



CONTENTS

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 . . . 1797

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. Mr. SASTROHANDOYO (Indonesia): As at the previous session, my delegation looks forward to your able guidance during this resumed session of the General Assembly dealing with the question of Namibia. My delegation would also like to take this opportunity to express its appreciation for the capable leadership of Mr. Paul Lusaka, President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, in conducting the activities of the Council during the past year. Indonesia takes pride in the Council's continued strong efforts to carry out its mandate in support of the people of Namibia and their sole and authentic representative, the South West Africa People's Organization [SWAPO], in its struggle to achieve self-determination, freedom and national independence in a united Namibia.

2. We postponed our discussion of the issue at hand during the regular session last year with the optimistic expectation that the then-scheduled Geneva pre-implementation meeting, undertaken at the initiative of the Secretary-General, would give rise to the independence for Namibia which we all seek. However, the expectations of the international community were not met by South Africa, nor was the willingness of SWAPO to sign a cease-fire agreement reciprocated, thus resulting in the collapse of the meeting. It is obvious that South Africa undermined the talks with the aim of prolonging its control of the Territory of Namibia because South Africa's demand for so-called "impartiality" in prospective elections is absurd, considering the fact that it would be South

African officials who would conduct the elections provided for by Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978) under the observation of a United Nations Transition Assistance Group [UNTAG]. South Africa's unwillingness to reach a peaceful solution was further exposed when the South African Administrator-General of Namibia stated that it had been premature for South Africa to enter into the pre-implementation plan.

3. It is very obvious that the international community and SWAPO have been most patient and reasonable in the search for a peaceful solution of the question of Namibia. However, we cannot afford to continue to tolerate South Africa's charade any longer, for the result of Pretoria's intransigence has not only led to a continuing stalemate in the search for a solution of the question, but, more tragically, permits the Pretoria régime to continue to carry out its illegal occupation.

4. In addition to South Africa's continued colonial domination, the Pretoria régime also exploits the natural resources of Namibia without due consideration of environmental factors and in contravention of various United Nations resolutions as well as of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia [A/35/24, vol. I, annex II], issued by the Council for Namibia in 1974 and approved by the General Assembly. The exploitation involves not only the mineral resources, but also the marine and fishing resources of Namibia, and this at a time when the 200-mile economic zone is finding acceptance in international law. This is not only a direct challenge to the international community, but is also deeply detrimental to the present and future economic well-being of the Namibian people.

5. If this exploitation is allowed to continue, Namibia may well start its independence on a weakened economic footing. As a result, it is incumbent upon the international community to act immediately to terminate this illegal exploitation and to safeguard Namibia's economic legacy for its own people. This is particularly true regarding the uranium resources of Namibia since it is not only an economic issue as concerns the natural resources that can rightfully be exploited only by the Namibian people, but is also an issue of world peace and stability.

6. The Council has well documented the role of transnational corporations in assisting the Pretoria régime in its illegal exploitation of the resources of Namibia and in co-operating to strengthen the régime in the military and nuclear fields. In many cases these corporations initially gained expertise in nuclear technology as the result of research and development efforts that are often financed by their Governments. Having created the conditions which give these corporations the opportunity for profitable sales to South

Africa in the field of nuclear technology, no Government can plead ignorance of what these corporations are doing. My delegation believes that by controlling the activities of these corporations the Governments concerned can make a significant contribution to ending the exploitation of Namibia as well as South Africa's nuclear development and can enhance Namibia's move towards independence since the corporations' support of Pretoria now helps to undermine, directly or indirectly, the Namibian liberation movement.

7. My delegation is pleased that last year's hearings on Namibian uranium called attention to the economic exploitation and the military threat it raises to international peace. This threat is due to the dangers of nuclear proliferation resulting from South Africa's sale of Namibian uranium and the development by South Africa of a nuclear capability. This possibility already exists as a result of a reported nuclear explosion carried out by Pretoria. In view of this, my delegation supports the call contained in the report of the Panel for hearings on Namibian uranium [*ibid.*, volume III] for the Security Council to consider this particular issue and take appropriate action.

8. An increasing military threat already exists, and I am referring to the stationing of some 75,000 to 100,000 troops by South Africa in Namibia. Those troops are not only used to subjugate the Namibian people, but they also make aggressive attacks on Namibia's neighbours, thereby worsening the already serious situation in the region.

9. To aid the Namibian struggle for independence it is important to promote greater awareness among the people of the world so as to create a strong and favourable world opinion. The United Nations Council for Namibia can assist in this effort by continuing to inform the world of the latest developments in Namibia and by keeping the issue before the public's attention. In this regard, the visits of the special missions of the Council to various States, along with international meetings, have played a role in sharpening international focus on the Namibian question, as was the case of the International Conference in Solidarity with the Struggle of the People of Namibia, held in Paris from 11 to 13 September 1980.

10. But these activities alone are not sufficient. We must strive to carry out the findings and realize the goals of these missions and meetings; and, in this connexion, the Algiers Declaration and Programme of Action on Namibia [*ibid.*, vol. I, para. 91] is a useful plan for implementation, and we must all adhere to it.

11. Indonesia has a particular concern for the issue, as manifested by my country's commitment to and participation in various international activities sponsored by the Council on behalf of Namibian independence. Along with the rest of the international community, we have sought an expeditious and peaceful solution in line with Security Council resolution 435 (1978), but, as we are all aware, these efforts have proved to be in vain.

12. In the light of the failure to arrive at a settlement at the recent Geneva pre-implementation meeting, it is imperative that a new avenue be pursued. My delegation looks forward to a new Security Council initiative, but the value of convening a special session of

the General Assembly is becoming more obvious in view of the collapse of the recent Geneva talks, which promoted our Foreign Minister to propose at the Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi from 9 to 13 February last that, given the failure of the pre-implementation meeting, "it is therefore necessary to convene as soon as possible a special session of the United Nations General Assembly to consider the follow-up actions required".

13. Mr. GBEHO (Ghana): Mr. President, first of all I should like to express my delegation's great pleasure at having you preside over the resumed session of the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly. The well-deserved acclaim and respect that you won for yourself through the commendable manner in which you conducted the first part of the session and the brief session held in January strengthen our hope for success in our present deliberations on the difficult question of Namibia. In the performance of this task you can count on the full support and co-operation of the Ghana delegation.

14. There should have been no need for the holding today of a debate on Namibia. But it will be recalled that during the thirty-fifth session we took a collective decision to defer the debate on the question of Namibia in order to pursue what we then considered a glimmer of hope in the effort to resolve the problem of Namibia. This debate today is the sad story of the pursuit of that hope.

15. When the Secretary-General made public his report of 24 November 1980,¹ the delegation of Ghana and, I believe, several other delegations supported the initiative to have the General Assembly postpone the debate on Namibia because we felt that there were certain positive elements in the report which could be pursued at the proposed Geneva meeting with a view to securing self-determination for Namibia through fair and free elections under United Nations sponsorship. In short, the Ghana delegation felt that, on the basis of the conclusions of the Secretary-General's report, an opportunity had come to set in train a process that would lead to the signing of a cease-fire agreement and the commencement of UNTAG operations, in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

16. Unfortunately, the expectation of the international community was to be in vain. As it turned out in Geneva, Pretoria, true to its style, had been less than frank with the Secretary-General and had shown to the whole world that it was not interested in the proposed UNTAG operations. On the contrary, it had gone to Geneva to buy time. Indeed, behind the facade of a willingness to negotiate, the South African delegation used the occasion to make the most reprehensible statements against practically all parties to the meeting. There was no doubt that its agreement to the holding of the Geneva meeting was just a ploy to perpetuate South Africa's illegal occupation of the Territory and frustrate the legitimate aspirations of the Namibian people. We have come to the painful conclusion that the failure of the Geneva meeting, as

¹ Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-fifth Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1980, document S/14266.

recognized by all, was the direct responsibility of South Africa. This event constitutes yet further testimony to the contempt of Pretoria for the United Nations.

17. Disappointing as the outcome of the Geneva meeting was, the delegation of Ghana believes that it has demonstrated that the impartiality of the United Nations was not, after all, the core issue for South Africa. The meeting has, therefore, served the useful purpose of exposing that Government's real intentions. The discourteous and prevaricating stance of the South African delegation was in marked contrast with the co-operative attitude of the SWAPO delegation. It is our view that if any doubts have existed in the mind of the international community as to our distrust of the racist régime, those doubts should now be discarded and support given to the United Nations in its final efforts to restore legality and independence to Namibia.

18. When Africa asked for a reconvening of the General Assembly, we did so in order properly to assess the situation regarding Namibia in the light of the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia, now before this Assembly [A/35/24 and Corr. 1 and 2], and also of the experience gained in Geneva.

19. The question of Namibia has been discussed in the United Nations for well over three decades; repeated efforts to solve the problem through numerous United Nations decisions have been continually frustrated by Pretoria; similarly, the relevant decision of the International Court of Justice² has also been ignored by South Africa. And yet this Assembly remains divided as to the action required to restore Namibia to legality and grant independence to the people of Namibia.

20. In our view, the quickest and most effective solution would be to unite in our determination to request South Africa to abide by the decision to hold fair and free elections in Namibia without any further delay, and under the supervision of the United Nations. There are influential members of the Assembly that are capable of exerting pressure on South Africa and we call upon them to use their political leverage to get South Africa to comply with Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

21. It is an open secret that the recent strong stand of South Africa against a United Nations settlement of the Namibian problem is the direct result of renewed hopes of support from certain Western countries. We believe that these hopes are misguided and, unless we are to turn the clock back, it is important and necessary that these hopes be smothered at once. As we debate the next steps to be taken by the Assembly to restore Namibia to legality, we trust that our partners will state their positions unequivocally to South Africa.

22. We have often been reminded here by several delegations about the importance of adhering to legality in dealing with South Africa. Legality is not a principle to be followed only in procedural matters: it should extend to substantive issues affecting Namibia,

as well. The illegality of South Africa's occupation of that Territory has been established beyond all doubt and we must unite in our determination to rid the Territory of all trappings of illegality.

23. Now I turn to the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia which is before the Assembly. As in previous years, the report has again underlined the serious threat to international peace and security arising from Pretoria's continued illegal occupation of Namibia. Specifically, it has drawn attention to a number of dangerous developments in the Territory and to their repercussions in the neighbouring African States—namely, Pretoria's unilateral appointment of an Administrator-General for Namibia, the unilateral registration of voters in the Territory, the series of unprovoked acts of aggression against Angola and Zambia and the intensified repressive measures against SWAPO designed to wipe it out as a liberation movement. In brief, paragraphs 10 to 16 of volume I have placed the situation in Namibia in its proper perspective and should, therefore, help the Assembly in taking the appropriate decision at the end of the present debate.

24. The delegation of Ghana supports the Council's recommendations and will vote positively for draft resolutions A to J contained in the report because their general objectives are in accord with the position of Ghana on the Namibia question, particularly as regards the urgency of resolving the question of the self-determination of the people of that Territory, the illegality of Pretoria's continued presence in Namibia, the leadership of SWAPO and the intensification and co-ordination of action by the international community to end the illegal presence of South Africa in Namibia.

25. To achieve these objectives, the General Assembly should be prepared to adopt stronger measures than have been resorted to in the past. We have come to this conclusion because all previous measures have failed to work, even when the international community has acted with the greatest restraint vis-à-vis South Africa so as to give diplomatic initiatives a chance of success. South Africa has, unfortunately, abused this restraint and must now face the full rigour of the provisions of the Charter. It is our view, therefore, that this Assembly should conclude the present debate with an unequivocal recommendation to the Security Council to impose mandatory comprehensive sanctions against the racist régime so as to bring to the end of the illegal occupation of Namibia.

26. Before concluding my statement I should like, on behalf of the delegation of Ghana and on my own behalf, to pay a well-deserved tribute to the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, Mr. Lusaka of Zambia, and to the members of the Council for their untiring efforts to find a solution of the problem of Namibia. In the same vein, I should like to thank the Secretary-General and his energetic staff for the important and dedicated service that they continue to render to the international community in the difficult negotiations on the question of Namibia. I should like to place on record our admiration for the exceptional calm and the diplomatic maturity they have shown in the face of the most trying circumstances.

² *Legal Consequences for States of the Continued Presence of South Africa in Namibia (South West Africa) notwithstanding Security Council Resolution 276 (1970), Advisory Opinion, I.C.J. Reports 1971, p. 16.*

27. Throughout the liberation struggle, we in Ghana have stood and continue to stand firmly behind SWAPO. We are happy to note that our support for this liberation movement was more than justified by the events of the Geneva meeting, and we renew that unflinching support for SWAPO and its leadership at this crucial phase of its struggle to achieve the legitimate aspirations of the people of Namibia.

28. Mr. SLIM (Tunisia) (*interpretation from French*): At this resumption of the thirty-fifth session, we are finally examining agenda item 27 on the question of Namibia. Many months have passed since the date on which this item was to have been discussed, months which we have attempted to put to good use and during which strenuous efforts were made to attain a peaceful solution of the problem, in accordance with the United Nations plan and Security Council resolution 435 (1978). A long process of bargaining and negotiations took place in which we had place all our hopes; and its last stage was the Geneva meeting this past January.

29. In going to Geneva the front-line States and SWAPO—and behind them all Africans—were guided solely by the principles of freedom and justice, relying solely on the virtues of negotiation and dialogue and animated solely by the determination to re-establish law and peace. Great political maturity and a keen sense of responsibility were shown by them throughout the negotiations; they also demonstrated a moderation and a flexibility which do honour to them, thus reflecting their sincere desire to do everything possible to avoid bloodshed and to spare the fraternal Namibian people their daily measure of death, desolation and destruction. SWAPO clearly demonstrated that it was ready immediately to sign a cease-fire and loyally to implement the United Nations plan in order to achieve independence in an atmosphere of peace and freedom. In a word, the Africans avoided imposing any veto at Geneva and managed to overcome the legitimate scepticism they felt as a result of the nature and designs of the Pretoria régime.

30. What are the results of all these efforts and that goodwill? Our profound disappointment today is equalled only by the gravity of the failure and its heavy consequences for the destiny of the people of Namibia and for peace in that region of Africa. For one question immediately presents itself: does the United Nations settlement plan have a chance of being implemented this year and will Namibia enjoy independence before the end of 1981 as provided for in Security Council resolution 435 (1978)?

31. Indeed it is more and more difficult to go on trying to pretend to believe that the Government of Pretoria is prepared to bring about any true change. The outcome of the Geneva meeting and the events of the last few days have revealed the true intentions of that Government. They constitute a new and intentionally definitive confirmation of the *fait accompli* and of its domination; they remind those of us who had hoped against hope that it is futile to continue to be lulled by illusions; and they form part of a particular context, of the implacable logic that characterizes the vision of the aggressor and the very system of *apartheid*. The last supplementary report concerning the implementation of its resolution 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) submitted by the Secretary-General

to the Security Council on 9 January 1981 [S/14333]³ is by no means ambiguous in that regard. However, there is one thing that Tunisia has never doubted: the inevitable victory of the brother people of Namibia. Africans have in no way proved unworthy of history. There is no reason for Africa's remaining the only continent where domination persists and *apartheid* holds sway.

32. A further series of lessons can be gleaned from a thorough reading of the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia. In that connexion I should like to praise all the members of the Council and its President, Mr. Lusaka of Zambia. They deserve our respect, our gratitude and our support for the competent, skilful and effective manner in which they conceived and implemented the decisions and programmes of the Council in the fulfilment of its mandate. I should like also to pay a tribute to the Secretary-General for the urgent steps he has taken and the resolute efforts he has made without cease throughout the years in the search for a peaceful settlement in accordance with resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. Likewise, the Tunisian delegation has already had an opportunity to express its great appreciation for the tireless efforts of the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia, Mr. Ahtisaari, and his exemplary dedication in the preparation and implementation of the Nationhood Programme for Namibia.

33. Since its establishment in 1967 the United Nations Council for Namibia has played a most important role in increasing public awareness of and growing international support for the cause of the Namibian people in the just struggle it is waging for independence under the leadership of SWAPO, its sole authentic representative. The activities of the Council have included public information campaigns and the preparation of various programmes of assistance designed to promote the economic and social well-being of the Namibian people. That is why we must assist the Council and strongly support all its activities, since it represents not only the legal Administering Authority for the Territory but also the most effective body for putting an end to the illegal presence of South Africa in Namibia.

34. There are two main elements in the Council's report which are of particular importance in our view.

35. The first of these is the Algiers Declaration and Programme of Action on Namibia adopted by the Council on 1 June 1980, which enlighten the international community with regard to the nature of the problems that exist in Namibia and which clearly indicate the choice between a conflict which may lead to escalation with disastrous consequences, and the speedy transfer of power to the people of Namibia on the basis of free and fair elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations.

36. The second is the disastrous consequences for Namibia of the frantic and merciless exploitation of the natural resources of the Territory by foreign economic interests operating in collusion with the Pretoria authorities. This sheds light for us on the forces which

³ Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-sixth Year, Supplement for January, February and March 1981.

are supporting South Africa in its arrogance and constant defiance of the decisions of the United Nations. Transnational corporations have a considerable appetite for profit, and that is the sole criterion of their conduct in Namibia. By their investments, those foreign economic interests contribute in large measure to the maintenance and strengthening of the Pretoria régime; at the same time, they constitute a major obstacle to the realization of the legitimate aspirations of the Namibian people and will, of necessity, have serious consequences on the economic growth and development of future independent Namibia.

37. The purpose of this debate is not to plead for the independence of Namibia; that stage has been left behind. The Namibian people has struggled enough to deserve that independence; and if it continues to struggle above and beyond the recognition of this principle which no one will challenge today, it is for a well-deserved purpose that will do it honour in the history of decolonization, namely the struggle against servitude and dehumanization, and against time—the time which South Africa wants to gain by its delaying tactics in order to perpetuate its systematic policy of aggression and exploitation, and the time which we want to gain for the cause of peace and the good of mankind.

38. For its part, Africa cannot be accused of favouring a solution of violence over peaceful solutions. We have seen proof of that many times, and on a number of historic occasions. However, it does draw a distinction between, on the one hand, the search for a peaceful solution which must from the outset indicate a will for change and, on the other hand, obstruction and immobilism.

39. But what can be done in the face of affronts offered by South Africa, its machinations and delays at a time when Western Powers seem to be inflexible in their failure to assist any positive action? Can those Powers not understand that they can no longer act in this manner?

40. We do not want to give in to pessimism and despair, and we still hope that the course of peace has not been definitively blocked. What we are afraid of is that habits of tension and violence will change the very content and significance of our civilization. A new positive and realistic approach is needed now more than ever. But this action will largely depend upon our capacity to avoid misunderstanding and to make efforts in the context of the principles and objectives which have long been defined by the international community. Our success will hinge also on the political will which some Member States will display in order to go beyond immediate contingencies, legal considerations, the political framework and trading or strategic considerations.

41. If the Organization—which alone holds legal authority over Namibia until that Territory reaches independence fails, at the risk of serious damage to its prestige and credibility, to pick up Pretoria's challenge, no decisive progress can be made in southern Africa or elsewhere.

42. I should like to take this opportunity to express to SWAPO, the sole authentic representative of Namibia, the full and total support of my Government

as well as the active solidarity of the Tunisian people as a whole. We are convinced that the sacrifices of the Namibian people will not have been made in vain. Thanks to the determination and wisdom of SWAPO, Namibia will soon enjoy freedom and independence.

43. We propose to react to the violation of law, to domination and to racist violence by the legitimate action advocated in the enforcement measures contained in the Charter. Indeed, we are of the view that only global and mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter will compel South Africa to implement the resolutions and decisions of the United Nations.

44. Our final objective is to put a final end to decolonization.

45. Mr. SHELDON (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*interpretation from Russian*): The events which have been occurring in the south of the African continent, particularly in Namibia, have provided compelling testimony as to the further deepening and irreversibility of the objective processes of historic development. As was recently stressed in a report delivered to the twenty-sixth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union by the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, Leonid Ilyich Brezhnev, the 1970s virtually saw an end to the process of eliminating colonial empires.

46. In the last decade alone a number of young States which have taken the course of independence and social progress have appeared on the map of the African continent. The victory of the patriotic forces of Zimbabwe have swollen the ranks of independent African States by a new fiftieth member, the Republic of Zimbabwe, the mounting ferocity of the liberation struggle in Namibia and South Africa itself are all eloquent evidence of the fact that colonialism in, so to speak, its classical form is doomed and its days are numbered.

47. In conditions of a difficult struggle with imperialism, the independent African countries and the national liberation movements in southern Africa have had to perform the task of eliminating the remnants of colonialism, racism and *apartheid*. The imperialists have been doing everything in their power to curb the movement of the African peoples for self-determination, independence and social progress and have been attempting to fetter them with the chains of neo-colonialism so as to be able to dispose more freely of their natural resources and use their territories for strategic purposes.

48. The colonialist and racist régime of South Africa, with the connivance and virtual support of the major Western Powers members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization [NATO], has been making systematic attempts and carrying out specific actions in order to perpetuate its illegal occupation of Namibia and prevent its people from attaining self-determination and independence and has been seeking to install and consolidate a puppet neo-colonialist régime in that Territory. The South African racists have been continuing and intensifying their terror and repression against the Namibians, particularly members of SWAPO, and have adopted a course of expanding the

militarization of the country and the annexation of individual parts of it, as well as the rapacious exploitation of its human and natural resources. At the 103rd meeting of the Assembly the representative of SWAPO again spoke of these things. Those actions by Pretoria constitute a further striking proof of the fact that South Africa is openly disregarding the relevant resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly and cynically refusing to comply with the United Nations decisions on Namibia. Those actions also demonstrate the limitless hypocrisy of the South African racist bosses who, on the one hand, talk a great deal about what they describe as their readiness to find ways and means of bringing about a political settlement in Namibia but, on the other hand, exploit the endless talks about such a settlement and the delaying and drawing out of these talks in order to play for time and entrench the neo-colonialist puppet régime that Pretoria has installed in Namibia.

49. In the declaration of the International Conference in Solidarity with the Struggle of the People of Namibia, which has been published as an official document of the United Nations, it is stated:

“The racist régime of South Africa has resorted to desperate acts and devious manœuvres to continue its illegal occupation of Namibia, consolidate its illegitimate rule over the great majority of the people of South Africa and to reverse the march of freedom in Africa.” [See A/35/539-S/14220.]

50. The Pretoria régime has armed itself to the teeth and is trying to acquire a nuclear potential, in co-operation with or with the participation of major Western Powers and their transnational corporations, in order to intimidate and blackmail the Governments and peoples of the whole region.

51. After the recent total failure of the Geneva talks, for which the South African racists are to blame and in which their Western protectors and patrons connived, the true purport of the political balancing act of the Pretoria régime has been even more convincingly revealed, as has its final and high-handed refusal to comply with United Nations decisions on Namibia and to resolve the Namibian problem by means of negotiations.

52. All the political manœuvres and stratagems of the racist régime of South Africa have been repeatedly condemned by the United Nations, the Non-Aligned Movement, the Organization of African Unity [OAU] and all the progressive forces of the international community. The Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries, which was held at New Delhi, categorically condemned the Pretoria régime for its constant refusal to leave the Territory of Namibia which it illegally occupies and for its deliberate undermining of the Geneva talks. That Conference called upon the Security Council as a matter of urgency to apply against South Africa mandatory economic sanctions pursuant to Chapter VII of the Charter. The participants in the Conference also recommended, in the event of the Security Council's being unable to apply sanctions against South Africa, that an emergency special session of the General Assembly be convened to consider the question of

Namibia again and take appropriate measures as provided for in the Charter.

53. The Pretoria régime continues to utilize the territory of Namibia, which it illegally occupies, as a springboard for carrying out systematic acts of aggression against neighbouring African States, particularly Angola and Zambia.

54. Of course, the South African *apartheid* régime would be unable to pursue its policy of suppressing the indigenous African population, its illegal occupation of Namibia and its aggression against sovereign African States were it not for the comprehensive assistance and support that the major Western Powers and their transnational corporations afford to the South African racists. Indeed, foreign investment in South Africa by the end of 1978 amounted to \$27 billion; for the period from 1972 to 1978 alone, foreign banks granted loans to the Pretoria régime totalling \$5.5 billion. As is pointed out in a United Nations document:

“Total foreign exports to South Africa rose by 13 per cent in the first three quarters of 1979. The United States, South Africa's largest trading partner, accounts for 19 per cent of South Africa's total bilateral trade, followed by the United Kingdom and the Federal Republic of Germany.” [A/35/22/Add.1, para. 92.]

In this connexion I should like also to refer to the Algiers Declaration of the United Nations Council for Namibia, which states, *inter alia*,

“The Council also deplores in the strongest terms the fact that these States”—that is to say, the Western accomplices of South Africa—“have continued their collaboration with the racist régime, thus fortifying it in its defiance of the United Nations. This collaboration continues even in the face of South Africa's continued contempt for the settlement plan originally proposed by the Western Powers and accepted by the international community.” [See A/35/24, vol. I, para. 91.]

55. As is well known, the basis for the co-operation between the imperialist Powers and the colonial racist régime of Pretoria lies in the cupidity of those countries and their transnational corporations and in their predatory exploitation and plundering of the richest natural resources of Namibia, as well as in the fact that monopolistic super-profits are being derived through the most cruel, essentially colonial-type, exploitation of the indigenous Africans. It is the diamonds, gold, ferrous alloys and especially uranium that attract imperialist monopolies to Namibia. South African, British and American transnational corporations, as well as the monopolies of other Western countries, are all operating in that long-suffering country. South African and Western transnational corporations are dominant in the key industry of Namibia—the mining industry. Such capitalist octopuses as Consolidated Diamond Mines of South West Africa, Ltd., which has an absolute monopoly over the mining of diamonds in Namibia; Tsumeb Corporation, which accounts for 90 per cent of the production of base metals in the Territory; Rio Tinto Zinc Corporation, Ltd., which has a monopoly over the mining of Namibian uranium and many other monopolies are taking part in the imperialist plundering

of Namibia's natural resources. The transnational corporations of the major Western Powers account for about three fifths of Namibia's income from taxes, which goes directly to South Africa. About one third to one half of Namibia's gross national product is exported every year in the form of profits and dividends for the imperialist monopolies and the foreign shareholders in South Africa, the United States, Britain and other Western countries.

56. It should be stressed that South Africa satisfies its needs for uranium by importing it from Namibia. United Nations documents have pointed out that "the gravest danger of South African domination of Namibia and its uranium reserves is that it enhances South Africa's ability to manufacture nuclear weapons from enriched uranium for the intimidation of the entire African continent".⁴

57. In the light of South Africa's nuclear ambitions and its practically free access to Namibian uranium, this poses a genuine threat not only to the security of African States but to international peace and security as a whole.

58. In the past few years the importance of Namibian uranium in terms of meeting the interests of the West has grown appreciably. About 20 major Western transnational corporations are taking part in mining or prospecting for uranium in Namibia. That is done also in the light of the strategic interests of the NATO bloc.

59. The intensified activity of imperialist circles of the major Western Powers in Namibia and their position on the question of Namibia in the United Nations are to be explained not in abstract terms but in terms of strictly concrete and material interests of profit-making, as well as military and strategic considerations. This position, which consists in blocking the adoption of effective measures against South Africa, is in fact—no matter what may be said here on the subject by representatives of those countries—aimed at supporting and entrenching the colonial racist régime of Pretoria. The continuing illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa and the consolidation of its puppet neo-colonialist régime in Windhoek caters not only to the interests of the South African racists but also to the interests of imperialist circles of the major Western Powers. That is the nub of the problem in this extremely long-drawn-out question of a political settlement in Namibia.

60. The time for lengthy discussions and exhortations addressed to the South African régime has passed. The United Nations must take urgent and effective measures to compel South Africa to leave Namibia unconditionally and without delay, to ensure the transfer of all power in the country to SWAPO, the sole lawful representative of the fighting people of Namibia—recognized by the United Nations and the OAU.

61. Attempts to infringe the territorial integrity of Namibia—including any attempts to annex Walvis Bay—must be vigorously halted. The efforts of the international community must be channelled towards providing comprehensive support for the struggle of the Namibian people, led by SWAPO, against the

South African occupation and colonial racist oppression, and for an independent, democratic and united Namibia.

62. The delegation of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic believes that the basis for a solution to the Namibian problem lies primarily in the resolutions on the subject adopted by the Security Council and the General Assembly, as well as resolutions adopted by other United Nations organs that have dealt with questions of decolonization. We must see to it that there is strict and unswerving compliance by all States with the sanctions against the racist Pretoria régime. In the light of South Africa's stubborn reluctance to comply with the United Nations decisions, its cynical disregard for those decisions and the continuation in southern Africa, and particularly in Namibia, of its policy—so dangerous to international peace and security—the General Assembly must, as so many representatives have said from this very rostrum, urgently call upon the Security Council to take immediate and effective measures against the racist Republic of South Africa, including comprehensive, binding sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter.

63. We believe that the representatives of Western Powers, who are by no means averse at times to talking about what they describe as their concern over the fate of the Namibian people, must demonstrate this in deeds and agree to the adoption by the Security Council of comprehensive, binding sanctions against racist South Africa.

64. In conclusion, I should like to stress that the delegation of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic will also support any other decisive and effective measures in accordance with the Charter to bring about an early, just settlement in Namibia in the interests of the Namibian people.

65. We declare once again that the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic will stand unswervingly, as it has always done in the past, by the side of the valiant people of Namibia, led by SWAPO, in their just struggle to achieve their self-determination and genuine independence.

66. Mr. THUNBORG (Sweden): Last year the struggle for majority rule and independence in southern Africa scored a long-awaited victory in Zimbabwe. Hopes were raised that the strenuous diplomatic efforts undertaken by the Organization would result in the birth of a free and independent Namibia this year. After the failure of the Geneva meeting in January, the prospects for such a development in the course of this year are dim. Therefore the present stalemate situation requires renewed vigorous efforts by the United Nations to bring about the fundamental political change in Namibia that its people has struggled for so long to achieve.

67. The United Nations has a particular legal and political responsibility to bring about independence for Namibia. The General Assembly and the Security Council have repeatedly reaffirmed the principles on which Namibia's transition to self-determination and independence must be based. Thus only the Namibians themselves—and that means all Namibians—have the right to decide their future. The United Nations plan for Namibia's independence has

⁴ A/AC.109/611, para. 14.

been approved by the Security Council and is embodied in its resolution 435 (1978), which has met with unanimous support from the world Organization.

68. In a situation in which new efforts are demanded by the United Nations it is, in the view of my Government, essential that particularly the parties that have been directly involved in the delicate negotiating process reaffirm their support for that plan as a basis for further efforts to solve the Namibian problem. Any hesitation in this regard would only serve the interests of the illegal occupant of the Territory of Namibia, South Africa, which is still making every attempt to obstruct the United Nations plan, as was clearly demonstrated in Geneva. In fact it seems obvious that South Africa has used the negotiating process not only to gain time to fortify its military position in the Territory but also to try to support the internal administrators of its own choice and, conversely, to try to weaken the support for SWAPO by violent repression. Recently we have noted with indignation that Namibians are again being given extremely severe sentences, including the death penalty, on political grounds, for supporting the liberation movement.

69. No one doubts that a free and independent Namibia will emerge out of this long-drawn-out and tragic conflict. However, the present stalemate in the negotiating process gives ground for fear that there will be increasing violence and human suffering on the long road to freedom for the people of Namibia. While the front-line States and SWAPO have, as was shown at Geneva and during the prelude to that meeting, played a constructive role in the efforts to achieve a settlement according to the United Nations plan, the South African Government has given proof of an increasingly defiant and arrogant attitude to the efforts to negotiate a settlement in Namibia. This attitude of South Africa must be condemned by the whole international community, which has a joint responsibility to uphold international law and the Charter of the United Nations. The continuous acts of aggression we witness in southern Africa today obviously stem from the militarily well-armed and politically ruthless South African régime, which is making barbarous attacks against neighbouring countries, in particular Angola, but recently also Mozambique. These attacks must stop.

70. The group of five Western nations more than ever has a key role to play in making South Africa comply with the United Nations plan for Namibian independence, terminate its illegal occupation of that Territory and adhere to the principles of international law. It is a well-known fact that especially that group of countries has the ways and means of exerting the necessary pressure on the South African régime, economically and politically. Moreover, as permanent members of the Security Council, some members of that group also share the responsibility of the Council to take without delay the action needed to implement its own resolutions.

71. But as Members of the Organization, which is the sole legal administrator of that Territory, all of us have an obligation to the people of Namibia. They have placed their hope in the Organization and its ability to bring peace and independence to their nation. We, as free and independent nations our-

selves, must not betray these legitimate hopes of the Namibian nation. Consequently we now urge the Security Council to take measures for the implementation of the United Nations plan, which is already long overdue, and to support all efforts to bring about real independence and democracy in Namibia.

72. The Swedish Government continues to support a negotiated solution of this conflict. We believe that there can be no real solution of the question of Namibia without the participation of SWAPO. Sweden will continue to support the victims of South Africa's repressive policies in Namibia by providing, through SWAPO, humanitarian aid to the many Namibian refugees in neighbouring countries as well as by providing aid to the various United Nations and non-governmental programmes assisting Namibians. Our hope is that this assistance will one day be transformed into long-term development co-operation with the Government of the New State. In the meantime Sweden will continue to assist the United Nations in carrying out the peaceful transition to a free and independent Namibia.

73. Mr. RÁCZ (Hungary): Since the General Assembly terminated the League of Nations Mandate of South Africa over Namibia and demanded a just solution, it has year by year indicated the proper way towards a Namibian settlement. I should like to point out, particularly now that the Geneva talks on the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) have failed, that the efforts of the General Assembly have been in vain so far.

74. As far as the failure of the pre-implementation talks at Geneva is concerned, recent events give us the obvious fundamental reasons for that fiasco. Besides the ignorant and even aggressive attitude of South Africa one reason is the tactical attitude of the Western Powers involved. At the New Delhi Conference the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of non-aligned countries drew our attention to that when they expressed regret over "the apparent reluctance of these countries to use their enormous influence and leverage on South Africa to ensure its co-operation with the United Nations Secretary-General in the efforts to implement the United Nations plan for Namibia".

75. Undoubtedly, the baseless but widely publicized allegations that SWAPO—which is recognized by the United Nations, the non-aligned movement and the OAU as the sole legitimate representative of the Namibian people—was a terrorist organization provided unexpected support of the South African régime.

76. Careful study of the recent report by the United Nations Council for Namibia reveals an obvious reason for the unchanged or, rather, the deteriorating situation in Namibia. In its report, the Council points out:

"... Western Governments had always depended heavily on transnational corporations in their countries to develop nuclear technology and raw materials for nuclear development. Those Governments has created the conditions permitting private firms, which were eager to sell their output, to negotiate arrangements for profitable sales of nuclear technology and materials to South Africa. They had done so within the framework of their government

programmes so in no case could it be said that the Governments of countries whose firms were engaged in developing the South African nuclear technology were ignorant of what those companies were doing.” [A/35/24, vol. III, para. 178.]

I should add that South Africa and its Western allies—particularly the NATO countries—need Namibia, rich in uranium and raw materials, and they are trying to find some way of maintaining their rule over the Territory.

77. The International Conference in Solidarity with the Struggle of the People of Namibia established that:

“The racist régime of South Africa has resorted to desperate acts and manœuvres to continue its illegal occupation of Namibia, consolidate its illegitimate rule over the great majority of the people of South Africa, and to reserve the march of freedom in Africa. It has armed itself to the teeth and sought to acquire nuclear capability, with the collaboration or complicity of powerful Government” [See A/35/539-S/14220.]

78. We are experiencing the obvious manifestations of those manœuvres day by day. In this regard I should just like to mention an article entitled “South Africa Agrees to UN Plan” which appeared in *The Christian Science Monitor* on 31 October 1980, and which we can now compare with the facts: failure at Geneva and renewed armed aggression against Angola and Mozambique. I do not think that anyone need explain what is behind those facts and point out why we consider them as part of the above-mentioned manœuvres. I shall merely refer to the resolution of the Council of Ministers of the OAU at Freetown in June 1980, in which the Council stated that it had learnt “with grave concern the decision by the illegal régime of South Africa to establish a puppet Council of Ministers in Namibia, aimed at imposing an internal settlement upon the people of Namibia” [see A/35/463, annex I]. In Geneva, those puppets of Pretoria already showed their true colours.

79. My Government and people keep rendering all possible support to SWAPO in its just struggle against neocolonialist aggression and imperialist exploitation. Our position on the question of Namibia is unchanged. We are strongly of the view that Namibia is the direct responsibility of the United Nations, and any settlement should be worked out within its framework; that SWAPO is the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people, and the genuine independence of Namibia can be achieved only with the direct and full participation of SWAPO and only through the full implementation of existing United Nations and OAU resolutions on Namibia; that the territorial integrity of Namibia, including Walvis Bay and the offshore islands, should remain intact; that South Africa’s illegal occupation of Namibia, its persistent defiance of United Nations decisions and its contempt thereof, the war of repression it is waging against Namibians, its repeated acts of aggression launched against independent African countries, its colonial expansion and its support of or collaboration with the Pretoria régime constitute a serious threat to peace and international security.

80. We believe that, in order to end that situation in Namibia, the General Assembly should demand the unconditional withdrawal of all South African troops and administration from Namibia; call for the cessation of all collaboration with South Africa and for the termination of all kinds of relations with it; request the Security Council to enforce comprehensive, mandatory economic sanctions against South Africa, as is provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, and to give effect to its resolution 418 (1977) on an arms embargo against the racist régime.

81. Mr. KLESTIL (Austria): In the debate on the question of Namibia at the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly, the international community expressed the hope that the year 1980 would be of decisive importance for the progress of the Namibian people to independence and self-determination, based on the United Nations transition plan. Once again, those hopes have not been fulfilled.

82. Austria has consistently associated itself with the United Nations plan for Namibia’s peaceful and negotiated transition to independence. In the view of the Austrian Government, any political settlement which aims at stability and durability has to rest on the broadest possible basis, comprising all the parties engaged in the problem. The plan originally put forward by the five Western Powers and subsequently endorsed by the Security Council in resolution 435 (1978) meets those basic requirements, as it provides for true self-determination on the basis of democratic and internationally supervised elections. Austria continues to regard the United Nations transition plan as the most promising and probably the only way to discharge the United Nations’ special responsibility for that Territory and to arrive at a genuine and peaceful transfer of power to the Namibian people.

83. We have on several occasions expressed our dismay and deep concern over the stalemate which the negotiations with the South African Government have reached. Our attention had therefore been focused with renewed hope on the pre-implementation meeting at Geneva in January this year, which for the first time brought all the parties involved in the dispute to the negotiating table and which in our view should have resulted in a final breakthrough and the establishment of the dates for the cease-fire and the implementation of the United Nations plan. In spite of the spirit of compromise which was manifested in the negotiations by SWAPO and the front-line States, we have again been disappointed. The report that the Secretary-General submitted on 19 January to the Security Council clearly outlines the wide area of agreement on the transition plan itself and the establishment of the demilitarized zone, an agreement which it has taken more than two years of intense and difficult negotiations to achieve. The international community cannot permit that those efforts should have been undertaken in vain and that the agreement on so many different issues should be of no avail.

84. Instead of appreciating fully the long-term advantages of a peaceful and internationally recognized transition of Namibia to independence, based on democratic principles, South Africa has continued its policy of obstructing the final implementation of

the United Nations plan. It has furthermore intensified its unilateral course of action, which started with the elections in Namibia and which creates a fictitious political reality in the Territory unacceptable to the international community.

85. Over the past year, the military presence of South Africa has increased and been accompanied by a new wave of detention and imprisonment of SWAPO personnel. South Africa's policy towards the front-line States has become even more aggressive and overbearing.

86. In the view of the Austrian Government, those steps undertaken by the South African Government reflect a wrong assessment of the political situation which could have grave and far-reaching consequences. This course cannot lead to stabilizing the area nor to establishing an atmosphere of peaceful and mutually fruitful coexistence in southern Africa. On the contrary, it will inevitably incite to further violence and further bloodshed in the military struggle, and will rightly increase the impatience of those who for so long have been deprived of the right to self-determination and independence. The South African Government should be well aware that it cannot dissociate itself from the responsibility resulting from its actions in Namibia and that the international community has at its disposal means of peaceful pressure in the provisions of the Charter which can be invoked.

87. I also wish to take this opportunity to express our appreciation and gratitude to the five Western Powers; to the Secretary-General, his Special Representative and his advisers for their unswerving efforts to implement the plan, as well as to SWAPO and those African nations most intimately concerned, which in a spirit and co-operation and understanding have participated in this endeavour.

88. Special appreciation is due also to the United Nations Council for Namibia, which, under the experienced and wise guidance of Mr. Lusaka, represents the interests of the Namibian people with skill and devotion. Among the manifold activities of the Council, the hearings on the exploitation of Namibian uranium deserve especially to be mentioned.

89. In our view, the present debate provides an excellent opportunity once again to impress forcefully upon South Africa that a solution to the Namibian question can be found only in an internationally recognized settlement based on the principles on which the world community has been united for a long time.

90. Mr. CORRÊA DA COSTA (Brazil): No one is entitled to challenge the fact that by now it is clear and obvious that South Africa does not intend to relinquish its control over the Territory of Namibia. How could one be led to believe otherwise? Indeed, since the First World War during which South Africa conquered the then German colony, the policies it applied to the Territory have betrayed its actual designs of perpetual occupation and control. Although South Africa had agreed at the Paris Peace Conference of 1919 to place South West Africa under the Mandates System of the League of Nations, a quarter of a century later South Africa's plans for annexation were brought out into the open by its refusal to place the Territory under the International

Trusteeship System of the United Nations. Ever since, the United Nations has underscored the necessity of the preservation of the international status of Namibia, a status upheld by the International Court of Justice, first in 1950 and most recently in 1971, when the South African Administration in Namibia was declared illegal by the Court.

91. In 1966, the United Nations, as the supervisory organ of the Mandated Territories inherited from the League of Nations and taking into account the fact that South Africa had flouted its obligations towards the international community as well towards the Namibian people, adopted General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) whereby it terminated the Mandate of South Africa to administer Namibia. The United Nations reserved for itself the right to administer the country until it attained independence and, for that purpose, it established the United Nations Council for Namibia one year later in resolution 2248 (S-V).

92. If nothing else, the Namibian case is therefore one of the issues with which the United Nations has been dealing for the longest period of time. And yet there seems to be no convincing reason to expect that it will shortly be withdrawn from our yearly agenda. In 1978, perhaps in a genuine misunderstanding of what the South African régime really meant, some of us were led to believe that a peaceful settlement of the question of Namibia was within our reach.

93. The Security Council, in resolution 435 (1978), had endorsed the proposal of the five Western Powers and shortly afterwards the Pretoria Government indicated its agreement, at least in principle, to that proposal. Again, we entertained the hope that the nightmare besetting the Namibian people would soon come to an end. Nevertheless, the South African authorities did not hesitate in rejecting important provisions of the implementation proposal put forward by the Secretary-General, on the grounds that it departed substantially from the Western Powers' plan. Ever since then, intensive and difficult negotiations have taken place in order to come to an agreement on the main technical and operational aspects. At one point, as the exchange of communications between the Secretary-General and the South African Minister of Foreign Affairs clearly indicated, one would have thought that no insurmountable obstacles remained to the prompt deployment of UNTAG. This apparent agreement was brought about in no small measure thanks to the significant concessions made by SWAPO, which had throughout adopted a realistic and conciliatory approach to the negotiating process. And yet Pretoria has come up with new arguments not directly related to the peace process and has resorted to procrastinating tactics which by now are common knowledge.

94. It was for the purpose of bringing about an atmosphere of trust and confidence that the Secretary-General convened the pre-implementation meeting that took place at Geneva this year. Since technical and operational obstacles no longer seemed to stand in the way of the implementation of the settlement proposal, there was reason to believe that an early date could be agreed upon for the cease-fire, leading to free and fair elections and the achieving of full independence before the end of this year. The international community, especially the front-line States,

spared no effort to ensure that the meeting would be successful.

95. In the first place, at the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly they agreed to postpone discussion of the question of Namibia so as to prevent South Africa from once more denouncing a so-called lack of impartiality on the part of the United Nations as a pretext for holding up the process of independence. SWAPO, on its part, when it arrived at Geneva, showed it is willing to proceed immediately with the implementation of the peace plan, a position that bespeaks SWAPO's spirit of sincere co-operation and its sense of reality. And yet, the delegation of South Africa has thwarted whatever hopes one might have entertained, by stating that the time is not yet ripe for the establishment of a date for a cease-fire, and that the people of Namibia, for whose security it claims to be responsible, continue to distrust the United Nations ability to supervise and monitor free and fair elections.

96. South Africa has accused the United Nations of partiality for SWAPO, formally recognized by the international community as the sole legitimate representative of the Namibian people. Pretoria has insisted that, should the United Nations plan be implemented, the Organization would be required to take a step backward and disavow its previous solemn statements to the effect that SWAPO, and nobody else, can speak on behalf of the inhabitants of Namibia. But there is no point in placing SWAPO and the puppet Windhoek groups, such as the Democratic Turnhalle Alliance, on the same footing. For only SWAPO has fought for the independence of the Territory, and only SWAPO is genuinely national in scope and stands for a united Namibia, with its territorial integrity preserved.

97. Opposing SWAPO are the political parties composing the so-called National Assembly, which are nothing but emanations of the *apartheid* and homeland policies introduced into Namibia by South Africa in the late 1960s. The concept of ethnicity is built into that so-called National Assembly, and the parties represented therein are in reality an instrument in the hands of the so-called second-tier authorities, which constitute the tribal governments under the homeland system of domination applied by Pretoria's racist authorities in the Territory. Only SWAPO is committed to the building of a broad national consensus in a united and independent Namibia.

98. By accusing the United Nations of being biased in favour of SWAPO and of nurturing a deep-rooted lack of understanding for South African positions, Pretoria pretends and wishes us to believe that the international community's stand on Namibia has no antecedents, as though, all of a sudden, the General Assembly picked SWAPO as the representative of the Namibian people and simply decided that the Territory should become independent. As I pointed out at the beginning of my statement, the Namibian case has a long history. Indeed, throughout the years, each new step by this Organization has been preceded by a careful study of its possible implications, and would never have been taken if only South Africa had vouchsafed a positive and constructive reply to the appeals of the international community. If today we stand where we are, it is because of South Africa's

intransigence, bigotry and lack of good faith—not the other way round, as Pretoria's most recent warped interpretations would seem to indicate.

99. The present situation with regard to the future of Namibia requires that all of us seriously ponder our next steps. Has Security Council resolution 435 (1978) any chance of ever being implemented? Can South Africa be persuaded to withdraw peacefully from Namibia? We cannot fail to draw some logical conclusions from the failure of the Geneva meeting. At the present stage, to hold ourselves aloof would be remiss, tantamount to moral abdication and to betrayal of our commitments to the people of Namibia, who see the United Nations as a bulwark of strength and support for their legitimate aspirations. One might well wonder whether those upon whom the Charter has bestowed special responsibilities for the maintenance of international peace and security will now duly acknowledge the seriousness of the situation and act accordingly.

100. It is paradoxical that the negotiations have failed, as a result of ever-increasing arrogant demands by a party that has no legal rights whatsoever over the Territory of Namibia and has long ago forfeited the respect and even the indulgence of the world community. Of South Africa, which was expected to have withdrawn from Namibia long ago, suffice it to say that at present it is continuing to subject its people to the obnoxious policies of *apartheid*. The procrastination and devious tactics resorted to by the occupying Power bespeak its visceral contempt for the principles of the United Nations Charter and for established norms of international conduct. South Africa has not abated the place of the internal settlement it is imposing upon the Namibian people. The convening of the Turnhalle Constitutional Conference in September 1975 was followed by the formation of the Democratic Turnhalle Alliance, a collection of tribal groups that became the vehicle through which South Africa is attempting to "decolonize" Namibia. A so-called National Assembly, which only pays lip-service to the notion of one man, one vote, was brought into being and granted some legislative powers. In June 1980 a Council of Ministers was formed and a few administrative and executive powers were bestowed upon it. But the main decisions on all important matters are left to the second-tier authorities—a system of government which, as already pointed out, is deeply rooted in the concept of ethnicity and reflects the philosophy of *apartheid*, which inspires all South African official policies. In the final analysis, it is nothing but a manifestation of the old and well-known tactic of dividing in order to conquer. These internal and unilateral developments have been rejected by the international community as a whole. South Africa is fully aware of that. In pursuing the same course, it will not deceive anybody.

101. The commitment of Brazil to the independence of Namibia is a matter of record. We supported the United Nations settlement proposal as a means of making our aspirations come true. Now, as the Brazilian Minister for External Relations put it in his statement in the general debate at this session "The risk we have been running since resolution 435 (1978) was adopted two years ago is that of having placed

too much trust in negotiations that have not developed in accordance with legitimate expectations." [4th meeting, para. 25.]

102. Not only has South Africa thwarted the prospects for the early independence of Namibia, but it has refused to eschew its constant attacks against the territories of front-line States, such as Angola, Mozambique, Zambia and Botswana, whose peoples have suffered far too much and far too long. Brazil will do its utmost to contribute to the economic reconstruction of these friendly countries; it was with this sole objective that Brazil participated in the Southern African Development Conference, held at Maputo on 27 and 28 November 1980.

103. Before concluding, I should like to pay a tribute to the United Nations Council for Namibia and to its Chairman, Mr. Lusaka of Zambia. The Council has been a staunch ally of the people of Namibia and has never shirked its responsibility for promoting the cause of the independence of the Territory.

104. Mr. NICIŃSKI (Poland): The Polish delegation is once again speaking in the debate on the question of Namibia in order to express its grave concern at the present situation in Namibia, seriously aggravated by the endless manoeuvres of the South African régime to deprive the Namibian people of its long overdue independence.

105. In the long history of United Nations efforts in the field of decolonization few examples could be given of so stubborn a resistance by the forces of colonialism to the legitimate aspirations of an oppressed people as that facing us in the case of Namibia. However, never before has the responsibility of the United Nations towards a colonial people been so great as it is in this case.

106. Fourteen years have now elapsed since the General Assembly took the decision to terminate South Africa's Mandate over Namibia and to place the Territory under the direct responsibility of the United Nations until it achieved independence. Even after so many years our Organization is still confronted with the illegal occupation of the Territory of Namibia by South Africa.

107. Yet the general situation in the southern part of Africa has changed dramatically in the course of the last several years in favour of the forces of progress and liberation. Not long ago we saw a number of colonial fortresses collapsing, one after another. The most recent example was the glorious victory of the people of Zimbabwe, won after a long and protracted struggle. That important victory has given a new impetus and encouragement to the liberation struggle of the Namibian people, waged under the leadership of SWAPO. The accession to independence of Zimbabwe has also underlined the anachronistic character of the continued South African occupation of Namibia as an abominable remnant of the bygone era of rampant oppression and subjugation.

108. This debate is indeed taking place at a crucial stage of the situation prevailing in and around Namibia. Over the years of the liberation struggle SWAPO has both won important victories and made many sacrifices which have brought wide international recognition of it as the sole and authentic representa-

tive of the Namibian people, which defends its true aspirations and interests. That is why the South African régime is sparing no effort to undermine SWAPO through a new wave of arrests and intimidation as well as through political manoeuvres.

109. As can be seen from the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia, the situation in Namibia has recently further deteriorated. South Africa's policies of intensified repression and terror in Namibia combined with the further expansion of its military forces, used both against the Namibian people and for repeated acts of aggression against independent neighbouring States, in particular the People's Republic of Angola and Zambia, must be a matter of serious concern.

110. In its determination to fight the growing and irreversible wave of national liberation the racist régime is doing everything it can to impose upon the people of Namibia a puppet, neo-colonialist régime. The establishment of the so-called Council of Ministers provides further proof of South Africa's bad faith and unwillingness to implement the relevant Security Council resolutions on Namibia as well as its real intention to perpetuate its illegal occupation of the Territory.

111. In this regard my delegation fully concurs in the assessment expressed in the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia that South Africa is relentlessly and continuously carrying out manoeuvres behind the facade of its apparent willingness to negotiate with the United Nations on the implementation of its resolutions. This negative and deceitful attitude of South Africa has been confirmed beyond any doubt by the failure of the meeting held recently at Geneva.

112. It is now clearer than ever before that the illegal occupation of Namibia by the South African régime, the war of repression it is waging there and its acts of aggression against independent African States represent a serious and growing threat not only to peace and stability on the African continent but to international peace and security as well. This threat is even further aggravated by South African attempts to acquire nuclear-weapons capability.

113. The South African régime has been able to maintain its intransigent position for so long and to persist in its refusal to meet the demands of the United Nations that it withdraw from Namibia because of the deep involvement of a number of transnational corporations from some Western countries in the exploitation of Namibian natural resources. The extent of that involvement was amply demonstrated recently during the hearings on the exploitation of Namibian uranium conducted by the Panel for hearings on Namibian uranium.

114. As we have already pointed out on many occasions a just solution of the Namibian problem lies in the speedy and unhesitant implementation of the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and of the Security Council.

115. My delegation is convinced that at this crucial moment of the fight for a free and independent Namibia decisive action should be taken by the international community. The present situation calls for urgent

and effective measures that would directly affect the South Africa régime and force it to abide by the United Nations resolutions on Namibia. Pressure should be intensified in order to achieve a solution consistent with the aspirations of the Namibian people and with the will of the international community.

116. In this regard my delegation considers especially important and relevant the recommendation of the New Delhi Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of non-aligned countries, endorsed recently at the thirty-sixth session of the Council of Ministers of the OAU, that mandatory sanctions against South Africa should be imposed by the Security Council, as provided for under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter.

117. The United Nations must live up to its special responsibilities and assist the people of Namibia in its fight for self-determination and independence. In order to overcome and counteract the South African manœuvres and delaying tactics the international community should intensify its support for the Namibian people and its sole and authentic representative, SWAPO.

118. On this occasion the Polish delegation wishes to reassure SWAPO and the African States of our firm and resolute support for their struggle for self-determination and genuine independence for Namibia and the preservation of the unity and territorial integrity of Namibia. On the basis of its consistent position of principle, Poland stands ready to make its contribution to the cause of independent Namibia through its participation in the work of the United Nations Council for Namibia as well. We are sure that the long struggle of the Namibian people, supported by the United Nations, will be crowned with full success and that we shall finally be able to welcome among us a free and independent Namibia.

119. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the Netherlands who will address the Assembly on behalf of the 10 member States of the European Community.

120. Mr. SCHELTEMA (Netherlands): I have the honour of making the following statement on behalf of the 10 member States of the European Community.

121. The United Nations has a particular responsibility for Namibia. The world community has repeatedly indicated that the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa must be brought to an end in conformity with Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978). The 10 member States of the European Community wish to reiterate their firm conviction that the people of Namibia must be enabled to exercise, without further delay, by means of free and fair elections its right to self-determination and independence. A solid foundation for this objective has been laid in resolution 435 (1978), which was accepted by both the Government of South Africa and by SWAPO. During past years strenuous efforts have been made by the Secretary-General and his Special Representative, by the five Western States, the front-line States, Nigeria and the OAU to implement the settlement plan. The Community is deeply appreciative of their untiring efforts.

122. At the end of last year there was sufficient progress in the negotiations to lead the Secretary-General to report that outstanding issues had been resolved. He was informed by the South African Government that, provided the prevailing acute mutual distrust and lack of confidence could be overcome, the end of 1981 would be a realistic target date for the independence of Namibia. It was agreed to hold a pre-implementation meeting at Geneva under the auspices and chairmanship of the United Nations. It is significant that that meeting brought together for the first time all the parties concerned.

123. The Community is deeply disappointed that the meeting failed to set an early date for the ceasefire as a first step in implementing the settlement plan. It regrets that it proved impossible to reach agreement following the statement of the delegation led by the South African Administrator-General that it was premature to agree on an implementation date. The Community concludes that, because of South Africa's unwillingness to proceed with the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), as indicated by its head of delegation, an important opportunity to achieve Namibia's independence through an internationally acceptable solution was lost.

124. The 10 members of the Community wish to underline the grave consequences of this delay in the implementation of the settlement plan. They fully associate themselves with the appeal made by the Secretary-General to the South African Government to reconsider its position. They consider it of the utmost importance that South Africa abide by its declared willingness to let Namibia gain independence, in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

125. The members of the Community also reiterate their rejection of any attempt to impose an internal settlement on Namibia. They remain firmly opposed to any solution that is not internationally acceptable and that could condemn Namibia to international isolation. In this connexion, they consider that such decisions as the introduction of military conscription for young Namibians will result in further exacerbation of tensions in the Territory.

126. In this serious situation, the 10 members of the Community consider it imperative that all parties show restraint and refrain from acts that might prejudice chances of reaching agreement in the future. They have learnt with particular concern of the renewed attacks by South African forces against neighbouring States. On 11 February 1981 the Members of the Community expressed their belief that such acts run counter to the search for peaceful solutions to the problems with which the area is confronted. As they have done in the past, they condemn such a resort to force, which is bound to cause increased suffering to the local population. In the same vein, they disapprove of acts of intimidation and violence perpetrated within the Territory. Those acts, as well as the continuing practice of arbitrary arrests and detentions without trial, create a cycle of violence which is deeply deplored by the Community. Such attempts to stifle the voice of an important segment of public opinion in Namibia place further obstacles in the way of the objectives of the United Nations. The Community calls again for the immediate and unconditional

release of all those in Namibia who have been arrested and are still detained because of their political beliefs.

127. The 10 members of the Community believe that South Africa should not continue to deny the people of Namibia its right to self-determination and independence. They urge all concerned, including South Africa, not to throw away the progress that has already been made. They urge the parties concerned to examine all possibilities that may be conducive to an early agreement. They continue to support the Secretary-General of the United Nations in his efforts to find an internationally acceptable solution to the Namibian problem. They express their satisfaction at the efforts made by the five Western Countries in this matter and hope that those countries which did so in the past will continue to offer their good offices to the Secretary-General.

128. Mr. MARINESCU (Romania) (*interpretation from French*): The resumption of the work of the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly on the question of Namibia has a special importance in the present circumstances. The General Assembly was compelled to meet again to consider this question which profoundly affects the international climate in the wake of new attempts further to delay the accession of the Namibian people to national independence.

129. More than two years ago the international community reached agreement in the Organization on the United Nations plan for Namibia, which contains the basic elements for a peaceful, just and democratic settlement of the problem. Unfortunately, obstacles continue to be created by the racist régime of Pretoria, with various excuses and pretexts, in the implementation of this plan.

130. We expressed our appreciation and full support for the Secretary-General's initiative in convening last January in Geneva, under the auspices of the United Nations, the meeting on Namibia, whose objective was quite clear and specific for the parties concerned, who had agreed to take part in it, as well as for the international community as a whole. The meeting sought to bring about agreement on a date for an early cease-fire, followed by the start of the process of implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia, with a view to proclaiming that country's independence before the end of this year.

131. The Geneva meeting, awaited with keen interest and hope by all the peoples of the world and international public opinion, was unable to achieve its goal owing to South Africa's refusal to take part in this process, the only process compatible with honour, international law, the imperatives of our times, the many relevant United Nations resolutions and the interests of peace and security in southern Africa and the world.

132. The constructive position of goodwill of SWAPO was opposed, as so many times in the past, by the obstructionist attitude and delaying tactics of South Africa, which is solely responsible for the failure of the Geneva meeting. By causing that meeting to fail, the South African régime has thus assumed a heavy burden of responsibility, showing once again that it obstinately refuses to listen to reason and recognize the inalienable right of the Namibian people to freedom and sovereignty. That attitude of South Africa is

but the well-known expression of a policy designed to maintain on the African continent a régime of colonial domination, racial discrimination and *apartheid* and a policy of aggression against the independent front-line African States.

133. In these circumstances, it is clear that the United Nations and the Member States have to shoulder their responsibilities towards the Namibian people. It is up to the General Assembly in particular—which is the plenary forum of the Organization—to take resolute action to ensure that the Namibian people may be able freely to exercise its inalienable right to self-determination, in conformity with this fundamental principle of the Charter. The special role of the General Assembly in the defence of the national cause of the Namibian people is also the logical conclusion of the fact that more than 14 years ago it assumed, on behalf of the United Nations, direct responsibility for the attainment of genuine self-determination, freedom and national independence for Namibia.

134. Romania continues resolutely to support the right of the Namibian people freely to choose its own path to economic and social development and to live in an independent and united country. Thus it has constantly acted in the context of the United Nations as well as other international forums for the adoption of the strongest measures likely to put an end to South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia and to ensure the exercise of the inalienable right of the people of Namibia to self-determination and independence.

135. As a member of the Security Council in 1976, Romania took an active part in the preparation of resolution 385 (1976), which it introduced together with the non-aligned countries members of the Council. That resolution, which was adopted unanimously, has served, as we know, as the basis for the efforts designed to achieve a political settlement of the problem of Namibia. Similarly, as a member of the United Nations Council for Namibia, whose report was introduced by its President, Mr. Lusaka [*103rd meeting*], Romania has worked for the achievement of a negotiated solution of the question of Namibia and has in various ways supported the preparation of the United Nations plan for Namibia's accession to independence through free elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations. It has actively supported the efforts of the Secretary-General and of all the States that worked for the implementation of this plan.

136. My country was in favour of the meetings of the representatives of the countries of the contact group with SWAPO and the front-line countries with a view to clarifying all the aspects of the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia and welcomed the Secretary-General's initiative of convening the recent Geneva meeting.

137. Although we favour a political solution of the problem of Namibia, it has always been obvious to us that, in the face of the obstinate position and the illegal actions of South Africa, the oppressed Namibian people has every right, under the leadership of its legitimate and genuine representative, SWAPO, to resort to any means—political, diplomatic and other, including armed struggle—to achieve the erad-

ication of the anachronistic colonial domination and occupation and the attainment of its legitimate aspirations to freedom and national independence. After 14 years of heroic struggle SWAPO has prevailed as the genuine representative of the Namibian people, and the Pretoria régime has been compelled to accept it as a party in the negotiations. We have no doubt that, benefiting—as it will also in future—from the wide support of the democratic and progressive forces of the world, among which my country took a place from the very beginning, by intensifying its struggle the people of Namibia will succeed in undoing the plans of the racist South African authorities and obtaining its independence. It is to achieve this lofty goal, which is clearly supported by the United Nations, that Romania will continue, as it has in the past, to give multilateral support to the Namibian people and its national liberation movement, headed by SWAPO, in the struggle to achieve national independence.

138. We believe that there is broad agreement that a solution of the Namibian problem can no longer be postponed, which is the decisive stage in the exercise of the right of the Namibian people to decide its own future.

139. At this time of difficult and protracted efforts to enable the Namibian people to accede to independence and put an end to one of the last vestiges of colonialism, it is, in our opinion, more necessary than ever for all Member States to intensify their actions of solidarity with the just cause of this martyred people and find the best possible means to enable the United Nations to discharge the historical responsibility it has solemnly assumed to bring about the independence of Namibia. In this context we attach special importance to the efforts of the non-aligned countries to strengthen the solidarity and co-operation of all progressive, democratic, popular and anti-imperialist forces in the struggle for the triumph of the national cause of the Namibian people. The position stated in the Declaration of the recent New Delhi Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries at which Romania was represented by an important delegation, undoubtedly constitutes a remarkable contribution to the efforts aimed at identifying new measures which should be taken at the international level in order to persuade South Africa to accept the effective implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia. Indeed, as emphasized in that declaration as well as in the final communiqué of the recent summit meeting of the front-line States and Nigeria, it is particularly important for the countries that maintain relations with South Africa, in particular the five Western countries of the contact group, to bring to bear upon the South African régime all necessary influence and economic and diplomatic pressure to compel this régime to enter into negotiations leading to a political settlement of the question of Namibia so that the Namibian people may obtain its independence without delay and in keeping with the United Nations plan. The United Nations and the international community as a whole are entitled to ask the countries of the contact group to make an effective contribution by means of firm action in the United Nations and through bilateral relations with South Africa to persuade the South

African Government to participate without delay in the implementation of the plan for Namibia.

Mr. Katapodis (Greece), Vice-President, took the Chair.

140. The present debate on the question of Namibia reflects the general concern of the countries of the world to find the most effective means to solve this problem and to eliminate a serious source of conflicts in southern Africa which threaten international peace and security.

141. More than ever before, the United Nations must meet these legitimate concerns by adopting decisions that will strengthen international action for the speedy attainment of Namibia's national independence.

142. We are convinced that the draft resolution on the situation resulting from South Africa's refusal to comply with United Nations resolutions on Namibia [A/35/L.59 and Add.1]—a draft resolution of which Romania is a sponsor—meets this requirement for immediate and effective action by the General Assembly and the Security Council, as well as all Member States.

143. As for the Security Council, it is called upon to act resolutely and to exercise fully its responsibility to adopt vigorous measures under the Charter, including measures under Chapter VII, to compel South Africa to comply with the resolutions and decisions of the Council and the General Assembly and to eliminate the opposition and obstacles created by the South African Government to the free exercise of the inalienable rights of the Namibian people.

144. It seems quite obvious to us that the General Assembly, in keeping with this role, must remain seized of this problem, whose special importance need no longer be emphasized and that, on the basis of future developments, it should meet to consider the measures required to speed up the process of accession to independence by the Namibian people.

145. In solidarity with the just cause of the people of Namibia, and aware of the direct responsibility of the United Nations towards Namibia, the Romanian delegation intends to continue to work together with other delegations for the adoption of vigorous measures that the situation requires and that respond to the hopes of the Namibian people and its aspirations to freedom and independence. We are firmly convinced that solving the Namibian problem could have a positive influence on the international climate and encourage efforts towards the settlement, by political means and by means of negotiations, of other serious problems facing the United Nations and the international community as a whole at this time.

146. Mr. ANDERSON (Australia): When it was agreed late last year to defer consideration of item 27 of the agenda, on the question of Namibia, my Government welcomed that decision. We saw it as reflecting the commitment of the international community to ensure that no possible pretext be given the parties attending the pre-implementation meeting which might delay agreement to put into effect in 1981 the procedures laid down in Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

147. In the three years since that resolution was adopted, progress has been exasperatingly slow but, as the Secretary-General said in his opening statement at the Geneva meeting on 7 January, "A very large area was already covered by a general consensus." [S/14333, para. 5.]

148. It is therefore all the more deplorable that the meeting broke down not over points of substance or even of detail but on a claim by members of the South African delegation that a definite date for implementation would be acceptable only after the United Nations had demonstrated its impartiality to their satisfaction over an unspecified period. At a time when the technical issues had essentially been resolved and when the other parties had gone out of their way to meet South African concerns, one cannot interpret the South African response as other than pure prevarication.

149. We agree with the Secretary-General when, in the report he submitted to the Security Council on 19 January, he states that the outcome of the meeting must give rise to "the most serious international concern" [*ibid.*, para. 21], and that the South African refusal affects not only Namibia but "also the future of the entire region" [*ibid.*, para. 9].

150. It is only a matter of time before Namibia will be independent. South Africa has the choice, even at this late stage, of co-operating in a prompt and peaceful process with the support of the international community or of persisting in its attempt to frustrate this process and facing mounting opposition, repression and violence from which none—least of all South Africa and the internal parties—will benefit.

151. My delegation continues to believe that despite the latest disappointment in Geneva the proposals formulated in Security Council resolution 435 (1978) still provide the best means available for reaching a peaceful, just and lasting solution. We cannot accept the South African claim that at this late stage in the negotiating process it would be "premature" to implement the proposals promptly. Further delay can only threaten the consensus already achieved and the commitments already made and add to the mounting mistrust of South Africa's commitment to a democratic and internationally acceptable solution.

152. In the course of this debate, speakers have referred to the role played by the Secretary-General and his senior staff and by the Western contact group. I should like to place on record my delegation's appreciation of the dedicated efforts of the Secretary-General, his Under-Secretary-General, his Special Representative and the Commander-Designate of UNTAG. We likewise commend the Western contact group for its persistence in keeping alive prospects for a peaceful settlement.

153. As the Secretary-General stated in his report, at Geneva all the parties, for the first time, sat around the same table and talked to each other. We hope that this contact will contribute to a sense of trust in the integrity of the United Nations. But it must not lead the internal parties to believe that with South African support they can hope to impose an "internal" solution in defiance of the international community.

154. Australia has demonstrated its commitment to the cause of Namibia and will continue to do so in the future. We have offered to contribute forces to UNTAG. Australia is also a member of the United Nations Council for Namibia and will continue to work actively to implement various programmes assisting the cause of Namibian independence and contributing to the welfare of Namibians who have been forced to flee their land. Furthermore, we shall continue to do all in our power to work for a peaceful settlement in Namibia. We earnestly call on all parties to the conflict to pledge themselves anew to the search for peace. Without such a commitment all that we have worked for so patiently could be lost.

155. The new year opened with guarded optimism that progress on Namibia might be at hand. It is deplorable that our hopes should so quickly have been belied, giving place to the disappointment we all feel today. We strongly endorse the Secretary-General's appeal to South Africa urgently to review its own position in regard to the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), since, as many other speakers have said, time is running out.

156. Mr. FLORIN (German Democratic Republic) (*interpretation from Russian*): A few weeks ago, during the thirty-fifth session, the international community marked the twentieth anniversary of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. Many representatives here today come from States that achieved their independence in that 20-year period. It is with profound concern, however, that we must note that the people of Namibia are still unable to exercise their right to self-determination and independence. The problem of Namibia, which is before the General Assembly this year too, is very familiar to everyone. A people has been denied its right to freedom, self-determination and national independence. There is constant disregard of decisions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, and there is defiance of the international community.

157. In itself, the racist Pretoria régime is an historical anachronism. For years and years it has been illegally occupying the Territory of Namibia, oppressing its population, plundering its natural resources and using it as a springboard for aggression against neighbouring African States.

158. The people and Government of the German Democratic Republic condemn with the utmost vigour the policy of aggression and occupation pursued by South Africa. General Assembly resolutions 2145 (XXI) and 3111 (XXVIII) and Security Council resolutions 385 (1976), 432 (1978) and 435 (1978) are clear and binding decisions of the United Nations on Namibia.

159. Now, what is the situation today with regard to compliance with those decisions? Everyone can see that since resolution 435 (1978) was adopted more than two years ago there has been no progress whatsoever towards the Namibian people in exercise of its right to self-determination. The failure of the talks held at Geneva in January of this year strikingly confirmed that. In spite of the constructive position of SWAPO, which in the interests of an early settlement of the Namibian problem agreed to considerable

concessions, at Geneva South Africa stated with cynical frankness that it had no intention of complying with resolution 435 (1978). The report of the Secretary-General to the Security Council of 19 January 1981 contains the relevant information.

160. The continuing destructive position of South Africa was reconfirmed in the letter sent by the South African Foreign Minister, Mr. Botha, to the Secretary-General on 28 January 1981.⁵ Pretoria has made no attempt to conceal the fact that the racist régime wanted to use the Geneva meeting simply to present to the international community the puppet politicians it maintains. Who are these representatives of the so-called internal parties? They are puppets selected by South Africa according to racial and tribal criteria who consistently and obediently represent the interests of the racist régime. There are, in fact, quite a few among them who to this very day maintain their reverence for Hitlerite fascism and publicly declare themselves supporters of that criminal system. On 29 December 1980 *The New York Times* reported that Dirk Mudge, a representative of the so-called Democratic Turnhalle Alliance and the so-called Council of Ministers in Windhoek, had only recently openly called for the direct incorporation of Namibia into South Africa.

161. At Geneva, indeed, the picture was practically symbolic. In the South African delegation, for display purposes, the puppets were put in the front rows, while behind them sat their South African lords, the puppeteers, holding the strings. The parallel with Zimbabwe is only too clear. There, more than a year ago, Muzorewa, as the so-called Prime Minister of Zimbabwe, played the puppet. History has now dismissed him, although there were powerful circles in imperialist States that flatteringly lauded him as the lawful, democratically elected head of the Zimbabwe Government and supported him. As for the South African puppets in Namibia, their places are ready for them in the scrap-heap of history.

162. With regard to the sham elections whereby South Africa attempted to lend a semblance of legitimacy to their puppets in Namibia, in paragraph 3 of its resolution 439 (1978), the Security Council declares "those elections and their results null and void and states that no recognition will be accorded either by the United Nations or any Member States to any representatives or organ established by that process"

163. The Declaration by the Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi, contains the following passage:

"The Ministers strongly condemned the South African racist régime for its persistent refusal to withdraw from Namibia, and in particular its deliberate sabotage of the Geneva meeting convened to implement the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, and declared that this refusal constitutes a threat to peace."⁶

It is indeed high time to put an end to political concessions and appeasement of the racist aggressor. The experience of history—and the United Nations

was itself born of that experience—demonstrates that a policy of this kind always serves only to encourage the aggressor to make further demands and to commit further acts of aggression.

164. The brutal attacks on Angola and Mozambique, the acts of subversion against Zambia and Zimbabwe over the last few months, should serve as a serious warning.

165. Once again, we must ask a question that we have asked in the past: how can such a Government as the *apartheid* régime in South Africa constantly flout the decisions of this world body, trample underfoot international law, terrorize with impunity the people of South Africa and the people of Namibia which they illegally occupy, as well as threaten neighbouring States and even attack them?

166. The answer is well known, and I should like to make it absolutely clear: co-operation with the *apartheid* racist régime and political, economic and military support of that régime by the major Western States are all a major obstacle to the speedy and consistent solution to the problem of Namibia. Recent events have made it abundantly clear that the African racists as a result of that assistance feel confident in their policy of terror within the country and of aggression outside it.

167. In connexion with the failure of the recent talks at Geneva, the Co-ordination Committee for the Liberation of Africa, at its meeting in Arusha in January 1981, noted in its resolution on Namibia.

"The initiative for a negotiated settlement of the Namibian situation has regrettably failed due to their vested interest in southern Africa, which clearly accounted for the apparent importance of the Western five in the Geneva pre-implementation meeting."⁶

168. Today, the United States and the Federal Republic of Germany, together with South Africa, are the three leading States in terms of the profit they have made from Namibia, which amounts to millions of dollars.

169. With regard to the interests of the Federal Republic of Germany, the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* of 22 October 1980 reported:

"The interests of the Federal Republic in South Africa are multifaceted. First of all, there are the rights of almost 30,000 Germans living in Namibia. Then, there are the economic interests. Namibia is rich in uranium and diamonds. In addition, there are security interests."

170. With such interests at stake, we should not be surprised that the allies of South Africa in NATO have so far done nothing to exert pressure on the *apartheid* régime, pressure which is necessary to compel it to co-operate in bringing about a settlement of the Namibian problem and bringing the Territory to independence. Furthermore, imperialist circles of certain members of NATO are again obstructing decisive measures of the United Nations.

171. It is understandable why African States at the recent meeting of the Council of Ministers of the OAU at Addis Ababa in their final document noted "the half-hearted attitude of the Western contact group to

⁵ *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-sixth Year, Supplement for January, February and March 1981, document S/14346.*

⁶ Quoted in English by the speaker.

exert concerted pressure on the Pretoria racist régime to co-operate with the United Nations Secretary-General in the implementation of the United Nations decolonization plan for Namibia.”⁶ [See A/35/794-S/14390.]

172. The delegation of the German Democratic Republic supports a speedy and just solution to the problem of Namibia. Such a solution can be achieved only if Pretoria is compelled to call a halt to its illegal occupation, if its allies end their continuing support and encouragement of the aggressor.

173. The delegation of the German Democratic Republic calls for the application of a broad range of coercive measures against South Africa pursuant to Chapter VII of the Charter, including an oil embargo and a stepped-up arms embargo. We will promote the adoption of a relevant decision by the Security Council—which is something that was called for by the Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries.

174. The true independence of Namibia, together with its territorial integrity, including Walvis Bay, and the exercise by its people of their right to self-determination, can be brought about only with the direct and full participation of SWAPO, the sole lawful representative of the Namibian people. The participation of SWAPO in the Geneva meeting which demonstrated such a high sense of responsibility and statesmanship, has once again shown the international community who really represent the interests of Namibia are. The German Democratic Republic will continue its policy of comprehensive support for SWAPO.

175. Mr. SULONG (Malaysia): The question of Namibia has been on the United Nations agenda for many years without any sign of a definite solution. We have repeatedly expressed, at past sessions of this body, our serious concern at the situation. And yet today, 14 years after its mandate over Namibia was transferred to the United Nations, South Africa is still in control of that country. The racist régime of South Africa has continuously employed deceptive and obstructionist tactics to deny the people of Namibia their basic rights of self-determination and independence through free and fair elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations. The régime has even flagrantly exploited the rich resources of Namibia, and by so doing has deprived the Namibian people of their inherent right to the wealth of their land.

176. Evidence has shown that this ruthless and unscrupulous régime has systematically resorted to all possible means of sabotaging the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia. It has manoeuvred to create an administrative structure to protect its own political and economic interests, with the apparent intention of unilaterally declaring the Territory independent. Such devious motives are clearly demonstrated by the establishment of the so-called National Assembly with broad legislative powers and the so-called Council of Ministers having equally extensive executive authority.

177. The régime has also intensified its military build-up in the Territory and escalated its wanton acts of aggression and interventions against neighbouring

African States and other political opponents. We are aware that its objective is to eliminate the bases of SWAPO, but such repressive activities are also meant purposely to create chaos and instability in order to divert world attention from its illegal occupation of Namibia. South Africa's sustained efforts to develop nuclear-weapons capability demonstrate clearly its belligerent attitude. All these actions pose a grave threat to regional and international peace and security.

178. Every effort of the United Nations and other interested bodies has been met by South Africa with acts of prevarication and utter defiance and contempt. By creating new objections and diversions, the régime has sought to prevent the stationing of forces of UNTAG in Namibia and the implementation of the independence plan for the Territory.

179. What can the United Nations do in the face of such defiance and intransigence? We know that only concerted action by the international community can check South Africa's stubborn policy. We know that we cannot allow the recent efforts of the international community to be as ineffective and futile as before.

180. Last June at Algiers the United Council for Namibia proposed that the Security Council should urgently impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter. The same recommendation was made by the International Conference in Solidarity with the Struggle of the People of Namibia in Paris last September. In view of the obstructive and uncompromising attitude displayed by South Africa at the Geneva meeting such sanctions assume immediate relevance. When South Africa and SWAPO agreed to meet in a pre-implementation meeting, we hoped that a breakthrough would at least be achieved. However, after all the laborious efforts of the United Nations and other parties to make the meeting possible, South Africa, in a series of deceitful manoeuvres and delaying tactics, declared that it was premature to implement the United Nations plan and that more time was needed to create a climate of confidence in the ability of the United Nations to oversee an election in Namibia impartially. We find the South African argument unconvincing. It was obvious that the South African delegation had come to Geneva to win time rather than to arrive at an agreement. South Africa's deplorable action provides further proof of its deliberate diversionary tactics and has serious security and political implications.

181. In regard to the Geneva talks, my delegation wishes to commend SWAPO for its display of courage, patience and a will to compromise and its constructive attitude in the face of South Africa's provocative and irresponsible actions. We should also like to extend our gratitude to the Secretary-General, to the OAU, to the front-line States and to the contact group for their untiring efforts in making the meeting possible.

182. Until and unless the United Nations plan is successfully implemented, we will remain convinced that South Africa has no desire at all to see a free and independent Namibia. On the contrary, we are of the view that it is still intent on perpetuating its control over the Territory and on preserving the *status quo*.

183. The failure of the Geneva meeting creates a dangerous precedent: it will only embolden the South African régime to create new diversions and to continue its irresponsible activities and intransigence. It is now imperative for the United Nations to consider the imposition of severe and effective sanctions under the Charter, including a total oil embargo against the régime. The South African Government must be made to realize that it can no longer carry out at will further diversionary tactics and blatant acts of defiance. My Government would like to repeat that it stands ready to support all measures, including sanctions under the Charter.

184. Malaysia's record in support of the cause of the people of Namibia is well known. My delegation wishes to reaffirm once again our continuing support for the people of Namibia led by SWAPO, their genuine and authentic representative, in the just struggle to achieve freedom, self-determination and independence in a united Namibia. We also wish to reiterate our firm conviction that Security Council resolution 435 (1978) should remain the basis for the peaceful implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia. We once again call on South Africa to heed the call of the international community for a lasting and just solution to the problem in accordance with the relevant decisions of the United Nations.

185. Mr. ELARABY (Egypt) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Although more than 35 years have already elapsed since the foundation of the United Nations, which offered new prospects for legality, the principles of justice and self-determination of peoples, although in 1960 the General Assembly adopted the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples contained in resolution 1514 (XV), and although quite recently we had occasion to celebrate the twentieth anniversary of the adoption of that Declaration, South Africa continues to occupy Namibia in defiance of unanimously held international public opinion and resolutions of the United Nations. The hopes of the people of Namibia for self-determination and independence have been dashed.

186. The occupation of Namibia by South Africa is an illegal act, and an end should be put to it immediately. Likewise, all the steps taken by South Africa unilaterally to impose an internal settlement on the people of Namibia should be regarded as a flagrant violation of all the resolutions of the General Assembly and Security Council and of the principles of international law. These actions should be held null and void. They further serve to strengthen tension and to threaten peace and security in South Africa and throughout the entire world.

187. The Security Council adopted a resolution by a large majority setting forth measures leading to genuine independence for Namibia. The five Western countries offered their good offices for the implementation of that resolution, and SWAPO demonstrated flexibility when negotiating with those countries. That led to the creation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, which was adopted by the Security Council in its resolutions 435 (1978).

188. If we review what has been done to implement this settlement plan we see that one of the parties

—SWAPO—still affirms its readiness sincerely to implement that plan, as well as its favourable attitude towards a peaceful solution to the problem of Namibia. The Secretary-General has expressed appreciation of the co-operation of SWAPO leaders in this connexion. Similarly, the front-line countries have voiced their sincere and genuine desire to implement the plan effectively and have agreed to the creation of demilitarized zones.

189. As far as the other party is concerned, the situation is quite the opposite: South Africa is trying to place obstacles in the way of that settlement and is maintaining its illegal occupation of Namibia. It is also undertaking a number of manoeuvres, while claiming that it wishes to negotiate with the United Nations in order to implement the settlement plan. Those manoeuvres include the establishment of administrative arrangements in Namibia, headed by agents of South Africa; the creation of a so-called Council of Ministers to govern that region; the adoption of legislation establishing compulsory military service for young people in Namibia; and the organizing of unilateral elections for the achievement of the so-called internal settlement. Those are some examples that furnish dramatic proof that the racist régime does not intend to implement this plan for a peaceful settlement.

190. What took place at the Geneva meeting should dispel any misunderstanding of South Africa's real purposes.

191. As we have often stressed the racist régime in South Africa can be dissuaded from all this only if severe sanctions are imposed which will oblige it to heed the international will. Nevertheless, the African countries, as well as SWAPO, agreed to respond to the appeal of the Secretary-General in connexion with the conference that was to be held before actual implementation of the plan. Those countries did not wish to miss any opportunity to settle this humanitarian issue and to ease the suffering of the Namibian people, the victim of barbaric racist occupation. It had been our hope that during the Geneva meeting we might be able to reach some agreement in order to begin implementing the settlement plan and that the racist régime would agree at least to discuss the arguments advanced by certain countries for not participating in the forced isolation of the South African régime.

192. What happened at the Geneva meeting can be regarded as but another link in the chain of manoeuvres undertaken by the racist régime to avoid implementing United Nations resolutions and to defy world public opinion. Although the leader of SWAPO, in his political wisdom, had declared at the beginning of the meeting that his organization was prepared to sign a cease-fire agreement and co-operate with UNTAG, South Africa and its agents voiced suspicion about the impartiality of the United Nations and claimed that the time was not yet ripe to sign a cease-fire agreement.

193. The Egyptian delegation would like here to stress its confidence in the impartiality of the United Nations; we should also like to pay a tribute to the efforts of the Secretary-General and his colleagues, particularly the representative of the Secretary-General who presided over the Geneva meeting.

194. The settlement plan was accepted by the international community, and the five Western countries collaborated in its drafting. Nevertheless, the racist régime, by its negative stance at the Geneva meeting, has placed those five countries in an embarrassing position. They now understand that South Africa had no intention of adopting a plan for a peaceful settlement. That is why those countries should now review their position of support for the racist régime, particularly since SWAPO leaders, in their political wisdom, have supported a peaceful solution.

195. That was demonstrated by the Secretary-General in his report of 19 January to the Security Council. It is clear now that, after the failure of the Geneva meeting, SWAPO has no alternative but to intensify its struggle to liberate Namibia. That is what the leaders of the front-line countries brought out at the meeting of 17 February last.

196. The situation in southern Africa is most critical: it threatens to lead to a bloody uprising which would threaten international peace and security. In the light of what I have just said, the Egyptian delegation deems it necessary, first, for the Security Council to meet immediately. In this connexion we appeal to the Western countries, permanent members of the Security Council, to shoulder their responsibilities and heed the will of the international community without creating obstacles to the imposition of mandatory sanctions against the racist South African régime, in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter. If the Council fails to adopt a resolution on the imposition of such sanctions, the Egyptian delegation would favour the convening of an emergency session to reach a settlement of this issue. Secondly, the colonialist racist régime of South Africa must be condemned. Thirdly, it is essential that Namibia swiftly gain independence and that its territorial and national integrity be respected. Fourthly, we must step up our support for SWAPO, the sole legitimate representative of the Namibian people. Fifthly, we should continue to co-operate with the front-line countries, which South Africa has forced to pay an enormous price, to bring about national independence in that region. Sixthly, we should reiterate the need for a commitment to respect Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia, enacted by the United Nations Council for Namibia in 1974, which affirms that the natural resources of Namibia are the national heritage of the Namibian people, and that its rights over these resources must not be violated. All violations of that decree should be condemned, including the illegal exploitation of Namibian resources and of the marine resources to be found in its territorial waters.

197. In this connexion the Egyptian delegation would like to refer to the results of the hearings of the Panel for hearings on Namibian uranium, which have uncovered serious violations of Namibia's wealth in uranium which the racist régime of South Africa, in collaboration with a number of transnational corporations and certain countries, has been trying to exploit for its own profit. These violations of the resources and national wealth of Namibia have reached dangerous proportions. On this question, my delegation would like to pay a tribute to Mr. Lusaka

of Zambia for his efforts to mobilize international public opinion in that connexion.

198. We are making a sincere appeal to the Western Powers from this rostrum. We should like to make it quite clear to them that it is not to their advantage to lose the friendship of the whole of Africa in order to hold on to a few partial advantages from a racist régime that has been condemned by the international community, a régime that is spreading terrorism and practising repression in that part of the world. South Africa must face its responsibilities and recognize that it has lost this opportunity to bring about peace, security and justice in Namibia.

199. Mr. BALETA (Albania) (*interpretation from French*): The General Assembly is resuming its work at a time when the force of circumstances is compelling us more than ever to increase our vigilance and make every effort to thwart the attempts and manoeuvres which are designed to undermine a solution of the problem of Namibia and to prevent the people of Namibia from acceding to national independence.

200. The events which have taken place since the last debate on Namibia and in particular the events since the decision not to discuss the Namibian question during the first part of the present session have given us fresh proof of the true intention of the enemies of the Namibian people, which is to perpetuate colonial domination in Namibia.

201. The decolonization of Namibia and the accession of that country to national independence have long been a legitimate aspiration and a just demand of the Namibian people and of its brother African peoples, which has the support and the sympathy of all peoples and of all progressive public opinion throughout the world. The realization of that aspiration, however, continues to meet with numerous obstacles raised by the racist clique of South Africa and the imperialist Powers that support it.

202. The Namibian people, sorely tried under long colonial domination, still lives under intolerable conditions. It is still enduring the suffering and misfortunes of criminal oppression and the policy of *apartheid* practised by the régime of South Africa.

203. The true situation in Namibia has been perfectly clear for some time. The problem of Namibia and the path towards its settlement are very well known both here at the United Nations and outside it. The causes and factors which keep the Namibian people from fully recovering its legitimate national rights are not unknown. The information contained in documents submitted to the Assembly by the United Nations Council for Namibia and the reported facts and the proofs submitted by representatives of SWAPO and of the democratic and progressive countries who have preceded us on this rostrum once again bear eloquent witness to the serious situation which continues to exist in Namibia and to the need to put an end to that situation once and for all.

204. In the view of our delegation, if this resumption of the thirty-fifth session is to be useful, we must focus our analysis and our attention on the substance of the problem and on the obstacles to its solution. That is necessary if we wish the Organization to be able to act with more determination in shouldering its

responsibilities. It is up to the Organization to carry out its responsibilities to the Namibian people more effectively by supporting its cause more practically and in particular by supporting the armed struggle for national liberation in the face of the manoeuvres and intrigues of its enemies.

205. Under the leadership of SWAPO the Namibian people has waged a difficult liberation struggle and has made great sacrifices for its freedom. In that struggle it has scored important victories and defended its cause. It has been able to foil its enemies. But the Namibian people are still faced with the aggressive acts of the South African Fascists, with the plots and intrigues hatched by the imperialist Powers to impede a just and final settlement of the Namibian question.

206. The most recent developments clearly demonstrate once again that the South African régime has never had and still has not the least intention of voluntarily renouncing its colonial domination of Namibia. At this moment it thinks only of stepping up its aggressive actions, terror and crimes so as to stifle the armed liberation struggle of the Namibian people. That régime continues not only to trample under foot the sovereign rights of the Namibian people but at the same time defies with heightened arrogance all peoples and world public opinion, which continue to condemn it. The disdain of the racists for the United Nations decisions on Namibia has always been revolting. This was demonstrated again at the beginning of this debate when their representatives tried to occupy seats in this hall illegally.

207. There is no further need to show that the racist régime of South Africa would not dare to continue its colonial policy in Namibia if it could not rely on the strong and consistent political, economic military and diplomatic support of the imperialist Powers, and primarily of the American imperialists. Those are the Powers that have always done everything they could to help the racist régime in South Africa to maintain its colonial domination in Namibia and to protect, thereby, their neo-colonialist interests in that country and in southern Africa in general and to threaten the other countries in Africa. It is for reasons such as these that the imperialist Powers are seeking by every possible means to delay and sabotage the advent of freedom and national sovereignty for the Namibian people.

208. In the last few years, in order better to assist the racists of South Africa, American and other imperialists have often pretended to work towards finding so-called political or negotiated solutions that would allegedly be to the advantage of and acceptable to everyone. A great deal of publicity has been given to the plan of the five Western countries, which has been held out as the best way to arrive at a solution of the problem of Namibia. All the manoeuvring of the imperialist Powers has been aimed at deceiving the Namibian people, the people of Africa and public opinion and at mitigating world reaction against the presence in Namibia of the racist régime of South Africa and imperialist interests. That manoeuvring has been aimed also at eroding the will to fight and breaking the national unity of the Namibian people, stifling its armed struggle for national liberation and

destroying SWAPO, the organizer and director of that struggle.

209. In the light of those facts of the past and the present, today we can see better than ever how the racists in South Africa continue to profit for their own ends, from the complex and dangerous situations created in Africa and throughout the world by the aggressive policy and the head-on rivalry of the imperialist super-Powers, the United States of America and the Soviet Union, for world hegemony and to carve out their own spheres of influence.

210. The racists of South Africa could not care less when African peoples have to face the difficult situations brought about on their continent by the interference of the imperialist super-Powers. The intransigence and arrogance of the South African régime with respect to a settlement of the Namibian problem become even clearer at a time when the serious situation which persists throughout the world shows new and very serious complications. More and more peoples are threatened as a result of the aggressive actions and hegemonistic aims of the American imperialists, the Soviet social-imperialists and the Chinese social-imperialists in various parts of the world. That situation greatly encourages the aggressive policies of the racists of South Africa and of all reactionary régimes. The racists of South Africa are quite pleased when other countries are the prey of intervention and domination of the social-imperialists. In order to succeed in their designs, they rely on the fresh crises and new conflicts which the super-Powers cause throughout the world. They hope that similar developments will prevent the peoples, especially the African peoples, from strengthening their support for and solidarity with the struggle of the Namibian people.

211. On the basis of its own experience and that of many other peoples, the Namibian people already knows that freedom and national independence are not offered as a gift. To obtain their national rights they have not hesitated to make the right choice, take up arms and plunge into the struggle for national liberation against their foreign racist and imperialist oppressors. The people and Government of Albania have always supported firmly the just cause of the Namibian people and the armed struggle for national liberation under the leadership of SWAPO. We remain firmly convinced that nothing can force the Namibian people to renounce its fervent wish and its aspiration to live free and independent. Locked in battle with its savage and cunning enemies, the Namibian people has already shown that nothing can break its fighting spirit.

212. As SWAPO has informed the Assembly through its representatives, the only result of the aggressive acts and the perfidious manoeuvring of the racists in South Africa and the imperialists aimed at stifling the legitimate aspirations of the Namibian people and at deflecting it from the struggle for its national rights has been to make the Namibian people more aware of the importance and need to pursue its armed struggle against foreign domination and oppression with increased vigour. It is precisely that struggle, waged to the bitter end, which is sure to lead the Namibian people to ultimate victory and national independence.

The meeting rose at 6.35 p.m.