financial implications.

108. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I now call on the Vice-Chairman of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, who will present chapter VII¹ of the report of the Special Committee.

109. Mr. HELSKOV, Vice-Chairman of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples: As the Vice-Chairman of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, I have the honour of introducing to the General Assembly chapter VIII of the report of the Special Committee covering its work during the year 1980 [A/35/23/Rev.1] concerning the question of Namibia.

110. The report, which relates to agenda item 27, is submitted pursuant to paragraph 12 of resolution 34/94 of 13 December 1979 on the implementation of the Declaration, by which the General Assembly requested the Special Committee "to continue to seek suitable means for the immediate and full implementation of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) in all Territories which have not yet attained independence and, in particular: "... to formulate specific proposals for the elimination of the remaining manifestations of colonialism and to report thereon to the General Assembly at its thirty-fifth session".

111. In continuing to perform the aforementioned tasks in relation to the question of Namibia, the Special Committee took into consideration the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly, particularly resolutions 34/92 A to G, as well as the relevant decisions of the Security Council and the United Nations Council for Namibia.

112. As will be noted from the report, during 1980 the Special Committee once again examined in depth developments relating to the question of Namibia with the active participation of the representatives of the United Nations Council for Namibia and of SWAPO.

113. In its consensus, adopted in August last year, the Special Committee called the attention of the international community to the extremely serious situation prevailing in Namibia as a result of the continuing manœuvres by the occupying régime of South Africa to perpetuate its illegal domination of the Ter-

ritory and considered that South Africa bears a grave responsibility for the creation of this situation, which seriously threatens international peace and security.

114. As the situation in Namibia continued to worsen as result of the intransigence, sinister manoeuvres and delaying tactics of the racist minority régime in Pretoria, the Special Committee observed that it was more than ever imperative that the United Nations reassert its responsibility in the matter and take urgent steps to bring about faithful and unqualified compliance by the minority régime with the decisions of the United Nations in order to enable the people of Namibia to exercise their inalienable right to self-determination and independence without further delay.

115. The Special Committee strongly condemned South Africa's continued illegal occupation of the Territory, its brutal repression of the Namibian people and its persistent violation of their human rights, as well as its efforts to destroy the national unity and territorial integrity of Namibia.

116. In reaffirming once again that Namibia is the direct responsibility of the United Nations, the Special Committee also reasserted the inalienable right of the people of the Territory to self-determination and independence in a united Namibia and the legitimacy of their struggle by all means at their disposal against the illegal occupation of their country.

117. The Special Committee rejected all manoeuvres by South Africa designed to legalize its own Turnhalle puppet elements in Namibia, including the creation of the "National Assembly", the "Council of Ministers" and the "South West Africa/Namibia Army" and declared that those illegal acts by the occupying régime were null and void, and it called upon all States to withhold any recognition to any representative or organ established as a result of those deceitful manoeuvres and not to co-operate with any puppet régime which the illegal South African administration might impose upon the Namibian population.

118. In reiterating that the only political solution for Namibia should be one based on the termination of South Africa's illegal occupation, the withdrawal of its armed forces and the free and unfettered exercise by all the Namibian people of their right to self-determination and independence within a united Namibia, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), the Committee reaffirmed the need to hold free elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations in the whole of Namibia as one political entity, in accordance with Security Council resolution 385 (1976). The Committee further reaffirmed its support for the people of the Territory and their national liberation movement SWAPO, and appealed to all Member States to grant SWAPO all necessary support and assistance in its struggle to achieve independence and national unity in a free Namibia.

119. The Special Committee condemned South Africa for its military build-up in Namibia and its illegal use of Namibia for acts of aggression against independent African countries. Finally, the Special Committee recommended that the Security Council consider imposing comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of

the Charter of the United Nations, with a view to securing speedy compliance by South Africa with the decisions of the Council.

120. On behalf of the Special Committee I commend the report to the serious attention of the General Assembly.

121. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): Before calling on the first speaker in today's debate, I invite representatives to turn their attention to document A/35/617, which contains the report of the Fourth Committee on the hearings it held on the question of Namibia. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the General Assembly takes note of the report of the Fourth Committee.

It was so decided (decision 35/451).

122. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): In accordance with General Assembly resolution 31/152 of 20 December 1976, I now call on the observer for the South West Africa People's Organization.

123. Mr. GURIRAB (South West Africa People's Organization): What an outrageous spectacle, what audacity on the part of a gang of marauding agents of the criminal international outlaws of *apartheid* South Africa seeking to obstruct the deliberations of the Assembly.

124. We knew through the grapevine that this was going to happen, so we had mobilized the forces on our side to undermine the sinister intentions of the vicious gangsters of the clandestine *Broederbond*. Still, we felt that some of their friends, who must have known in advance about all this, would talk them out of what they had in their deranged minds. Thus we considered that wisdom would in the end prevail over banditry, and such uncivilized behaviour as we saw this morning in this Hall. But we must accept the fact that a leopard cannot change its spots, no matter what.

125. True to type, the racist marauders once again made a point of deliberately sabotaging the proceedings of the session. They knew very well the world community's severe indictment of their evil system and the continued illegal occupation of Namibia. The ruling given on that subject by the President of the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly and sustained by other decisions since still stands out like a milestone and a valid parameter in the treatment of the status, if any, of the racist Boer junta in the United Nations.

126. The United Nations is being blackmailed and held to ransom by the representatives of an illegitimate régime, while the Namibian people are languishing as hostages held at gun point by the very Fascist régime that continues defiantly to maintain an illegal racist colonial occupation in Namibia. SWAPO notes with satisfaction the decision taken in the Assembly to reject the credentials of the illegal and illegitimate régime of South Africa in respect of both South Africa itself and occupied Namibia. We also took note of all the explanations of vote and we will consider them case by case as appropriate.

127. I must say at the outset in all candour that this debate, which belatedly is now taking place on agenda item 27, entitled "Question of Namibia", should

rightly have taken place in December last year as originally scheduled. Regrettably, however, the international criminal gang of the Fascist Boer junta of Pretoria through duplicity and dilatory tactics once again manœuvred to take the well-intentioned world community for a ride.

128. SWAPO was manifestly opposed to the postponement of the debate. We struck a note of caution. We stressed the fact that there was no evidence whatsoever of racist South Africa's having committed itself to co-operating with the United Nations in the search for an agreement leading to a negotiated or peaceful settlement of the thorny problem of Namibia. SWAPO was convinced that the Boer régime was resorting to its customary sinister political chicanery with a view to delaying further the implementation of Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978). This much was unmistakably clear to us.

129. As people who are dealing daily on the spot inside Namibia with the racist usurpers and terrorists, we have grown accustomed to their bad faith and die-hard mentality. The fact of the matter is that the bloodthirsty fascist, illegal régime is digging its menacing heels more and more into the ground in Namibia in order further to entrench the illegal occupation, colonial oppression and exploitation of our country.

130. I do not wish to labour the point more than necessary, because I do not delight in saying "We told you so". But I must stress that it is the successive Afrikaner régimes and the white settler minority racist clique which have invited the wrath of the world community upon themselves. They cannot blame anybody else for that. Nothing good has ever been said about the policies and practices of the non-representative minority régime of South Africa—in the United Nations or in various other international bodies. It is a country whose *apartheid* system has been condemned as a crime against humanity and whose régime has been dismissed as an illegitimate one.

131. In respect of Namibia, the record speaks for itself. Throughout the 35 years of the United Nations efforts to rid Namibia of foreign colonial domination, oppression and exploitation, every single one of these criminal Boer régimes has adopted an obstructionist policy of defiance and rejection of all the resolutions and decisions of the Organization. The Present Botha régime is no exception to the intransigence and prevarications characteristic of the Afrikaner Fascist authorities.

132. Today, in shameless disregard for honesty, the Pretoria racist mafia is trying to fool the whole world by twisting facts and shifting the blame somewhere else, especially on to the United Nations, for allegedly holding-up Namibia's independence. And, ironically, this diatribe and the distortions emanating from Pretoria enjoy sympathetic, if not encouraging, coverage in the mass media of the major capitalist countries. There is absolutely no element of truth in the empty yelling of the racist international outlaws. South Africa has no case whatsoever regarding Namibia. The repeated demand of the international community is for the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of South Africa's illegal, racist colonial Administration from Namibia.

133. The cause of the Namibian people is the cause of the United Nations and of all progressive, peace-loving and justice-upholding mankind. It is a cause of decolonization, of the attainment of the right to self-determination, freedom and national independence by the oppressed people of Namibia. It is indeed a cause of liberation, social justice and progress. These, we believe, are some of the ideals for whose fulfilment the United Nations was founded.

134. The Namibian patriots, led by SWAPO, their sole and authentic representative, have been waging a war of national liberation with arms in hand for these noble ideals. They are heroically suffering and sacrificing to reconquer our fatherland, to re-assert control and ownership over the natural resources of Namibia and to ensure that our people regain freedom and independence, which are their birthright.

135. In this bitter struggle, which is sustained through the blood, sweat and tears of our heroes and martyrs, we have been leading the Namibian masses at home and abroad, engendering vigour and determination in them to persevere in the struggle until victory is won. SWAPO has also adopted a strategy of engaging the enemy on all fronts: military, political, diplomatic and ideological. We have learned to fight by fighting. We have also learned to negotiate by negotiating, on the principle that negotiation is a form of struggle, and that what we are fighting for are basic political goals which we are determined to bring about, by either the bullet or the ballot.

136. It is with this perspective that we had agreed to negotiate and committed ourselves to co-operate with the Secretary-General in the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

137. In his report of 24 November 1980,⁵ the Secretary-General invited, amongst others, a SWAPO delegation to the United Nations-sponsored pre-implementation meeting at Geneva, the sole purpose of which was to set dates for an agreement on a cease-fire and for the emplacement of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group [UNTAG]. We accepted the invitation, on the clear understanding that it would be for SWAPO and racist South Africa, the two warring parties in Namibia, to facilitate such an agreement, as clearly stated in the United Nations plan.

138. When we agreed to go to Geneva, while we registered a strong protest in the knowledge that the meeting was doomed to a failure, SWAPO was never found wanting. Right at the outset of the opening meeting, Comrade Sam Nujoma, President of SWAPO, wasted no time by reiterating SWAPO's acceptance of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and adding that our delegation was ready, right there in Geneva, to sign a cease-fire agreement with the delegation of South Africa so that peace could come to Namibia and to co-operate with UNTAG—both military and civilian components—in order to ensure the early commencement of the implementation process.

139. We went to Geneva with no pre-conditions or demands, except that we stressed that the United Nations plan should be retained in its final and defini-

⁵ *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-fifth Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1980, document S/14266.*

tive form and that we would not, in any circumstances, renegotiate any element of the plan.

140. The fiasco of the Geneva meeting caused by the intransigence and arrogant behaviour of the delegation of racist South Africa has been covered widely by the international press. Extensive analyses and commentaries have been made by various interested parties. Several meetings reviewed the situation in Namibia subsequent to the failed Geneva meeting and adopted declarations, resolutions or programmes of action. Without any exception, responsibility for the failure of the meeting has been put squarely on the Pretoria régime, which deliberately wrecked that meeting.

141. In his report in connexion with the pre-implementation meeting, which was issued on 19 January 1981,⁶ the Secretary-General stated "I believe that the outcome of the meeting in Geneva must give rise to the most serious international concern. Members of the Security Council, and all those concerned, will wish to consider the proceedings and the situation which has now arisen."

142. Indeed, a most serious situation has arisen in the aftermath of the deliberate wrecking of the meeting by the Boer delegation. The question was raised right there in Geneva, namely, "What has to be done"?

143. SWAPO President, Comrade Sam Nujoma, responded in his concluding statement on 14 January 1981 in Geneva:

"I have reiterated over and over—and yesterday in my press conference—to world public opinion that SWAPO is ready to proceed at this very meeting to sign a cease-fire and to agree to a target date for the arrival of UNTAG in Namibia, so that peace may come to our embattled country.

"Regrettably, at no point throughout this meeting, and not even now, has the South African delegation made a similar firm commitment regarding Pretoria's readiness to sign a cease-fire and to agree to a firm date for the beginning of the implementation process."

He continued:

"Instead, this august meeting has been subjected to the most intemperate attacks and vilification by members of the South African delegation.

"In the face of South Africa's manifest intransigence and prevarications, this meeting cannot escape the obvious conclusion, namely, that this meeting, like all the other previous efforts by the international community to find a peaceful solution to the Namibian problem, has failed to achieve this noble objective.

"Consequently, the oppressed people of Namibia are left with no other alternative but to continue with the liberation struggle until final victory.

"We are confident that Namibia will be free. No people has ever been kept in permanent oppression. The question is: at what cost? The responsibility for the continued loss of life and suffering lies with the Pretoria régime. We are certain of one

thing, and that is that SWAPO enjoys the overwhelming support of the oppressed people of Namibia, whose yearning for freedom will continue to inspire the combatants of the People's Liberation Army of Namibia (PLAN) to persevere in the armed liberation struggle until final victory.

"In this context we return to our operational bases to increase and intensify our efforts on all fronts of the struggle.

"It follows also that the international community is left with no other choice than to continue to render all-round support and assistance to the Namibian patriots, who are resisting the illegal occupation and colonial oppression in Namibia.

"To this end the United Nations has a unique and special responsibility for Namibia and its people to ensure that genuine independence is achieved in the Territory. On this basis, the General Assembly must, during its forthcoming resumed session, make appropriate recommendations on Namibia to the Security Council. The Security Council should once again be called upon, as a matter of urgency, to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions, including an oil embargo, on South Africa in order to compel the Pretoria régime to relinquish its illegal and oppressive occupation of Namibia."

144. Similarly, in a joint press statement of 14 January 1981 the front-line States, Nigeria and the OAU, echoing our position, declared:

"From the outset it must be emphasized that this meeting"—that is, the meeting at Geneva—"is the direct consequence of the successful armed liberation struggle being waged by SWAPO. Therefore, if SWAPO agreed to attend the Geneva meeting, it was because they had hoped for results which are going to be achieved after the completion of the ongoing armed struggle. Throughout that struggle, Africa has always been and continues to be behind SWAPO. On behalf of the independent African States, we take this opportunity to pay a special tribute to the gallant fighters of SWAPO for the successes scored on the battlefield that have made this conference possible."

The statement continued:

"SWAPO declared during this meeting their readiness to sign a cease-fire agreement and to reach agreement on the date for the implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia. South Africa, on the other hand, has characteristically exhibited its usual obstinacy and intransigence by rejecting the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia. From the beginning it was clear to the front-line States, Nigeria and the OAU that South Africa was stalling for time by diverting this conference from discussing its main objective, the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). It was clear from the beginning that South Africa was here to wreck the meeting by provoking SWAPO through the most intemperate and sometimes outright crude language used by certain members of the South African delegation. The SWAPO leadership demonstrated to the world their statesmanship by refusing

⁶ *Ibid.*, *Thirty-sixth Year, Supplement for January, February and March 1981*, document S/14333.

to respond in kind, thereby making it possible for the conference to last as long as it has. We therefore hold the South African régime responsible for the collapse and failure of this meeting. SWAPO and ourselves came to this conference in the hope that an agreement on the modalities for the implementation of the Security Council resolution would be attained. That is why this meeting was expected to be the last one before the emplacement of UNTAG.

“SWAPO came here to conduct serious negotiations. They had hoped for positive results from this meeting. The same can also be said of the front-line States, Nigeria and the OAU. Regrettably, the racist régime of South Africa used this meeting to buy time to prolong its illegal occupation of Namibia.”

The statement continued:

“Now that the Geneva meeting has failed to produce the desired results, due to the usual South African contempt and disregard of the international community, we are left with no other alternative but to support the escalation and intensification of the armed struggle heroically being waged by SWAPO. In this regard, the OAU member States as a whole pledge their full backing for SWAPO. Africa pledges increased material and financial assistance to SWAPO until final victory and total liberation of Namibia. The United Nations, and indeed the international community as a whole, must feel as rebuffed as Africa has been. We therefore call upon the international community to understand our motives and rise to the occasion and adopt effective measures against the *apartheid* régime of South Africa, including economic sanctions as called for under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.”

145. Not too long thereafter, the Co-ordination Committee for the Liberation of Africa, having critically analysed the problem of Namibia in all its aspects, especially its military and political dimensions, adopted a strong resolution and a comprehensive plan of action on Namibia, including the setting up of an emergency Namibian liberation fund for the promotion of the armed struggle being waged by the People's Liberation Army of Namibia, the military wing of SWAPO.

146. This, then, is SWAPO's and Africa's call for action. This is what we have now brought before the Assembly for endorsement.

147. Although it is true that the problem of Namibia is close to the hearts of all the peoples of Africa, it is equally true that it is an international problem; it is a problem which should affect all of humanity. It follows therefore that there was world-wide reaction and anger at what transpired at Geneva. As would be expected, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries responded constructively and unequivocally in the Declaration issued at their New Delhi Conference. It joined in Africa's call for punitive measures against the illegal, racist colonial régime of South Africa in order to force that régime immediately and unconditionally to vacate Namibia. It firmly stood behind SWAPO. The Movement has also decided to set up a Namibian solidarity fund to

mobilize funds for the armed struggle being waged by SWAPO in Namibia.

148. I know that there have been extensive consultations here at the United Nations as well to support the actions taken so far. For example, the United Nations Council for Namibia spared no efforts in responding in a most appropriate manner to the challenge hurled at the international community by the Pretoria racists.

149. In our view, the crowning act is manifested in the strong position of the Council of Ministers of the OAU whose thirty-sixth session has just concluded its meeting at Addis Ababa and adopted yet another resolution on Namibia. In that resolution the Ministers condemned South Africa, denounced the Western “contact group” for its recalcitrance and connivance with the racists and for its apparent unwillingness to exert concerted pressure on racist South Africa. The Ministers also once again expressed complete solidarity with SWAPO and reiterated the total commitment of the OAU member States to increasing material, military, financial, political and diplomatic support to the heroic people of Namibia, through SWAPO, their sole and authentic representative, in order to intensify further the armed struggle in Namibia.

150. The question before the resumed session of the General Assembly is whether the international community can now demonstrate the courage of its convictions by drawing the line here. It is, in our view, a matter of urgency for the Assembly to adopt unambiguously a clear and categorical position representing the awareness of the world community that enough is enough and that what is called for is the total mobilization of all resources, as was done against nazism, to end the racist colonial oppression and illegal occupation of Namibia by the neo-Hitlerites of South Africa. The Assembly should once again urge the Security Council to apply a all economic sanctions, including a total oil embargo, against racist South Africa, as recommended by the OAU, the non-aligned movement, and the United Nations Council for Namibia.

151. We foresee difficult days ahead of us; we expect vicious and massive military attacks and political repression from the enemy; our people will be subjected to a renewed terror campaign of arbitrary arrests, incarceration, torture and killings. Right now numerous Namibian youth and students are being conscripted at gun-point into the Fascist, colonial army of the occupation régime to fight their fellow Namibian patriots of the People's Liberation Army of Namibia. Yes, they will certainly endure increased sufferings and make the supreme sacrifice. The President of SWAPO raised a question in Geneva: At what cost must Namibia win freedom? The Namibian patriots and combatants have taken up arms to free Namibia. The United Nations, which has assumed a unique and special responsibility for Namibia and its people until independence, must also now answer that question, not merely in words but through action.

152. This is the first time since the unanimous election of Mr. von Wechmar to the presidency that I have spoken in the General Assembly. May I at this time extend to him our sincere congratulations and offer

him our best wishes for the successful completion of the remainder of his mandate as President of the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly which has so many urgent tasks before it.

153. The brilliant election of Mr. Salim A. Salim of the United Republic of Tanzania as President of the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly was a source of great pride and satisfaction to us. His stewardship of the Assembly was outstanding and innovative. We are proud of his memorable contribution and remain convinced that Africa's prestige has thereby been greatly enhanced. While he is now serving his beloved country as its Foreign Minister, Africa as a whole would like to see him playing a prominent role one day in the wider context of international affairs.

154. Nearly four years ago a diplomatic initiative of the Western "contact group" was launched amidst lofty words and political fanfare. It was advertised as an alternative to the intensification of the reactionary violence *versus* armed struggle in Namibia in particular and southern Africa in general. It was also stressed that the "contact group", using collectively the enormous influence and leverage that the major Western trading partners of South Africa have over that régime, would be able to prevail over South Africa to accept and comply with the United Nations resolutions and decisions on Namibia.

155. We were thus manipulated and urged not to insist on calling for the application of economic sanctions and an oil embargo against the Pretoria régime until the Western initiative had taken its course. It was said that our frustrations and impatience were justified, understood and shared, but that we should try to extend the zone of patience a bit further.

156. SWAPO, Africa, the United Nations and the rest of peace-loving mankind agreed after much reflection and when the countries concerned had repeatedly iterated and reiterated their bona fide intention to deliver us from the Boer régime.

157. The events on that score since the spring of 1977 are a matter of record and are well known to the representatives and the United Nations Secretariat. If we could put a price on the loss of human lives and destruction of property during that period, it would run into trillions of dollars. But, then, how can we quantify the value of human lives? We are still busy trying to put a price-tag on the systematic decimation of the Namibian population by the brutal colonial forces of imperial Germany. But, even so, can we bring the dead back to life?

158. The fact of the matter is that Namibia is not yet free. The promises and assurances given in the spring of 1977 have proved to be fraudulent and dishonest. How else can we interpret the obvious recalcitrance of the so-called contact group, which continues to pretend that it is completely helpless in the face of Pretoria's continued defiance, intransigence and hostility towards the international community.

159. SWAPO knew very well and put it on record before the Western Powers that their economic and strategic interests, huge investments and other financial concerns and military arrangements in southern Africa constituted too profitable a real estate, yielding

super-profits and enormous guarantees for the survival and stability of the capitalist world. Thus our people must continue to suffer and die while the natural resources of our country are being illegally exploited to the detriment of the present and future generations of Namibia.

160. Years ago we recognized the racist Boers in South Africa as mere front-line managers and police for the monstrous governmental and private interests of the ugly transnational corporations and the military alliance of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization [NATO] in our region.

161. It is through these elaborate and deep ties of the traditional alliances that racist South Africa is given all the help it needs to maintain racial domination and colonial occupation in Namibia and to wage a war of imperialist expansion and aggression against independent African States.

162. Yet, to add insult to injury, the racist demagogues and their imperialist supporters try in their mass media, by way of outrageous propaganda and carefully orchestrated distortions, to cover up the victimization and exploitation for which they are responsible in our country. The heroic, patriotic struggle we are waging to free our land and to take the destiny of our country again in our own hands is being presented as if we were mere pawns in the imperialist aggressive war to maintain or expand its global hegemony or as if we were representing some phantom foreign interests.

163. Today we hear new voices using the old rhetoric of cold-war militarism and interventionist impulse. Those countries, which like the socialist countries and other friends of the struggle, have throughout the years of our bitter struggle stood with us are being viciously castigated as being responsible for the misery and subjugation which speak to the condition of our people. We do not need anybody to tell us that we are oppressed and exploited by foreign Powers and interests and that our land is occupied by a colonial army more than 70,000 strong. We know this; we see and feel this every day in Namibia. It is the weapons and armaments made in and mercenaries from the NATO countries, including Zionist Israel, that kill our men, women and children—lest we forget Kassinga.

164. The challenge posed by racist South Africa to the international community is really a challenge to the Western "contact group". If they felt four years ago that our demands then for the application of total economic sanctions against South Africa were premature, now we expect them to take the lead in calling for sanctions against the defiant, criminal régime of South Africa or to support such a call without any hesitation or excuses.

165. We do not expect the Assembly at this session to waste time on irrelevant issues and preposterous demands made at Geneva by the delegation of South Africa or the latest public relations charade here by that very same racist country. South Africa is alone responsible for the situation in Namibia and cannot, through sinister schemes and dilatory manoeuvres hope to devolve that responsibility on its puppets and local racist agents of the so-called National Assembly or the bogus Council of Ministers. Nor do we

want to be dragged into the pros and cons of the forthcoming all-white parliamentary election in *apartheid* South Africa, which we have dismissed as yet another political gimmick aimed at relieving international pressure.

166. The President of the Assembly postpone the debate on Namibia last December in order to allow the Geneva meeting to take place. Today he has called the resumed session of the General Assembly to order and the debate on agenda item 27 has finally commenced. I am grateful to him and to all the representatives for their kind consideration in allowing me to be one of the first speakers.

167. I have had great pleasure in listening to the previous speakers and have taken note of their remarks and the recommendations contained in the reports submitted to the Assembly. I must make special mention of the work of the United Nations Council for Namibia under the wise and dynamic leadership of Mr. Paul Lusaka of Zambia in its support of and solidarity with the struggle of the Namibian people. I should like to go on record as fully endorsing his statement and all the recommendations that he has so ably put before the Assembly. I wish I could say that all the draft resolutions before this Assembly would be adopted unanimously. But I am practical and realistic. I know that there is a conflict of interests in some imperialist quarters, and I know that there will be some lame excuses before or after the vote. I am, however, consoled in the knowledge that the overwhelming majority of the countries represented here will support the struggling Namibian people and SWAPO.

168. In addition to the recommendations that have today been made from this rostrum, the Assembly has recommendations from the ministerial meeting of the countries of the non-aligned movement and the OAU, recommendations we endorse fully.

169. It is therefore my sincere hope that the Assembly will act on the basis of all those recommendations in terms of its own work and in connexion with those actions and decisions that it must recommend to the Security Council in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.

170. Before concluding, I should like on behalf of SWAPO and in the name of the entire people of Namibia to extend to Mr. Kurt Waldheim our goodwill and our appreciation for his tireless efforts to expedite the decolonization of Namibia. We are most grateful to him for the co-operation and courtesy that we have always received from him and his colleagues. I wish to reassure him that we remain ready to co-operate with the United Nations in our common search to implement United Nations resolutions.

171. Finally, I shall merely repeat what our national leader has said: that the struggle continues until final victory. We have no other choice but to intensify the armed liberation struggle and we therefore expect generous and all-round support and assistance from the world community. May we add our voice to the harmonious chorus of peace-loving, progressive and justice-upholding mankind in appealing for effective assistance for the front-line States whose selfless support for the cause of liberation in southern Africa has made them targets of unprovoked military attacks

and other acts of aggression committed against them by the fascist régime of South Africa.

172. The struggle continues. Victory is certain.

173. Mr. ILLUECA (Panama) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Under the outstanding presidency of Mr. von Wechmar the General Assembly has today resumed its thirty-fifth session to consider the critical situation regarding Namibia, agenda item 27.

174. After the collapse of the meeting held at Geneva during the second week of January 1981 the Assembly once again has before it the tragic plight of the fraternal peoples of southern Africa. It is therefore up to the international community to use the enforcement machinery it has available to counter the obstinacy of the South African Government, which in open contravention of Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978) systematically conspires to thwart the holding of free and fair elections in Namibia under the supervision and control of the United Nations.

175. Corrective action by the United Nations must not be further delayed, as everyone is aware of the manoeuvring of the racist régime of Pretoria to perpetuate its illegal occupation of the Territory of Namibia as well as the exploitation and depletion of uranium and other natural resources through fraudulent and illegal schemes; through all kinds of massive violations of the human rights and fundamental freedoms of men, women and children; through the arbitrary arrest and detention of political activists; and through attempts, as desperate as they are reprehensible, to destroy SWAPO in a futile effort to achieve suppression of the national independence movement of the Namibian people.

176. Panama's Foreign Ministry firmly believes that the legal and political bases for a peaceful solution to the question of Namibia within the framework of the United Nations can be found in the declaration on decolonization [*resolution 1514 (XV)*]; in the resolution on the permanent sovereignty over natural resources [*resolution 1803 (XVII)*] in the Declaration on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order [*resolution 3201 (S-VI)*]; in General Assembly resolutions 2145 (XXI) and 2248 (S-V); in the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of 21 June 1971; in Security Council resolutions 385 (1976), 431 (1978), 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) and in General Assembly resolutions 3111 (XXVIII), 31/146 and 31/152, in which, *inter alia*, SWAPO was recognized as the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people and was given observer status in the General Assembly.

177. In regard to the difficult path towards Namibian independence, my country wishes to pay a tribute to Mr. Paul J. Lusaka of Zambia, the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, and through him to the members of the Council for the extraordinary work that that body, as the legal administering authority of Namibia until its independence, has done. That work is clearly reflected in the three volumes of the Council's report as well as in the additional report submitted by the President of the Council on the occasion of the resumption of the thirty-fifth session, in conference room paper dated 26 February 1981. The important information and recommenda-

tions contained in those reports provide the Assembly with the background it needs to arrive at the agreements which the present historic moment demands.

178. Moreover, the General Assembly cannot fail to consider at the present time the Declaration on Namibia and Programme of Action in Support of Self-Determination and National Independence for Namibia, proclaimed in its resolution S-9/2 of 3 May 1978, as well as the Algiers Declaration and Programme of Action on Namibia, adopted by the United Nations Council for Namibia at its extraordinary plenary meeting in Algiers [A/35/24, vol. I, para. 91]. Nor can the General Assembly disregard the statement of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the OAU, held at Freetown in 1980; the recent agreements of the Co-ordination Committee for the Liberation of Africa, which met at Arusha, from 19 to 23 January 1981; and the relevant sections of the Final Declaration of the Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi from 9 to 13 February 1981.

179. In the view of the delegation of Panama, the draft resolution recommended by the United Nations Council for Namibia, with a few stylistic changes that may be necessary, should command the support of the General Assembly—if not of all the members, then surely of an overwhelming majority. The draft resolutions to which I have referred describe thoroughly and accurately the situation prevailing in Namibia as a result of the illegal occupation of the Territory by South Africa; the intensification and co-ordination of United Nations actions in support of Namibia; the programme of work of the United Nations Council for Namibia; the action of the intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations in connexion with Namibia; the support for the United Nations Institute for Namibia; the activities connected with the Nationhood Programme for Namibia; the United Nations Fund for Namibia; the dissemination of information on Namibia; the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the People of Namibia for Independence; the question of Namibian uranium; and the situation resulting from South Africa's refusal to comply with United Nations resolutions on Namibia.

180. Nevertheless, we believe that the debate on this question must focus particularly on consideration of the situation produced by South Africa's having caused the failure of the Geneva meeting held from 7 to 14 January 1981. The central purpose of that meeting was to achieve a firm agreement on the date of a cease-fire and the beginning of the implementation of the plan proposed for the independence of Namibia before the end of 1981, in accordance with resolution 435 (1978) adopted by the Security Council as a result of the negotiations of the five Western States members of the Security Council in 1978—that is, the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Canada and the Federal Republic of Germany—together with the front-line States; Angola, Botswana, Zambia, Mozambique and the United Republic of Tanzania; as well as the two main parties, the Government of South Africa and SWAPO.

181. In that connexion, it should be pointed out that the Government of Panama maintains its offer of a

contingent of 500 troops from its armed forces to form part of the military contingents of UNTAG.

182. The Secretary-General, in his further report concerning the implementation of Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978), makes an objective presentation of the failure of the Geneva meeting. In that report⁶ the Secretary-General, without reservation, assigns responsibility for the collapse of the Geneva meeting to the Government of South Africa, when he states "It became clear in the course of the meeting, that the South African Government was not yet prepared to sign a cease-fire agreement and proceed with the implementation of resolution 435 (1978)".

183. In the face of the delinquent attitude of South Africa, an attitude of open rebellion towards decisions of the General Assembly, the Security Council and the International Court of Justice, the Government of Panama believes that the General Assembly must adopt the measures required by the existing serious situation in southern Africa, taking into account the following elements: First, Namibia is the direct responsibility of the United Nations; its occupation by South Africa is illegal. Secondly, the United Nations is duty bound to ensure self-determination, freedom and national independence in Namibia. Thirdly, there can be no doubt about, or violation in any way of, respect for the territorial integrity of Namibia, which includes Walvis Bay, the Penguin Islands and other islands facing the coast. Fourthly, the United Nations Council for Namibia, as the Administering Authority of the Territory until independence, must promote and strengthen its co-operation with the non-governmental organizations supporting the liberation struggle of the Namibian people, under the leadership of SWAPO, its sole and authentic representative.

184. The international community cannot recognize and must reject any assembly, administration or entity established at Windhoek that is not the result of free elections in Namibia held under the supervision and control of the United Nations. The international community must recognize, as does my Government, the constructive support of SWAPO in the search for peaceful formulas to solve the problem.

185. My Government also commends the positive activities, the patience, the spirit of understanding and the high sense of ethics of the African leaders, who showed extraordinary restraint in Geneva in the face of the desperate South African provocations. We commend the front-line States and Nigeria, as observers at the Geneva meeting, for their valuable and intelligent contribution.

186. Today more than ever we can see the urgent need for the Western States that are permanent members of the Security Council, and that have the means to do so, to exert decisive pressure on South Africa and to take steps to ensure that that Government co-operates with the efforts of the Secretary-General to implement the United Nations plan for Namibia, a goal for which Mr. Martti Ahtisaari, the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia, has been doing such outstanding work; we thank him most sincerely for this. At the same time, my country hopes that the States Members of the United Nations will, through

financial contributions, ensure the putting into effect of the recent decision by the Liberation Committee of the OAU to establish a special fund for the liberation of Namibia.

187. The Panamanian Government, aware of its responsibilities as a member of the Security Council and as a member of the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Countries, after having assessed the conclusions and recommendations of the United Nations Council for Namibia, of the OAU and of the Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries at New Delhi, believes the time has come for the General Assembly, in the exercise of its functions and powers under Article 11, paragraph 2, of the Charter, to recommend to the Security Council that it adopt the enforcement measures authorized in Chapter VII of the Charter to compel South Africa to implement United Nations resolutions on the independence of Namibia. To that end, as long as South Africa continues its refusal, the Council must see to it that the arms embargo against South Africa is strengthened and that an effective oil embargo against South Africa is enforced. It must also see to it that South Africa is deprived of all material, technical and any other type of assistance in the sphere of nuclear energy, as we know the militaristic purposes of the racist régime of Pretoria.

188. In keeping with the conclusions reached by the ministerial meeting at New Delhi, my country also feels that, if the Security Council because of a veto by any permanent member is unable to implement the enforcement measures required by the present situation, an emergency special session of the General Assembly should then be convened at the level of Ministers for Foreign Affairs, in order to review the question of Namibia and adopt the measures that are appropriate in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations. That type of action must not be sidestepped, since Namibia is the direct responsibility of the United Nations and since the Organization is in duty bound to render effective the self-determination and independence of a united Namibia.

189. The question of Namibia represents not only the most shameful remnant of colonialism in the world, but also the accumulation of more than three decades of frustration of the United Nations system by the obstinate refusal of South Africa to fulfil its international obligations.

190. It is possible to affirm, without fear of error, that the question of Namibia has the potential to destroy the United Nations, just as the question of Abyssinia led to the downfall of the League of Nations.

191. In this situation, the lack of political will among the permanent members of the Security Council, with their veto power, has played an important role. As a result, the international community has up to the present been unable to resolve the question of Namibia and the problems of southern Africa, nor has it been able to resolve many other grave problems, such as those concerning the Arab-Israeli conflict in the Middle East, the situation in South East Asia, the situation in South West Asia, the question of Cyprus and conflicts affecting the very existence of the coastal States of the Persian Gulf and the Indian Ocean.

192. It is clear that all those problems and many others—in Africa, Asia and Latin America—remain unresolved as a result of the rivalry between the two super-Powers. Moreover, the present outlook in international relations is clouded by the intensification of the arms race and by the deterioration of the world economic situation, which may be further worsened if the constant increase in oil prices continues or if there is a serious interruption or disruption of the supply of oil from the areas of conflict.

193. In connexion with the question of Namibia, there is every reason to expect that the Security Council, in a forthcoming meeting, could resolve the matter once and for all in the only manner possible, which involves nothing other than the national independence of a united Namibia throughout its territory.

194. In connexion with the other disturbing problems and international conflicts which my country has mentioned, we believe that those could be considered with the possibility of success at a meeting of the Security Council at the level of heads of State or Government, along the lines suggested by the President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Soviet Union, Leonid Brezhnev. There would, of course, have to be adequate preparatory work for that, which would have to include broad agreement on an agenda and possible solutions and agreement would have to be reached among the permanent members of the Security Council not to utilize the veto and to arrive at negotiated solutions that could command a consensus.

195. We have no doubt that in compliance with the feelings of Member States the Secretary-General and the very experienced Secretariat staff would cooperate enthusiastically in preparations for the convening of such an important meeting.

196. The solution of the question of Namibia cannot be made subordinate to the conflicts that exist between the two super-Powers because insurmountable obstacles would then arise. The task of the General Assembly is to seek ways and means to put an end to colonialism, racism and *apartheid* in southern Africa, and in particular in Namibia, towards that end overcoming the obstacles that exist. It is clear that the era of détente that began in 1972 came to an abrupt end in 1980 with the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, which has opened the door to a return to the regrettable methods of the cold war.

197. A new United States policy to restore that country's superiority has been clear as of 20 January 1981 and has given extraordinary priority to strategic interests, or so-called international security, above and beyond any other concern of a social, cultural, economic or spiritual nature. We wonder what consideration will be given to the heartfelt yearnings for freedom of all dependent peoples, the denial of which is the most serious threat to world peace. As was stated by the Secretary-General at New Delhi, in addition to the question of Namibia, "there exist unfortunately a number of unresolved problems in other parts of Africa and in Latin America". The new policy of rearmament, the hard line adopted by President Reagan's Administration to contain so-called Soviet expansionism, has created a commo-

tion in the framework of international relations. That reaction can be gauged from the statement made in this country at the end of last week by Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher of the United Kingdom, in pledging British support for the actions of President Reagan to block what she described as Soviet intrusion in regions vital to the interests of NATO, including El Salvador, Africa and the Persian Gulf.

198. We believe that the question of Namibia, African problems, Latin American problems, Asian problems and the complex situation in the Persian Gulf cannot be resolved using the criterion of whether the solution of such problems is in harmony with the alleged "vital interests" of NATO or the Warsaw Pact alliance. Rather than in Africa, we believe, or in El Salvador, as stated by James Reston and reported on 28 February 1981 in *The New York Times*, it is in the area between the Mediterranean and the Indian Ocean that the threat of Soviet expansion must be dealt with.

199. Latin Americans and North Americans share the same geographical space in the western hemisphere. Our respective countries—and here historians on both sides agree—were formed by radicals who cherished freedom and began their independent life as a result of a bloody liberation revolution which freed them from their colonial status—because we were colonies. We have many reasons to live in peace as good neighbours and to give validity, in the exercise of our sovereign equality, to the principles of international law concerning friendly relations and co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter.

200. Aware as it is that it is not a territory that lends itself to colonialism or neo-colonialism or any kind of hegemony or foreign domination, Latin America aspires to live in harmony with the States of the continent, which must no doubt be aware of Latin America's importance to the international community as the most highly industrialized region of the developing world and as a region which, moreover, is composed of young nations whose population in the next two decades will reach the figure of 600 million persons, of which two thirds will be under 25 years of age.

201. For Latin America, the case of El Salvador, which has been compared with that of Africa, has particular characteristics since its social and economic problems are more profound than those created by struggles between ideological groups. The case of El Salvador, moreover, has been presented on the continent and beyond as a problem that is global in character rather than regional. The impact that this approach will have on the future of the inter-American system can be assessed from the reactions which have recently been manifested and will be manifested in Latin American capitals at the governmental and non-governmental level.

202. The Government of Panama agrees with the Government of Mexico that a military solution is not viable and cannot be lasting and that only a political solution resulting from a peacefully negotiated consensus can restore peace and security to the region. The same concern has been expressed by other important sectors of Latin American and European

public opinion, above all the political circles which compose the Socialist International comprised to a great extent of social-democratic parties. In this connexion the validity and effectiveness of the legal and political machinery of the inter-American system, still remains to be tried, particularly the machinery enshrined in the Charter of the Organization of American States and in the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, which are essentially based on a procedure of consultation that up to the present has been an eminently inter-American institution.

203. Western Germany and France have stated through their most authoritative spokesmen that they prefer a "political solution" to a "military solution" in El Salvador. This position is in line with the views of the Secretary-General, who stated at the New Delhi Conference that "the arms race cannot either remove the threats of today or be a shield against the dangers of tomorrow". The Secretary-General added: "We must all, therefore, encourage a perception of security in other than military terms. This requires an unceasing effort to build confidence among nations which, in turn, demands that the causes of distrust should be constructively dealt with".

204. In connexion with the parallels that could be drawn between Africa, El Salvador and the Persian Gulf, we must point out that, just as Latin America is committed to seeking Latin American solutions to Latin American problems, African countries, acting through the GAU, are also committed to the search for African solutions to African problems without disruptive foreign interference, be it from within the continent or from abroad.

205. The question of Namibia demonstrates how ineffective the Security Council has been up to the present in its attempts to resolve this serious international problem. We must overcome the weaknesses of a system that reduces the Council to a state of impotence and possible paralysis in the case of Namibia because of the possible use of the veto.

206. Everyone is aware of the priority importance attached by the major Powers of the East and West to their relations with the countries in their respective military alliances and with the countries that are the keys to their control of world transportation routes, of the supply of oil and other raw materials, and to the projection of their political, economic, social and cultural influence. The case of South Africa is an example of this phenomenon, given the importance of that country for the control of the sea route around the Cape as a means of access to the Indian Ocean and the South Atlantic.

207. The United Nations, in adopting the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, expressed its conviction that the continuation of colonialism prevents the development of international economic co-operation, obstructs the social, cultural and economic development of dependent peoples and militates against the ideal of universal peace of the United Nations. That conviction remains valid, because strategic interests must not prevail over the yearning of peoples for freedom nor undermine their right to the exercise of self-determination and the achievement of territorial integrity and independence.

208. It would therefore be highly unfortunate for the interests of democratic peoples if any Western Powers having the right of veto and clinging to so-called strategic interests or asserting so-called positions of defence of their international security were to prevent the Security Council from implementing urgent enforcement measures which cannot be postponed in order to compel South Africa to comply with the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia.

209. Those who feel that the interests of a State are safeguarded when priority is given to international security over the vital interests of the population concerned are committing a serious mistake. Hence we wonder, can there be international security without national stability? Can the security of a State or group of States be protected, as resentment builds up in them, by promoting the subjection of peoples to foreign domination and exploitation or by denying them their basic human rights?

210. Small and medium-sized countries do not have the physical means to put an end to the monstrous oppression suffered by Namibia under the South African colonial yoke. But what we can do is rise up in international forums, as we are doing in the General Assembly, uniting in a respectful but forceful demand that the major Powers put an end to their rivalry and confrontation and place their vast resources at the service of the United Nations to find a prompt solution to this problem through a peaceful process leading to independence for the Namibian nation. In a highly interdependent world such as the one in which we are living, Panama, like other Latin American countries, and together with the other non-aligned States, is opposed to having international problems resolved from the sectoral standpoint of a Communist or non-Communist world. Intelligent minds must be aware of the dangers involved for freedom and democracy as a result of such an approach, which could promote a resurgence of fascism and nazism, the architects of which unleashed the tragic hecatomb produced by the Second World War. It must, therefore, be a source of deep concern for peace-loving States that third world countries are deliberately chosen as appropriate theatres of confrontation between the United States and the Soviet Union.

211. We must admit that in the Assembly the view prevails that the resources available to the major

Powers must be used, without further waste of time, to bring about Namibia's freedom and independence. It is those countries that are able to put an end to the long and painful plight of the Namibian people and to open new horizons of peace and progress for the African continent.

212. Every minute, every hour and every day that this inconceivable situation goes on, resentment deepens, hatred intensifies, coexistence is poisoned and conditions abound for the outbreak of widespread rebellion, with its bitter train of revanchism, social disruption, economic imbalance and, more distressing still profuse bloodshed, as is inevitable in a struggle for national liberation. In short, the door would be shut to moderation, and we would see the turbulence of extremism.

213. We have stated before, and we repeat now, that, as the Secretary-General has had occasion to warn, we must not lose sight of the possibility that the patience, the capacity to withstand hardship and constant humiliation, and the innate goodness of African peoples, may be exhausted and that the oppressed peoples of South Africa may decide to obtain justice by their own hands—by the heroic hands of the stalwart freedom fighters. At that time we will hear lamentation and cries of distress; we will see contorted faces and hands outstretched in anguish.

214. We believe there is still time to avoid having the people of Namibia and our brothers in southern Africa, because of the deaf ears of the major Powers of the international community, abandon peaceful methods and seek the light of day via the dark path of violence and extremism, which are the only avenues open to human beings when they are denied their right to be free, when they are victims of frustration, misery, disillusionment and despair.

215. We are confident that the voice of Africa, the voice of Asia, the voice of Latin America and the voice of non-aligned Europe, united with the outcry of oppressed peoples, through the Assembly and by the adoption of the draft resolutions submitted by the United Nations Council for Namibia, will enable the Security Council to implement, on the basis of Chapter VII of the Charter, the political and economic enforcement measures that will compel South Africa to comply fully with the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia.

The meeting rose at 7.30 p.m..