



CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Agenda item 27:	
Question of Namibia (<i>continued</i>):	
(a) Report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples;	
(b) Report of the United Nations Council for Namibia . .	1859

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. MAVROMMATIS (Cyprus): The thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly has been resumed at this crucial and decisive time in order to consider once again the Organization's primary responsibilities towards Namibia and express once again its firm solidarity with the deprived people of that Territory in the wake of the failure of the pre-implementation meeting held at Geneva from 7 to 14 January 1981, a failure caused in its entirety by South Africa's intransigence, duplicity and arrogance.

2. There were fears and doubts stemming from lack of confidence in the sincerity and honesty of the Pretoria régime, but some of us might have also entertained some hopes and expectations that perhaps the time had come for South Africa to perceive age-old injustices, amend its policy and act in accordance with the edicts of the international community as expressed in numerous United Nations resolutions.

3. It is indeed deplorable that once again the racist régime of South Africa has turned its back on the world and stubbornly refused to carry out the previously accepted United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia. It is not the first time. We recognize once again South Africa's face of hypocrisy. We clearly see behind the new concept of "impartiality" put forward by South Africa the well-known dilatory tactics of the racist régime aimed at creating confusion and more difficulties in order to prevent the start of the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

4. In the face of this constant provocation, which poses a serious threat to international peace and security, something has to be done and done as a matter of urgency. The United Nations cannot and must not any longer endure repeated contemptuous disregard of its decisions and challenges to its very credibility.

5. More than 14 years have elapsed since the General Assembly, by its resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966, decided to terminate the Mandate conferred upon South Africa by the League of Nations for the Territory of Namibia, declared South Africa's continued occupation of Namibia illegal and placed the Territory under the direct responsibility of the United Nations. A year later, in 1967, the General Assembly, by resolution 2248 (S-V), established the United Nations Council for Namibia charged with the administration of the Territory until independence. Since that date numerous other General Assembly and Security Council resolutions have followed, as well as an advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice stressing that the continued presence of South Africa is illegal and that South Africa is under obligation to withdraw its administration from Namibia immediately and thus put an end to its occupation of the Territory.¹

6. Not only has the *apartheid* régime of South Africa flouted with arrogance and disdain the repeated appeals of the international community, refusing to recognize any authority of the United Nations over Namibia, but throughout all these years South Africa has procrastinated and continued its hideous manoeuvres to perpetuate its illegal occupation of Namibia, in flagrant violation both of the rights of the Namibian people and of the very authority of the United Nations.

7. Despite all efforts and the international moral pressure brought to bear on South Africa to withdraw from the Territory, despite the fact that the United Nations by repeated resolutions has whole-heartedly supported over the years the just struggle of the people of Namibia for their liberation and self-determination, South Africa turns a deaf ear to the world and continues to occupy Namibia illegally, aggravating repression in the Territory and resorting to acts of aggression against neighbouring African States.

8. Today, more than ever before, the General Assembly faces serious responsibilities. Namibia is the only Territory in the world which has so far been placed under the direct authority of the United Nations. Yet the resultant stalemate in the situation in Namibia quite obviously raises the question of the very credi-

¹ Legal Consequences for States of the Continued Presence of South Africa in Namibia (South West Africa) notwithstanding Security Council Resolution 276 (1970), Advisory Opinion, I.C.J. Reports 1971, p. 16.

bility of the Organization because of the latter's inability to give effect to the resolutions of its principal organs and because of the compelling need for measures, as expressly provided for in the Charter, to give substance and validity to the Organization through the effectiveness of its resolutions. If the United Nations does not ensure the implementation of its resolutions, it cannot function effectively, and the very concept—or even, I dare say, the very existence of the United Nations is in jeopardy. The non-implementation of the resolutions of the Organization is the essence of the Namibian situation and other similar cases. It is the underlying cause of the perpetuation of all unsolved and proliferating international problems, to the detriment of peace and security.

9. It is high time for the United Nations decisively to take more effective action in favour of the Namibian people. We believe that the time is now ripe for approving further measures, in addition to those under Security Council resolution 418 (1977) covering the military field, to impose on South Africa comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter. In this connexion, we fully endorse the call of the Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi from 9 to 13 February, for the convening of the Security Council to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa in order to compel the Pretoria régime to terminate its illegal occupation of Namibia. We also support the recommendation that in the event of a failure by the Security Council to apply such sanctions, an emergency special session of the General Assembly be convened to review the question of Namibia and take measures, as appropriate, under the Charter.

10. The people of Namibia have suffered far too long, and yet their most fundamental rights and freedoms are being denied to them. What is really happening in Namibia is not only a flagrant and gross violation of international law, not only a crime against humanity as a whole, but the total usurpation of man's dignity and identity.

11. The United Nations has the duty and obligation to discharge its responsibilities with regard to the people of Namibia. The Organization has set itself the sacred task of leading the Namibians to their independence. It is imperative that the international community intensify its support to bring about the realization of the legitimate aspirations of people that have suffered for decades under colonialism, racism, foreign domination and oppression.

12. The position of Cyprus on the question of Namibia is consistent and very well known. Our age-old history has also been one of continuous struggle against innumerable conquerors, foreign domination and colonialism. The noble cause of the people of Namibia, the sacrifices of many generations, their admirable heroism and sacrifice give pain but are also a source of pride to all freedom-loving people in the world.

13. My delegation has always taken a strong and clear position on the question of Namibia. Cyprus is proud to be one of the 31 members of the United Nations Council for Namibia, and we have participated with enthusiasm in the work of the Council and have utilized every opportunity presented to promote the

cause of Namibia in various international forums and on missions of the Council to several countries as well as in organized seminars.

14. We have consistently supported the legitimate struggle of the people of Namibia for their long-overdue liberation from foreign domination and oppression under the able leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization [SWAPO], the sole and authentic representative of the people of Namibia. Their ordeal has lasted far too long. The economic exploitation and the plundering of their natural resources continue unabated, despite the enactment in 1974 by the United Nations Council for Namibia of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia [A/35/24, vol. I, annex II].

15. We will continue to associate ourselves with all United Nations efforts to bring to an end the illegal occupation of Namibia and to enable its people to exercise their right to self-determination and independence in a united Namibia.

16. In that connexion, we wish to express our deep appreciation for the untiring efforts of the Secretary-General to bring about through peaceful means an acceleration of the process of genuine independence for Namibia through the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

17. We wish likewise highly to commend the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, Mr. Paul Lusaka of Zambia, for his able leadership, his untiring work and enthusiasm, dedication and contribution to the just cause of the people of Namibia.

18. In conclusion, we wish to recall that the United Nations was established on the finest principles to safeguard peace and security and, to that end, to promote human rights, social justice and legal order. Resolutions alone, however masterfully drafted, cannot by themselves lead to the desired goal. It is their effective implementation that is of paramount importance—importance to peace and security and the credibility of the United Nations.

19. Mrs. DORSET (Trinidad and Tobago): The year 1981 dawned with a meeting which held the greatest significance for the international community. It was significant because its main purpose was to agree on the modalities for the implementation of the United Nations plan for the decolonization of Namibia, in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978). The outcome of that meeting, which was held at Geneva from 7 to 14 January, is now well known. Subjected as it was to the sabotage of the South African régime, the meeting adjourned without any agreement having been reached on the date for a ceasefire and the commencement of the implementation of the proposal which would have allowed for the achievement of Namibia's independence before the end of 1981.

20. During the course of the debate on the question of Namibia, we have heard and shall continue to hear innumerable expressions of disappointment over the failure of the Geneva pre-implementation talks. Which one of us, however, can express any degree of genuine surprise? South Africa's performance at Geneva was once again in keeping with its character and a further demonstration of the contempt and disregard which the racist régime has for the international community.

My delegation shares the view expressed by the Secretary-General in his report that the outcome of the latest round of negotiations or, better put, attempt at negotiations, gives rise to the most serious international concern.

21. The international community has long recognized the fact that the situation in southern Africa constitutes a major threat to international peace and security. However, time and again South Africa has defied the will of the international community because of the overt and covert support it receives from responsible nations that fail to comply with various United Nations resolutions in which it is recognized that the total isolation of South Africa is the most viable and peaceful means of dealing with the régime's intractability. It is obvious to all that the racist Pretoria régime has absolutely no desire to fulfil its international obligations on the question of Namibia. Its stance at the recent Geneva talks is only the latest in a series of manoeuvres which it has employed in order to enable it further to consolidate its economic and political stranglehold on the Territory and to strengthen its military position there. The collective will of the majority of States Members of the United Nations is not recognized by South Africa.

22. The Pretoria régime has consistently failed to recognize the United Nations, through the United Nations Council for Namibia, as the sole legal Administering Authority for the Territory. It has instead, through sham elections and the establishment of a puppet régime, sought to create an administrative structure of its own in the Territory, designed solely to satisfy its own economic interests, as well as those of its collaborators. As a result, independence for Namibia is delayed and the development of the economic resources of Namibia for Namibians is delayed. How long will this state of affairs persist?

23. Let us ask the question, from what source does the Pretoria régime derive its confidence? The answer is that the racists are well protected by members of the international community. Although democracy is espoused by many, it is not given an opportunity to manifest itself in Namibia, and the will of a minority is effectively given licence over that of the majority. Democracy by way of the United Nations institution is frustrated in that the will of the majority has been denied implementation. When it comes to sanctions, again we see the democratic process in limbo. A not-so-simple veto does it. The arrogance and insensitivity of Mr. Botha and company are thereby encouraged in the sure knowledge that their allies will act in their behalf.

24. In the light of the dismal failure of the pre-implementation talks and the resulting impasse, the international community is faced with no alternative but to review the entire question of Namibia. The international community must give active consideration to the adoption of measures which would force the Pretoria régime to terminate its illegal and oppressive occupation of the Territory.

25. In this connexion, the delegation of Trinidad and Tobago whole-heartedly supports the call of the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity [OAU] at its thirty-sixth ordinary session, held at Addis Ababa from 23 February to 1 March 1981

[A/35/794-S/14390, annex], for the Security Council urgently to convene a meeting with a view to taking effective enforcement measures against the Pretoria régime. The imposition of a comprehensive régime of mandatory economic sanctions, including an oil embargo, under Chapter VII of the Charter, is essential. My delegation also reiterates its support for the call made by the New Delhi ministerial conference of non-aligned countries that, in the event of failure by the Security Council to adopt mandatory sanctions against South Africa, an emergency special session of the General Assembly should be convened to review the Namibian question.

26. Trinidad and Tobago continues to advocate strongly and above all a peaceful and negotiated settlement of the dispute. My delegation would like to take this opportunity to appeal to every Member of the Organization not to allow the possibility of such a settlement to recede further.

27. The Government and people of Trinidad and Tobago wish to commend SWAPO, the sole legitimate representative of the Namibian people, for its statesmanship and the spirit of compromise which it exhibited during the pre-implementation talks, as well as for the positive efforts which it has made over the last three years through negotiations aimed at achieving a peaceful settlement of the situation in Namibia. We recognize also the positive contributions which the OAU, the front-line States and Nigeria have made in the past and continue to make to the Namibian struggle.

28. The United Nations Council for Namibia, under the chairmanship of Mr. Paul Lusaka of Zambia, must be applauded for its unswerving dedication and must be given every encouragement in the arduous task of fulfilling its mandate. We wish to assure the Council of Trinidad and Tobago's continued support.

29. Every Member of the Organization claims to espouse the principle of freedom and justice for all. It is the earnest hope of my delegation that they will put their words into action, in order to ensure the independence of Namibia with the minimum delay, thereby curtailing the deplorable and tragic waste of human resources in southern Africa.

30. Mr. COUMBASSA (Guinea) (*interpretation from French*): At the opening of the present session the Government of Guinea, through its Foreign Minister, appropriately conveyed to you, Sir, its warm congratulations on your accession to the presidency of the Assembly [20th meeting]. It also expressed to you the feelings of friendship and co-operation which exist between your country, the Federal Republic of Germany, and our own, the Revolutionary People's Republic of Guinea. By your leave, Mr. President, we should like to reiterate to you the same sentiments on behalf of our delegation.

31. My delegation is convinced that under the guidance of such an eminent diplomat and efficient negotiator as yourself, the General Assembly, which has now resumed the thirty-fifth session to continue its work on the question of Namibia, will arrive at bold and positive decisions whose immediate implementation should finally enable the Namibian people, under the leadership of its sole and authentic repre-

sentative, SWAPO, to accede to full national sovereignty.

32. To the Secretary-General, I should simply like to reaffirm the friendship and regard of the people of Guinea and its beloved leader, the Supreme Leader of the Revolution, President Ahmed Sékou Touré.

33. May I recall that one of the corner-stones of the foreign policy of the State Party of Guinea is the expression of active solidarity with all those forces which throughout the world are engaged in a struggle against injustice, imperialism and colonialism. The people of Guinea and its State Party stand resolutely and constantly behind the liberation struggles being waged by the peoples of Africa to eliminate once and for all the last vestiges of colonialism on our continent. All those are reasons why the question of Namibia is a matter of primary concern to our Government.

34. One has only to recall that the 50 States which today make up the OAU, with the exception of Ethiopia and Liberia, were practically all colonies in 1945. Among those African States are all the former colonies which became Mandated Territories in 1919 and are today sovereign States: in Africa, the United Republic of Cameroon, the United Republic of Tanzania, and Togo; in the Middle East, the Syrian Arab Republic and Lebanon recovered their independence well before the United Nations came into being.

35. It is a sad fact, however, that of all the former possessions which were placed under Mandate, only Namibia still remains under foreign domination. In resolution 2145 (XXI) of 1966, the General Assembly once and for all put an end to South Africa's Mandate for Namibia; it placed the Territory of Namibia under the direct responsibility of the United Nations; and, finally, it proclaimed the inalienable right of the people of Namibia to freedom and independence. Furthermore, paragraph 2 of that resolution stipulates that the Territory of Namibia possesses international status and shall maintain that status until it achieves independence. Unfortunately, nothing was done to induce South Africa to withdraw from Namibia; on the contrary, it has continued to occupy Namibia and to proclaim the infamous laws of its criminal policy of *apartheid*.

36. In an advisory opinion which is widely known throughout the world, the International Court of Justice at The Hague declared that, the continued presence of South Africa in Namibia being illegal, South Africa was under obligation to withdraw its administration from Namibia immediately and thus put an end to its occupation of the Territory. Nothing has yet been done to prompt South Africa to respect that advisory opinion and put an end to its illegal occupation of Namibia. Rather, we have continued to witness the stubborn refusal of South Africa to withdraw from that Territory, the cold and culpable indifference of its allies to the illegal annexation of Walvis Bay and the ever-growing collective and individual massacre of the Namibian people.

37. Why do we find such brazen obstinacy on the part of South Africa? Is it because the United Nations has been unable to induce South Africa and its allies to respect the decisions of the Security Council and the General Assembly and thus put an end to the importa-

tion into Namibia of the hateful system of *apartheid*, which is a consequence of the colonial system? It must be recalled that in order to foster dialogue the international community, through all its institutions and bodies, has made use, if not of all its resources, then of all necessary means of persuasion to bring the racist régime of Pretoria to its senses.

38. How many resolutions have been adopted? How many plans for a peaceful settlement have been drawn up? How many talks have been initiated? How many meetings have been held? The last of them, held from 7 to 14 January 1981 at Geneva, brought together around the same table the international community with Africa and SWAPO and the representatives of *apartheid* for another attempt at solving the Namibian question. What were the results of that? The international community has once again been mocked by the adherents of the abominable system of *apartheid*. Will Africa and the international community continue to tolerate this defiance, which has lasted only too long? Where do we stand? What new proposals are being made to the international community by the advocates of dialogue with racist, colonialist South Africa? The members of the international community, whose good intentions have been betrayed by the disappointing and appalling results of the recent Geneva talks on the question of Namibia, must draw the necessary conclusions.

39. As far as we are concerned, South Africa's refusal to initiate any genuine dialogue with the United Nations and SWAPO at the most recent Geneva meeting on Namibia is abundant proof of the desire of Pretoria to prolong its illegal occupation of Namibia, to continue to violate its territorial integrity, to perpetuate its frenzied exploitation of its natural wealth, and to disrupt the national unity of the Namibian people.

40. In the face of this defiance, my delegation proposes to the Assembly: first, an intensification of the armed struggle; secondly, an increase in aid to Namibian refugees as well as to the front-line States which are victims of repeated acts of aggression by South Africa in order to strengthen their defence capabilities. For, as affirmed by the President of the Revolutionary People's Republic of Guinea, Comrade Ahmed Sékou Touré, "Freedom is not negotiated: it is conquered. Independence is not given as a gift: it is conquered. Dignity is not given as a gift: it is conquered." In the face of a situation like that of the Namibian people, there are certain requirements which the nations represented here cannot avoid.

41. It is, to say the least, paradoxical, if not disturbing, to note that certain members of the international community, particularly the Western countries, which bear responsibility for world security, are at the same time the protectors of the selfish interests of the colonialist and racist minority in southern Africa. Is that not a betrayal of the trust of all mankind?

42. We have at our disposal means of dissuasion which need only to be used boldly to put an end to Pretoria's insolent attitude. The first of these radical measures are mandatory economic sanctions, as provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter. They are essential and vital. The arms embargo was a step which yielded rather dubious results. Since then, there has

been unanimous agreement on economic sanctions to be applied effectively against the Government of South Africa.

43. We firmly support the decision taken at the most recent ministerial conference at New Delhi and at the latest session of the Council of Ministers of the OAU, at Addis Ababa, to request a meeting of the Security Council to take up the question of Namibia in order to decide on the specific measures to be taken against the South African Government.

44. My delegation would like to address its warm congratulations to the United Nations Council for Namibia for the dedication and sense of responsibility which it has displayed in the fulfilment of its mission under the presidency of Mr. Paul Lusaka of Zambia.

45. Finally, my delegation would like to reaffirm the active solidarity of the militant people of Guinea and of its State Party with SWAPO, the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people, in its just and heroic struggle for national independence and sovereignty.

46. Mr. PASTINEN (Finland): The General Assembly has resumed consideration of the question of Namibia at a particularly crucial time. Only a short while ago, a meeting took place at Geneva in order to determine the final modalities of the implementation of the Security Council plan for Namibia. The culmination of the persistent efforts deployed during the last three years seemed to be at hand. The meeting, however, proved abortive. Once again, the hopes of the international community were dashed. There is no room for interpretation with regard to responsibility for the failure: it lies squarely with South Africa.

47. During the protracted process of negotiations, South Africa has raised a host of different arguments. The last one was the issue of the partiality or impartiality of the United Nations in this question. The obvious answer to that one is indeed simple: the United Nations is partial. It has been, and continues to be, partial: it is in favour of an immediate peaceful solution to the question on the basis of free and fair elections and an early transition of Namibia to full independence. This partiality stems from the Charter itself, particularly from its Chapter XI, and from the universally recognized legal status of Namibia as an international Territory for which the United Nations has assumed responsibility. In this respect the United Nations enjoys the full confidence of its Member States.

48. The extended process of negotiation on Namibia has taxed the patience of the international community in general and of the African States in particular. The statesmanship demonstrated by the OAU, the front-line States and SWAPO deserves our tribute. Their disappointment is justified. Yet political sagacity and farsightedness will always have their reward. The patience demonstrated by the African States will prove worthwhile. We also appreciate the contribution of the five Western Powers which were instrumental in getting the negotiations under way. We trust that they will continue to be aware of their continuing interest and responsibility and act accordingly.

49. The main obstacle to a peaceful settlement in Namibia has been and is the Government of South

Africa. All along, its intentions have been ambiguous, to say the least. The Geneva meeting was another proof of that. The prospect of a truly independent Namibia obviously requires a profound change in the attitude of South Africa. It is often hard to measure long-term benefits with the yardstick of immediate gain. However, in Namibia—as was indeed the case in Zimbabwe—a peaceful settlement, after years of bloodshed and violence, would be a solution which would benefit all. Laying aside preconceived fears and suspicions, then, this should be true for South Africa in its future relations with an independent Namibia. Sooner or later, even South Africa has to acknowledge the necessity for change.

50. The position of my Government on the question of Namibia remains unchanged. The illegal occupation of Namibia must come to an end. The Namibian people should be given the right to exercise its right to self-determination. No internal solution will be acceptable to the international community.

51. In these matters my country acts in close concert with the other Nordic countries. As early as September 1977 the Nordic Foreign Ministers, at their meeting in Helsinki, expressed their joint support for the activities initiated with a view to achieving a peaceful settlement of the question of Namibia. Since then the Nordic countries have closely followed the efforts to achieve a negotiated settlement in conformity with Security Council resolution 385 (1976). They have been in frequent contact with the five Western Powers, the originators of the proposals, with SWAPO and with the African front-line States. The Nordic Foreign Ministers reaffirmed their commitment to the United Nations plan at their meeting in September last year.

52. We Finns have a special relationship of friendship with the Namibian people spanning more than a century. This relationship is based on humanitarian and educational activities. In the United Nations Finnish initiatives and proposals led to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice in 1971, which confirmed the illegality of the South African presence in Namibia, to the founding of the United Nations Fund for Namibia, and to the establishment of the United Nations Institute for Namibia. The Nationhood Programme for Namibia—now in full progress—was also based on an initiative of ours. We annually contribute to the United Nations Fund for Namibia, to the Institute and to the Nationhood Programme. My Government has already pledged to make Namibia a major recipient of Finnish bilateral technical assistance as soon as independence has been achieved. Finland also continues to give financial and other kinds of assistance to SWAPO for humanitarian purposes. All along our action has been motivated by a desire to make a constructive and pragmatic contribution to the cause of the people of Namibia.

53. For the United Nations as a whole Namibia has been a matter of deep concern for more than 30 years. Fourteen years ago the United Nations assumed direct responsibility for Namibia and terminated South Africa's Mandate. We must pay a tribute to the tireless work done ever since by the United Nations Council for Namibia, and the report of the Council before us [A/35/24 and Corr.1 and 2] bears witness to its efforts under the energetic presidency of Mr. Paul Lusaka of Zambia. It describes in graphic detail the continuing

sufferings of the Namibian people, the agony of a captive nation, the deprivation of its human rights and the depletion of its rich natural resources—the very basis of its future livelihood.

54. The full realization of the historic responsibility of the Organization and all its Members towards the people of Namibia is long overdue. Therefore the question of Namibia remains a test—a supreme test—for the Organization and for all of us.

55. Mr. BENDAÑA RODRÍGUEZ (Nicaragua) (*interpretation from Spanish*): It is inevitable that we should begin our statement on the question of Namibia by referring to the breakdown of the Geneva meeting on the achievement of independence for that long-suffering nation. Despite the dedicated and patient work of the Secretary-General, the international community cannot but be indignant at the spectacle of the South African delegation flagrantly and deliberately causing that meeting's collapse.

56. Vulgar insults compounded the intransigence which, as in the past, characterized the attitude of the representatives of the racist régime. The refusal of the Pretoria régime to accept the just and necessary United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia was once again made patently clear.

57. At no time did the South African régime attempt seriously to discuss the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). Rather, we saw provocations and delaying tactics aimed at bringing about South Africa's real objective, which is to prolong its illegal, repressive and exploitative occupation of the Namibian nation. How brazenly the puppets of the occupying Power acted, as if they represented a State.

58. That was not the attitude adopted by SWAPO, the sole and legitimate representative of the Namibian people. SWAPO came to Geneva to enter into a dialogue and negotiate seriously, bolstered not merely by its role as the vanguard of the just struggle of the valiant Namibian people for its freedom and full self-determination but also by the legitimacy conferred upon it by numerous resolutions of the United Nations and the OAU.

59. From a position of firmness and legitimacy that it holds by virtue of history and popular support, SWAPO from the beginning made clear its willingness to sign a cease-fire immediately and to agree to set a date for the arrival of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group [UNTAG] provided for in the United Nations plan. At Geneva the statesmanlike and responsible attitude of SWAPO and its capacity to govern a free Namibia were fully demonstrated.

60. Are we to conclude, given this new chapter in the long history of South African intransigence with respect to Namibia, that only the path of armed struggle remains? Clearly, the South African régime believes so, because its contempt for the opportunity to bring about a peaceful transition to Namibia's independence is nothing but a diabolical strategy to perpetuate by all possible means the domination of *apartheid* in southern Africa and to relieve the profound internal crisis in that inhuman system.

61. There is no clearer proof of Pretoria's intentions than the new escalation of acts of armed aggression

against neighbouring countries. Recently, on 30 January, there was the attack by racist commandos against the homes of refugees of the African National Congress of South Africa in Mozambique. To that are added the new acts of aggression against the People's Republic of Angola. The South African Prime Minister himself, in statements on 25 February, threatened to continue the attacks against sovereign front-line States. This is the beginning of an escalation of aggression against the countries that support the liberation movements in the region. The main objective of these acts of aggression is to destabilize the front-line States in order to weaken their unshakable commitment to the liberation of Namibia.

62. It is in that framework that Nicaragua interprets and condemns the massive repression unleashed against that people and its vanguard, SWAPO, by the illegal occupying Administration. The racists seek to create a climate of terror in order to impose a political arrangement perpetuating the brutal system of *apartheid* and its colonial exploitation. We are witnessing the forced recruiting of Namibians for the setting up of a repressive force, the so-called South West Africa Army. That manœuvre, as well as the creation of puppet power structures, shows South Africa's determination to proclaim unilaterally the independence of Namibia for its own benefit.

63. Similarly, Nicaragua notes and condemns the military co-operation between South Africa and certain States, which is in violation of Security Council resolution 418 (1977), which imposed an arms embargo against South Africa. No less of a stumbling-block for the independence of Namibia are the activities of those foreign economic interests that in partnership with the South Africans are facilitating and benefiting from exploitation of the human and material resources of Namibia. We recall and support Decree No. 1 of the United Nations Council for Namibia, which calls for action by States whose transnational corporations are continuing to operate in Namibia under the illegal South African Administration.

64. The same interests are now pleading for greater understanding of South Africa and other repressive régimes, while they characterize as terrorist the liberation movements, whether in Namibia, Palestine or El Salvador. The threat of violent assault by criminal armed forces is a daily reality for those peoples; for it is the peoples that are the victims of terrorism. But the peoples will not be the pawns of those who assert that they have vital interests or spheres of influence, nor are they going to be the victims of those who wish to unleash a new cold war.

65. Since the situation in Namibia is continuing to worsen rapidly, seriously threatening international peace and security, it is essential that the United Nations reaffirm its responsibility in the matter. As the Secretary-General has said in his report, "the outcome of the meeting at Geneva must give rise to the most serious international concern".²

66. We would recall and reaffirm that Namibia is the direct responsibility of the United Nations until that Territory achieves genuine self-determination and that

² *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-sixth Year, Supplement for January, February and March 1981, document S/14333, para. 21.*

the decisions of the United Nations cannot be flouted with impunity. The United Nations is facing the most serious challenge to its authority since its foundation.

67. The hope harboured in some sectors that South Africa is capable of heeding reason and respecting the United Nations must be set aside once and for all after Geneva. The United Nations must face that fact and not merely ignore it. On that score, the position of Nicaragua, along with that of 94 countries, was put forward at the recent ministerial conference of the countries of the non-aligned movement at New Delhi, when they called on the Security Council urgently to impose on South Africa broad mandatory economic sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter in order to compel the Pretoria régime to put an end to its illegal occupation of Namibia. Nicaragua agrees with the recommendation that, failing application by the Security Council of such economic sanctions, a special session should be convened at the ministerial level to examine the question of Namibia and to take the appropriate necessary measures.

68. We would conclude by reaffirming that the people and the revolutionary Government of Nicaragua will be equal to the challenge represented by the struggle for the liberation of Namibia. We fully associate ourselves with the words of the Observer for SWAPO at the 103rd meeting, who reminded us all that the struggle for Namibian liberation and its cause is the cause of the United Nations and of all progressive mankind devoted to peace and the protection of justice. It is the cause of decolonization, of the achievement of the right to self-determination, freedom and national independence. We would humbly add that it is also the cause of the Nicaraguan revolution and of the people of Sandino.

69. Mr. KASEMSRI (Thailand): Once again urgent and weighty circumstances have compelled the General Assembly to consider the situation in Namibia. After the deplorable failure of the recent pre-implementation meeting at Geneva, it is both timely and appropriate for this body to take up this thorny issue and to ponder possible courses of future action.

70. The question of Namibia has for over three decades cast an ominous shadow on the otherwise historic accomplishments of the United Nations in the area of decolonization. The United Nations, which is directly responsible for promoting self-determination, freedom and national independence for Namibia, has seen its efforts time and again frustrated by the intransigence and duplicity of the Pretoria authorities.

71. Namibia remains illegally occupied by South Africa in open violation of the principles of the Charter and international law, as well as numerous Security Council and General Assembly resolutions and in callous defiance of international opinion and outcry. The unfortunate history of the South African occupation of Namibia is replete with inhuman acts of subjugation and depredation, plunder and pillage by the occupying Power. The atrocious policy of *apartheid* and shameless exploitation of Namibia's natural resources only add to the long list of abominable crimes committed by South Africa against the Namibian people.

72. My delegation has consistently supported the struggle of the people of Namibia—in accordance with the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples [*resolution 1514 (XV)*] as well as other relevant United Nations resolutions—under the leadership of SWAPO, in order to attain their legitimate goals of self-determination, freedom and independence in a united Namibia.

73. The right to self-determination of all peoples is surely one of the most fundamental rights vested in mankind. It is all the more deplorable that in certain parts of the world today there are peoples who share a plight similar to that of the suffering Namibian people.

74. In such situations involving illegal foreign occupation and deprivation of that right, there is inevitably a serious threat to international peace and security as the occupying forces proceed to commit deliberate acts of aggression or intimidation against neighbouring countries. For instance, South Africa's aggressive acts against front-line African States have been launched from the illegally occupied Territory of Namibia.

75. Furthermore, world peace is in jeopardy because of the involvement of major Powers and their increasing rivalry in such trouble-spots. Moreover, such situations give rise to the problem of refugees and displaced persons, which increases the burden on countries of first refuge, as well as on the international community as a whole, not to mention the enormous human suffering which accompanies such developments.

76. Therefore, with regard to Namibia, as well as in similar situations, the occupying Power must be compelled to withdraw all forces, to cease repression of the local population, to desist from disrupting their economy, to halt demographic changes in the occupied Territory and to stop plundering its natural resources.

77. The people of Namibia must be guaranteed their freedom to exercise their right to self-determination in United Nations-supervised elections. It should be recalled that, in 1978, South Africa was engaged in thwarting United Nations peace efforts by organizing illegal elections in Namibia, in defiance of the relevant United Nations resolutions, particularly Security Council resolution 439 (1978). Those so-called elections were held in the presence of the occupying armed forces in an attempt to legitimize their occupation of Namibia as well as the installation of the puppet régime by the force of foreign arms. However, the international community was not fooled by those devious manoeuvres. Instead, South Africa's perfidious acts were strongly condemned by the world.

78. The natural resources of Namibia are the inviolable heritage of the Namibian people. South Africa and other parties concerned must refrain from exploiting such resources for their own enrichment, to the detriment of Namibia's sovereign rights over those resources. All parties must refrain from any economic activity or collaboration with South Africa, which can only serve to impede progress towards self-determination, freedom and independence for the Namibian people. Thailand, for one, voluntarily imposed a trade embargo against South Africa several years ago, and it has consistently supported other

measures against the Pretoria régime in compliance with the relevant United Nations resolutions.

79. My delegation notes with serious concern the report of continued access to sophisticated weapons and nuclear technology by South Africa, in contravention of the arms embargo. Surely the international community is not unaware of the dangerous implications and grave risks that this involves. We should therefore renew our efforts to monitor those developments closely and put an end to such illegal collaboration once and for all.

80. South Africa's obstinate refusal to implement Security Council resolution 435 (1978) of 29 September 1978, which provides the proper basis for a peaceful settlement for Namibia, constitutes a threat to international peace and security in the region. South Africa's unwillingness to sign a cease-fire agreement and to proceed with the implementation of the peace plan endorsed by the Security Council is indeed a manifestation of arrogance on its part. South Africa must therefore be held responsible for the failure of the pre-implementation meeting at Geneva, which is of grave concern and a disappointment to my delegation. Every effort must be made to compel South Africa to comply with all United Nations resolutions without any further delay.

81. My delegation would like to reaffirm its fervent hope that Namibia will soon gain its rightful place in the community of nations. Meanwhile, we join with other delegations in calling for an immediate cessation of the brutal suppression of the Namibian people by South Africa, which is indeed a horrendous crime against humanity, and for the prompt and full implementation of the peace plan under United Nations auspices in order to ensure the earliest possible attainment of freedom and independence by Namibia.

82. Mr. DORJI (Bhutan): We recently rejoiced at our success in fulfilling our objective of a free and independent Zimbabwe. We shall not sit idly by while Namibia struggles for its independence.

83. The Namibian people have suffered under an illegal, repressive and oppressive régime for six decades. It is indeed unfortunate that we should again have to gather here to grapple with the issue of Namibian independence, which should long since have been an accomplished fact. There is no doubt in any of our minds, except that of South Africa, that Namibia should take its rightful place in the free comity of nations.

84. The economic, political and social conditions of black Namibians under South African Administration have been far from enviable—in fact, they have been deplorable. The inhumanity of South Africa's repressive and discriminatory practices in Namibia is compounded by the very real threat those practices pose to international peace and security. South Africa uses Namibia as a base for aggression against its neighbouring States, and the volatile conditions prevailing in Namibia as a result of guerrilla warfare could easily spread and involve more than just SWAPO and the South African forces. Apart from this, South Africa is illegally exploiting Namibian natural resources, particularly uranium, the exploitation, processing and random marketing of which increase the threat to international peace and security.

85. The United Nations has always been active in bringing international pressure to bear on South Africa in the interest of Namibian independence. By means of the momentous General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) of 1966, the United Nations formally revoked the League of Nations Mandate, stating that South Africa had failed to fulfil its responsibility for the material and moral welfare of the Namibian people. Having revoked the Mandate, we in the United Nations thus assumed the responsibility for administering Namibia and affirmed its international status until it should become a sovereign independent State as a result of free elections.

86. In pursuance of that responsibility, at its fifth special session, in 1967, the General Assembly, by resolution 2248 (S-V), established the United Nations Council for Namibia to administer the Territory until independence. At this point, I should like to express the appreciation of my delegation to the United Nations Council for Namibia and its President, Mr. Paul Lusaka, for their untiring efforts towards achieving the goals of the United Nations. At the ninth special session, on Namibia, in April 1978, the General Assembly adopted a clearly defined programme for the independence of Namibia, including the territory of Walvis Bay [*resolution S-9/2*].

87. Invaluable as General Assembly action on Namibia has been, it was the Security Council in its resolution 385 (1976) that for the first time called for elections in Namibia, and all succeeding efforts to achieve Namibian independence under United Nations auspices have been predicated on that resolution.

88. South Africa's intransigence, however, has stymied any genuine moves towards free and fair elections. Negotiations between the five Western members of the Security Council and South Africa produced an agreement to hold free and fair elections under United Nations supervision and control, an agreement formalized in Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

89. However, the fact that South Africa is not really interested in co-operating has been proved once again. In spite of the fact that South Africa originally agreed to resolution 435 (1978), the latest round of talks on the pre-implementation meeting held at Geneva, failed as a result of South Africa's unwillingness to accept the implementation of that resolution. At the Geneva meeting, South Africa tried to hide behind the puppet régime that it has installed in Windhoek, Namibia, but there is no question as to who pulls the puppets' strings. They always seem to manufacture some excuse to block progress when matters are heading towards definitive action on Namibian independence.

90. Because of the failure of the pre-implementation talks, the Foreign Ministers of non-aligned countries, at the New Delhi Conference, issued a Declaration in which they called on the Security Council urgently to impose comprehensive mandatory economic sanctions, under Chapter VII of the Charter, against South Africa to compel it to end its illegal occupation of Namibia; and should the Security Council fail to impose such economic sanctions, the Ministers recommended the convening of an emergency special session of the General Assembly. It is the hope of my delegation that the Assembly will take action to this end. We

can no longer allow the immoral actions of South Africa to continue apace. My delegation believes that at this very session we must summon up all our resources and ensure that Namibia is finally extricated from the avaricious claws of its ruthless neighbour.

91. The Kingdom of Bhutan is a peace-loving country, and our position has always been to welcome and support all measures proposed and adopted by the United Nations to break down South Africa's intransigence by non-violent means. It has been our avowed contention that the only way for the Namibian people to exercise the right of self-determination without fear of reprisals would be if the South African army were withdrawn from the area and elections held under the auspices of the United Nations. Persistent efforts have brought us close to the goal, but its final achievement has been frustrated. Now South Africa is casting doubts on the validity of the impartiality of the United Nations itself. Such behaviour cannot be tolerated, and we must make a supreme effort to achieve our final goal—that of a truly independent State of Namibia, an equal and respected partner in our comity of nations.

92. Mr. SILWAL (Nepal): The General Assembly at the resumed thirty-fifth session, is considering the question of Namibia at a time of great anxiety over the future of that Territory. Events in the last few months have moved swiftly, and the world body is now at a decisive point where its commitment to genuine independence for the people of Namibia is being put to the test.

93. The road to the independence of Namibia has been made amply clear by the various resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council, in particular by Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978). The convening of the pre-implementation meeting at Geneva early this year raised hopes that the long-delayed independence of Namibia would be achieved this year. The talks failed because of the characteristic intransigence of South Africa. The questioning of the impartiality of the United Nations and the demanding of an atmosphere of trust and confidence by the so-called representatives of the Territory and the Pretoria-appointed administrator have again laid bare the ultimate intentions of South Africa.

94. The Geneva pre-implementation talks have, once again, demonstrated the willingness of SWAPO, the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people, to enter into any meaningful search for a negotiated settlement of the Namibian question. We have always supported and continue to support the legitimate struggle for independence led by SWAPO.

95. My delegation wishes also to express its appreciation of the efforts exerted by the Secretary-General to find a peaceful solution of the question. I should also like to express my delegation's appreciation to the front-line States, Nigeria, the OAU and the contact group of the five Western countries for the efforts they made during the pre-implementation talks. My delegation fully supports the activities of the United Nations Council for Namibia and highly commends its efforts for the early realization of Namibian independence.

96. South Africa's defiance of international public opinion constitutes a grave threat to international peace and security. Its military build-up in Namibia underlines this fact. It is no accident that the growing intransigence of the racist régime has coincided with its increasing aggression against neighbouring African States. The stepped-up repression within Namibia by South Africa further underlines its designs.

97. A just settlement of the question of Namibia cannot be conceived except on the basis of the total and unconditional withdrawal of the occupying forces, the abolition of the administrative system imposed by South Africa and the guarantee of the territorial integrity of Namibia.

98. The United Nations must now meet the expectations of the Namibian people. We strongly support the adoption and effective implementation of comprehensive measures under Chapter VII of the Charter. Only a policy of systematic, effective and comprehensive sanctions can force South Africa to end its illegal occupation and transfer power, under United Nations supervision and control, to the Namibian people. Such a concerted international effort must relate not only to Namibia but also to the policy of *apartheid* of the South African régime. When all avenues have been tried, the time comes to act. Any delay, hesitation or weakness will strengthen the hand of the racist oppressors, and this would mean defeat for the noble purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, which we are all committed to uphold.

99. Mr. OKEYO (Kenya): The question of Namibia has been on the agenda of the General Assembly ever since the inception of the Organization. The international community has therefore pronounced itself on it many times, but in every case the pronouncement has fallen on the deaf ears of the racist régime of Pretoria.

100. This belated debate on Namibia should have taken place in December last year. The international community acted in good faith in the belief that the racist régime of South Africa would honour the terms of settlement in Geneva, with the eventual result that Namibia, through the leadership of SWAPO, would gain independence in 1981. Regrettably, the criminal racist régime in Pretoria, through duplicity and dilatory tactics, once again manoeuvred so as to take the well-intentioned world community for a ride.

101. It could be said that SWAPO was right when it felt that the Boer régime was resorting to its customary sinister political tactics with a view to further delaying the implementation of Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978). South Africa has adopted these dirty tactics so as to buy time and therefore dig its menacing heels deeper and deeper into the ground in order to entrench further the illegal occupation, colonial oppression and exploitation of Namibia. The International community has condemned the *apartheid* system as a crime against humanity and labelled its régime illegal, and yet these fascists continue to behave as though the rest of the world were irrelevant.

102. The Fascist and colonial régime in Pretoria is currently trying to fool the world by twisting facts and shifting the blame somewhere else as regards the

failure of the Geneva meeting. South Africa alone became obstinate on the proposal for the cease-fire, and consequently the holding of open and fair elections under the supervision of the United Nations was not possible.

103. There is absolutely no element of truth in the empty propaganda now being generated by that racist régime. The repeated demand of the world community is for the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of South Africa's illegal racist colonial Administration from Namibia.

104. Perhaps one needs to restate the events as they have evolved so far. In April 1978, the five Western countries then serving on the Security Council announced a settlement proposal in accordance with the provisions of Security Council resolution 385 (1976), which raised expectations that Namibia would at long last achieve its independence. The proposal was the product of lengthy discussions with both South Africa and SWAPO, as well as with other parties concerned, in particular the front-line States. In September that year, the Security Council endorsed the Secretary-General's plan for implementation of the settlement proposal and decided to establish UNTAG under its authority. The racist régime had bluffed the world body by accepting the settlement proposal of the five Western countries in April; on the other hand, it rejected the implementation plan of the Secretary-General.

105. My delegation is therefore deeply disturbed by the intransigent attitude of South Africa which led to the lack of agreement on a cease-fire. Thus the international community is now faced with a regrettable situation in which yet another round of endeavour has to be manufactured. It is the view of my delegation that the international community has no option left but to resort to more drastic undertakings against the racist régime. When the Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries met at New Delhi in February, the Ministers reached the most opportune and correct conclusion on the course of action to be taken by the international community against South Africa. The Kenya Government fully shares those conclusions. I should like to quote, therefore, the recommendation of the Foreign Ministers:

“As a result of the failure of the Geneva meeting, caused by South Africa's duplicity and arrogance, the Ministers called on the United Nations Security Council urgently to impose comprehensive mandatory economic sanctions under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter against South Africa to compel the Pretoria régime to terminate its illegal occupation of Namibia.”

106. The international community must therefore face the arrogance of South Africa directly. Comprehensive economic sanctions have also been supported by the Council of Ministers of the OAU, which met at Addis Ababa a week after the New Delhi Conference.

107. Kenya, as a country that went through colonial struggle to attain independence, believes it inevitable that Namibia will achieve independence. The writing is on the wall. South Africa had better listen or, at least, read the writing on the wall. Our African brothers are dying for liberty, which is their inalienable right.

108. The people of Kenya will always support the Namibian people through its only authentic organization, SWAPO, which is also recognized by the OAU as the only legitimate organization representative of the oppressed Namibian people.

109. As things stand now, the arrogance and intransigent attitude of South Africa have left no room for any course of action other than economic sanctions. Their imposition is perhaps the only measure that would ensure South Africa's compliance with the world's stance on the Namibian question. My delegation trusts that South Africa is taking serious note of the growing indignation of the world community and that it will not behave as though the world community does not mean business.

110. My country will continue to support the struggle of SWAPO in any form until the oppressed people of Namibia are free of colonialism and racism. We oppose the systematic fragmentation of the territory of Namibia exemplified by bantustanization. We oppose the racist régime's policy of divide-and-rule, the staging of sham elections and the appointment of a so-called Council of Ministers. We shall always oppose the denial to Namibians of their economic wealth through the indiscriminate exploitation of their natural resources.

111. South Africa will co-operate on a negotiated cease-fire only when it is forced to do so by armed struggle. Comprehensive economic sanctions will assist that struggle to the final conclusion. The world community must address this question, therefore, with these realities in mind.

112. South Africa must be forced out of Namibia so that the Namibian people can hold free and fair elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations. The international community has enough moral grounds to ensure that Namibia does not continue to be a colonial enclave of the racist régime.

113. Mr. SHAIKHO (Bahrain) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The majority of the States Members of the Organization have, year after year, supported the right of the people of Namibia to independence and self-determination. We have affirmed the duty of the United Nations to enable that people to exercise that legitimate right. Throughout the past years, however, that support has not helped the people of Namibia to win its independence and self-determination.

114. The General Assembly, in the first part of this session, deferred consideration of the question of Namibia by its decision 35/450 of 17 December 1980, to allow the pre-implementation meeting, which was held at Geneva under the auspices of the United Nations, to proceed with positive negotiations. However, the Government in Pretoria did not take advantage of that opportunity and, with unprecedented arrogance, failed to respond to the United Nations with goodwill. It completely torpedoed the Geneva talks, despite the concessions and the goodwill offered by the other parties concerned, but not, obviously, by South Africa.

115. The League of Nations entrusted the Mandate for Namibia to South Africa, but unfortunately we have seen that the wolf has been made the shepherd and the offender has become the judge. The Namibian

people, bound hand and foot, remain in the hands of the racist and inhuman Government in Pretoria. On 27 October 1966 the General Assembly put an end to that Mandate with its resolution 2145 (XXI), and the next year saw the creation of the United Nations Council for Namibia. Since then numerous resolutions on the question of Namibia have been adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council, and the International Court of Justice, on 21 June 1971, handed down an advisory opinion which had been solicited by the Security Council in its resolution 284 (1970). All these resolutions supported the legitimate rights of the people of Namibia and condemned the illegal stand of the Government of Pretoria. Those resolutions, however, did not bring the racist Government of Pretoria to heed the voice of right and justice. The United Nations must therefore now change its tactics, drop its desire for dialogue and pleading and adopt sanctions amounting to a total political and economic embargo on South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter.

116. It is also high time that the Western Powers and peoples that co-operate with South Africa faced up to their responsibilities. That is clear from the Charter and the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council and follows equally clearly from the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Consequently, the time has come to commit ourselves to work on the basis of humanitarian principles. It is impossible to co-operate with injustice, to support the culprit and simply to rap the knuckles of the racist régime of Pretoria; instead, very clear-cut and specific steps should be taken against it. Lip service is of no avail against injustice and oppression.

117. It was only right that South Africa's participation here was rejected last week by the General Assembly, because the South African Government has failed to observe decisions taken by this body and has refused to apply the principles of the Charter. It was the least that could be done to express quite clearly our rejection of the racist policies pursued by the Government of Pretoria in Namibia and in southern Africa. Those who engage in legal quibbles about South Africa's participation in our discussions are fully aware of the true point of the issue, but they are attempting to ignore the fact that the presence of South Africa in Namibia is illegal and that the racist policies of South Africa are both inhuman and contrary to international law.

118. My delegation would like to thank the United Nations Council for Namibia, under the leadership of Mr. Lusaka, for the humanitarian efforts it has made on behalf of Namibia and its people. My delegation would also like to take this opportunity to express its support for SWAPO, which is the sole legitimate representative of the people of Namibia, now struggling for its freedom.

119. My delegation reiterates its appeal that Chapter VII of the Charter be applied against the racist Government of South Africa so that it will be forced to withdraw completely from Namibia, including from the region of Walvis Bay.

120. Mr. da LUZ (Cape Verde) (*interpretation from French*): The resumption of the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly should not be a mere technical

formality having as its purpose the analysis of one of the items on its agenda, namely, the question of Namibia.

121. It should lead to the taking of effective measures against the constant defiance by the Pretoria racists of the international community.

122. It should lead to an appropriate response to the heroic struggle of the Namibian people, under the leadership of SWAPO, and to the hopes nurtured by almost three years of negotiations, separate meetings and attempts to find a peaceful settlement of the problem of Namibia which, to say the least, suffered a very grave setback last January at the Palais des Nations at Geneva.

123. It should produce a strong response to the frustration which troubles our conscience and to the questions that call for self-criticism on the part of us all. We ought, in fact, to ask ourselves whether, in accordance with the responsibilities and the commitments we have entered into vis-à-vis the Namibian people, we have done everything possible to bring about a solution.

124. In taking part in this debate the delegation of Cape Verde does not wish merely to discharge its duty as a member of the international community but, above all, to demonstrate its unconditional and militant solidarity with the Namibian people, which since 1966, under the clear-sighted leadership of SWAPO, its sole legitimate representative, has in all areas been waging a ceaseless struggle to recover its place in history as an independent and sovereign people.

125. In this respect, we think that at a time when manoeuvres to prevent genuine independence for Namibia are proliferating, the allies of SWAPO in its anti-racist and anti-colonialist struggle must show their unconditional support for it.

126. There is no need to go into the background of the events in Namibia and the struggle waged by its people under the leadership of SWAPO since South Africa's Mandate was revoked by the General Assembly in its resolution 2145 (XXI); it is too well known. But let me recall the circumstances which led to the adoption of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which we consider to be important in the search for a peaceful settlement of the question of Namibia.

127. In the view of my delegation, a peaceful settlement befitting the legitimate aspirations and the painful struggle for national liberation waged by the Namibian patriots ought to have no other result than genuine independence for Namibia, safeguarding its territorial integrity in accordance with the ideals of peace and justice set forth in the Charter and in relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, notably Security Council resolution 432 (1978).

128. Resolution 435 (1978) enshrines the victories won in armed struggle and on the diplomatic level by the Namibian people under the leadership of SWAPO. Those victories showed the irreversible nature of the struggle of the Namibian people and required that the international community act more consistently in the search for a peaceful settlement of the problem.

129. Accordingly, the United Nations drew up a plan, resulting from the joint proposal of Can. da,

France, the Federal Republic of Germany, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America, with the assurance of co-operation from South Africa. We accepted this, convinced that it constituted a serious working basis for a settlement of the question of Namibia.

130. But what have we seen since then? On the one hand, the willingness of SWAPO to co-operate in the search for a negotiated settlement, demonstrating its readiness to engage in dialogue and the political maturity of its leaders, in particular President Sam Nujoma; on the other hand, the arrogant, provocative attitude of Pretoria, which, through its constant manoeuvres, has shown only scorn for the decisions of the international community, continuing to exploit the wealth of Namibia and perpetuating the subjugation of its people to one of the most ignominious of crimes in the history of mankind—*apartheid*.

131. However, if we are to be consistent, we are bound to admit that the Namibian people and South Africa are not the only actors in this drama which has already inflicted on the Namibian people the loss of thousands of human lives, severed a legitimate part of its territory—Walvis Bay—and exposed its natural resources to a veritable looting.

132. If we are to be consistent, it is essential that we denounce the direct and indirect accomplices in this perpetuation of retrograde colonialism by South Africa, in the imprisonment, torture, and slaughter of thousands of Namibian patriots and in the annexation and the dismemberment of the Namibian nation along tribal lines, accomplices who are, in the final analysis, beneficiaries of the pillaging of the immense natural resources of Namibia.

133. Without that complicity South Africa would long ago have given up its illegal occupation of Namibia and in the last resort would have benefited from the overtures of SWAPO to collaborate in the United Nations plan in a search for a peaceful settlement.

134. The manoeuvres and procrastination that we witnessed at the Geneva meeting and the attempts to impose on SWAPO direct negotiations with Dirk Mudge, the puppet leader of the Democratic Turnhalle Alliance, bear clear witness to South Africa's intentions and to its total opposition to resolution 435 (1978). On this score and clearly in order to play for time, hoping for a possible about-face by his allies, "Pik" Botha declared that there was no need for South Africa to negotiate directly with SWAPO, and Dirk Mudge sought to present himself as the elected Prime Minister of the Namibian Government.

135. However, we feel that all the efforts made to organize the meeting were not in vain. Indeed, the meeting confirmed the seriousness and the goodwill of SWAPO, demonstrated when it went to Geneva. It denounced to world public opinion all the insolent delaying tactics used by South Africa, on which must fall the political and moral responsibility for the failure. But it particularly showed that SWAPO and its allies will never accept puppet independence, remote-controlled from Pretoria, and that the freedom fighters are ready to make any sacrifice to build a Namibian fatherland in accordance with their political and economic options.

136. The failure of the Geneva meeting means that new ideas are required from the international community, new approaches and specific measures, as the only way to redeem itself in the eyes of the heroic people of Namibia. The unconditional allies of SWAPO are no longer morally justified in calling for further tolerance on its part, a spirit of conciliation and greater concessions, for that would be incompatible with the grandeur of its national liberation struggle.

137. It is incumbent upon Pretoria's allies to show proof of their determination to contribute effectively to getting South Africa to put an end to its permanent defiance of the decisions of the United Nations and to ensure that it halts the daily acts of aggression in southern Africa that threaten to spread across our entire continent.

138. Those urgent measures which necessarily imply, on the one hand, military, political and financial support for SWAPO, and, on the other, willingness to apply comprehensive economic sanctions against South Africa are not compatible with calculations of the pros and cons of genuine independence for Namibia. All national liberation struggles have their own dynamics, and the struggle of the Namibian people, dialectically, has already shown that it has built up an irreversible momentum.

139. This axiom should constitute the basis for consideration of initiatives and measures which the contact group and its allies must take in the future as their contribution to solving a conflict which is extremely dangerous for international peace and whose future proportions are difficult to predict. The contact group has a political and moral duty to respond positively and unreservedly to the appeal which we make to it not to stop half-way but to co-operate in the search for a just and true peace for the Namibian people. First, as members of the international community they also bear responsibility for genuine independence in Namibia and are themselves victims of any defiance of the Organization by South Africa. Secondly, as the privileged partners of South Africa they have the appropriate means to bring pressure to bear and to get South Africa to conform to the resolutions and decisions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. Lastly, the hopes which they raised in us and the assurance they gave that South Africa would respond positively to the peace initiative according to the terms emerging from the plan which they presented deserve an adequate response. But we insist that these measures and actions are urgent. The urgency is all the greater because, while preventing the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) in Geneva, South Africa also stepped up internal repression and the violation of the territory of neighbouring countries, particularly of Angola, Mozambique and Zambia. These measures are particularly urgent because the international community cannot remain passive in the face of this growing aggression that is accompanied by acts of barbarism and terrorism against its members.

140. At the recent Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi, a thorough analysis was made of the Namibian problem following the failure of the meeting at Geneva and measures were advocated which should be adopted at the present session. The delegation of

Cape Verde subscribes to those recommendations and proposes that the Security Council meet urgently to decide on the imposition of economic sanctions against South Africa in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter. We hope that the contact group will continue to work to compel Pretoria to withdraw from Namibian territory; in the present case, that would mean the non-use of the veto by the three members of the contact group who are also permanent members of the Security Council.

141. Before concluding, we should like to pay a tribute to the Secretary-General for the tireless efforts he has made in the search for a peaceful settlement of the problem of Namibia.

142. We should also like to pay a tribute to the United Nations Council for Namibia, and especially to its President, Mr. Lusaka, for the work he has done in guiding the activities of the Council, which is the legal Administering Authority in Namibia until independence. Through you, Mr. President, we should like to pay a special tribute to the front-line States which, on behalf of Africa and the whole international community, have made countless sacrifices for the liberation of southern Africa.

143. In this connexion, we condemn the brutal acts of aggression against Angola, Zambia and Mozambique, which have resulted in loss of human lives and the weakening of the economies of those countries. We consider the ceaseless armed attacks on the People's Republic of Angola and the recent act of aggression against the People's Republic of Mozambique—which led to the death of innocent refugees—as attacks on our own country; they deserve to be most vigorously condemned. We call upon the international community to take consistent action to put an end to those acts.

144. Finally, we should like to reaffirm the inalienable rights of the Namibian people to freedom and independence in a united Namibia, and we reiterate our unconditional and militant solidarity with our Namibian brothers in the struggle they are waging under the leadership of their sole and legitimate representative, SWAPO.

145. The struggle continues; victory is certain.

146. Mr. AL-ZAID (Kuwait) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The history of South Africa's presence in Namibia is well known. Instead of working for the well-being of the population and promoting its economic and social development, South Africa has impeded the development of the country, depriving it of any chance of blooming.

147. South Africa has not tried to refute the data placed before the International Court of Justice which show that after more than 40 years of South African Administration, no member of the indigenous population of Namibia has been trained as a lawyer, a doctor or an engineer. South Africa has deprived Namibian workers of the right to form trade unions which could negotiate on their behalf and safeguard their rights. It has prevented them from occupying any post which requires experience and training. But South Africa has done even more than that: it has practised the policy of *apartheid*, which allows the white colonizers to profit from the rich natural resources and to confine

the indigenous population to the poorest areas and use it for the exhausting work. South Africa has also displaced populations and prevented the indigenous people of Namibia from enjoying any political rights, including the right to vote and stand for office and the right to self-determination.

148. This anomalous situation, which is not in accordance with international law, led the United Nations to terminate South Africa's Mandate for Namibia and to create the United Nations Council for Namibia as a transitional stage in the process of Namibia's achieving independence. The General Assembly adopted a historic resolution [*resolution 3111 (XXVIII)*] recognizing SWAPO as the authentic representative of the Namibian people. It is clear that an indispensable prerequisite for the restoration of legitimate rights to the people of Namibia is the elimination of all those injustices and the complete withdrawal of South Africa from Namibia. All the problems and suffering endured by the Namibian people stem from the presence of South Africa in Namibia. No positive action can be taken as long as South Africa controls the destiny of that people.

149. The United Nations must have direct responsibility for Namibia until that country wins total independence and self-determination. Up to now, the United Nations has been unable to fulfil its commitment to the Namibian people. The armed struggle of that people, under the leadership of SWAPO, must be supported completely, so that self-determination and national independence can be achieved in a unified Namibia.

150. South Africa's constant defiance of the will of the international community is a form of aggression against the people of Namibia and its national liberation movement. It is the duty of the United Nations and of all peoples throughout the world to face South Africa's manoeuvres in Namibia, the purpose of which is to put all power into the hands of an illegal puppet group which serves South Africa's interests and which helps it to pursue its policy of dominating the Namibian people and maintaining its grasp on their natural resources. It is our duty to affirm that a just and permanent solution to the Namibian problem can be achieved only if SWAPO is fully involved in it. It should also be stated that Walvis Bay is an integral part of Namibia; South Africa must be foiled in its attempt to annex that part of the area. The territorial integrity of Namibia must be safeguarded. We should also like to say that the islands off the Namibian coast are integral parts of Namibia as well.

151. The international community must energetically demand the release of all political prisoners held in Namibia. We fully appreciate the sacrifices they have made in order to lead their country to independence. The régime of terror imposed in Namibia by South Africa has gone beyond Namibian frontiers and has resulted in acts of aggression against neighbouring independent countries. To this must be added the policy of colonialist expansionism and the policy of *apartheid* pursued by South Africa, as well as its acquisition of nuclear weapons, which is indeed a threat to international peace and security.

152. The Security Council must adopt firm measures, in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter so that

South Africa may be forced to heed the will of the international community and United Nations resolutions.

153. Nor should we overlook the illegal foreign economic activities being pursued in Namibia under the protection of South Africa. It is the duty of the Governments of the countries in which these corporations have their head offices to abide by the resolutions of the United Nations and to refrain from making further investments in the region so that the multinational corporations may be forced to withdraw from Namibia.

154. Since the 1960s, Kuwait has imposed an embargo on all activities involving South Africa, including the severance of all economic, political and consular relations with that country, for we believe that the only way to clip South Africa's wings and bring about its total isolation is to impose sanctions on it.

155. That is why we should reaffirm that the only political solution for Namibia must be based on the following: the termination of the illegal occupation of the Territory by South Africa, the withdrawal of all armed forces and the exercise by the Namibian people of its right to self-determination within the framework of an independent and united Namibia. To achieve this, free elections under United Nations supervision and control must be organized, with Namibia considered as an indivisible political unit. All the countries of the world must support the armed struggle of Namibia, under the leadership of SWAPO, so that an

end can be put to the occupation by the South African racist régime and Namibia can accede to independence and total freedom.

156. In this connexion we should like to refer to the military co-operation between South Africa and certain countries—including Israel—especially in the nuclear field. This co-operation is a flagrant defiance of the will of the international community and of the relevant resolutions of the United Nations, and it is a threat to international peace and security.

157. We request the Security Council to adopt effective measures against South Africa and, in particular, to impose against that country, under Chapter VII of the Charter, comprehensive economic sanctions, including a trade embargo, an oil embargo and a total embargo on all deliveries of weapons, so as to compel the South African régime to comply as quickly as possible with the Security Council resolutions.

158. We cannot but express our thanks to the Governments and the peoples of the front-line States, which have pledged themselves to support all efforts to ensure the triumph of the cause of the Namibian people, and we must pay a tribute to them for all they have done to provide every kind of moral and material assistance for the heroic Namibian people, at whatever cost. We also support the struggle of SWAPO; we are certain that victory is near.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.