



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 . . . 1897

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. TUBMAN (Liberia): As in so many of the discussions on the question of Namibia which the Assembly has been obliged to undertake over the past 35 years, it will again not be easy to assess what, if anything, is achieved by this debate now drawing to its close. This is no fault of the Organization. However, in the view of my delegation at least two desirable things have been achieved: in the first place, the majority of the members of the Assembly at the outset of this debate were afforded an opportunity to demonstrate deep abhorrence of the reprehensible and evil racist régime in Pretoria when the credentials of the delegation of that minority régime were rejected once again by the Assembly.

2. For many of us, especially the African States, it was a cause for regret that many States with which we have ties of friendship and whose concepts of justice, law and fair play we share could not bring themselves to show practical concern and support for Africa on this all-important question. The rules of the General Assembly, the Charter of the United Nations, respect for the principles of international law—all of these, we were told, had to be respected. Of course, we fully respect the views of all the Members of the United Nations. But as a result of such a stand being taken—a stand which South Africa has already interpreted as endorsement of its *apartheid* system at the very time when new and needed stress is being placed on checking and stamping out international terrorism—we feel that an opportunity was lost to rebuff an outstanding international terrorist State of today.

3. No *bona fide* supporter of the Organization and the principles laid down in the Charter can be opposed to the need to check terrorism in the international arena. Once the question of who is a terrorist is answered—and most of us would wish to see the causes of that terrorism addressed simultaneously with the efforts aimed at its cure—we could not quarrel with any determined efforts aimed at frustrating terrorism; on the contrary, we would welcome and support those efforts. We would do so because the real issue—indeed, the only issue—involved here is support for the establishment of an international climate in which the rule of law can and does prevail.

4. There is, in our view, such a thing as State terrorism, an outlaw State. How else can one characterize South Africa's suppression of the people of Namibia, its ruthless denial of basic human rights to millions of people in South Africa on the basis of race? If the savage illegal attacks by South Africa against Angola, Zambia and the other front-line States are not terrorism, then what are they?

5. We have it on the pronouncements of the highest international legal authority, the International Court of Justice, that South Africa's continued presence in Namibia is illegal¹ and that all States Members of the United Nations are under a legal obligation not to support that illegality in any way. Since that is the case, how can South Africa come to the Assembly, when its persistent, defiant and notoriously illegal acts are to be denounced and punished, and claim any legitimate rights to yet another day in court? South Africa's right to a day in court—in no less a court than the International Court—has come and gone. South Africa's presence, its conduct and continuing role in Namibia have been adjudged by the International Court and acknowledged by the membership of the Assembly to be illegal. What, then, is the legal issue or principle here involved? Why at this stage must great stress be placed on the right of an adjudged law-breaker to be heard indefinitely?

6. Respect for law demands that decisions made by judicial tribunals must be carried out at the appropriate point. That is the only duty and function which the Assembly and, indeed, all of us are obligated to uphold on the question of Namibia at this time. To do otherwise would, in our view, be to undermine in a most glaring and important way respect for international law and the fragile organs such as the International Court of Justice which struggle against great odds to ensure that law and justice are upheld in the world community.

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.*

7. The second important objective served by this debate, in our view, has been the opportunity to restate the problem for the whole international community, including those newly arrived at positions of power who may be unfamiliar with it but who, nevertheless, will be looking at it with an open mind in order to be constructive, to give them an opportunity to learn what has gone on in the United Nations over the years regarding this question, including how deep are the emotions which it arouses for most Members of the United Nations.

8. The international community's involvement and responsibilities in Namibia go back more than 60 years. It is not cynical to recall that this relationship commenced on a high moral note. The world community, represented by the victorious Powers in the peace talks which followed the end of the First World War, assumed a sacred trust towards the people of Namibia, to be discharged on behalf of the world community by South Africa until the people of Namibia were able to stand on their own feet. The sorrowful saga of South Africa's betrayal of this solemn responsibility is one of the great continuing tragedies of this century. But we need not recount the sufferings of the people of Namibia here today. It is sufficient to say that all the other Territories which were placed under Mandate or a Trusteeship similar to that involving Namibia have long since attained independence and their spokesmen sit with us in the Assembly today as representatives of sovereign States. The League of Nations, which established the Mandate for Namibia long ago, has passed into history, while its successor, the Organization, for all its 35 years of existence and in spite of the most persistent efforts, has not been able to ensure the attainment of independence by Namibia.

9. The responsibility to ensure Namibian independence is an awesome one which the Organization cannot escape. The independence of Namibia is not just another case of decolonization; it is a matter of unique responsibility for the United Nations, since the present colonial shackles in which the people of that Territory are now languishing were brought about by actions for which the Organization bears responsibility and which to this day it has always fully accepted. But the acceptance of a responsibility means nothing unless it entails the employment of the most effective means by the bearer of that responsibility to ensure that it is discharged. Herein lies the question that, in all candour, the Assembly must ask itself, and it must answer positively.

10. Four years ago, decades after the deadlock on the question of Namibia's independence had become a cause of despair and frustration for the Organization, those of us who sincerely desired to see Namibia attain its freedom through a peaceful process were gladdened when five Western countries then on the Security Council, including three permanent members of that body, among them the most powerful and influential friends of the Pretoria régime, took upon themselves the praiseworthy task of spearheading efforts aimed at Namibia's attainment of independence.

11. Two years after those initiatives commenced, our feeling of optimism did not subside when efforts by the Western contact group led to the adoption of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), by which, through

United Nations-supervised elections, the process for Namibia's speedy transition to independence would finally be launched. Indeed, after South Africa had pronounced its acceptance of this plan, dates for Namibia's independence were actually bandied about. Those dates have come and gone, and Namibia is still not independent.

12. The situation, in fact, has become so muddled that the only thing of which the world community can feel certain is that the capacity of the South African régime for deception and the employment of dilatory tactics is unlimited. The South African authorities have proved themselves past masters at raising expectations and then dashing those expectations at the last moment. Those of us who had been quick to support the Western plan—the demilitarized zone proposal, the pre-implementation meeting and numerous other modalities aimed at securing South Africa's implementation of the plan for Namibia's independence—are now totally disappointed by South Africa's intransigent attitude. More than anything else, we cannot help feeling that we may have been duped into what must be called a shameful betrayal of the people of Namibia.

13. Today, on the diplomatic front—though not, happily, on the ground, thanks to the heroic fighting of the Namibian people under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization [SWAPO]—we find ourselves back where we were when first the Organization began seriously to try to resolve this question. If we have understood it, South Africa's latest insistence is that the impartiality of the United Nations must be proved. But since when does a burglar have the right to insist that the legal occupiers of a house must give him equal treatment in that house? How, in any case, can South Africa, which has ruled Namibia for all these years and which even now has more than 70,000 troops stationed there, pretend that it is in a weak position and must be given equal treatment with those undertaking a heroic struggle at great sacrifice for the national liberation of their country?

14. I feel that we are clearly dealing here with people whose concepts of up and down, back and front, right and wrong are unique and so defy normal comprehension.

15. The Organization cannot square the circle, and the people of Namibia cannot have their right to self-determination and independence denied until we are able to do so. Efforts at compromise with the uncompromising and the uncompromisable have gone on far too long. The United Nations owes it to the people of Namibia, and even more, to itself, to take urgent, effective measures—the best within its power—to ensure, without further delay, the genuine independence of Namibia with all its national territory, including Walvis Bay, fully inviolate.

16. That is why 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—following the Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries at New Delhi in February, where a similar stand was taken—has asked that the Security Council be convened by the middle of April to consider the situation

in Namibia with a view to adopting comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter against racist South Africa in order to ensure the implementation of United Nations decisions and resolutions on Namibia.

17. My delegation will end this statement by addressing a most sincere appeal to all Governments here to support these just and long-overdue demands.

18. Mr. ZARIF (Afghanistan): The United Nations has once again taken direct responsibility for enabling Namibia and its people to achieve genuine independence. The consideration of agenda item 27 by the General Assembly at its resumed thirty-fifth session is, in our opinion, an urgent task. The struggle of the Namibian people for their independence, which is indeed one of the decisive struggles in the total uprooting of the shameful colonial system, has gained new dimensions.

19. We condemn the racist rulers in Pretoria for their illegal occupation of Namibia and for their use of that Territory as a military springboard for aggression and acts of provocation against neighbouring independent African States such as Botswana, Zimbabwe, Mozambique and, in particular, Angola and Zambia in order to intimidate those countries and to compel them to stop their support for the national liberation movements in Namibia and South Africa.

20. Moreover, this war of repression and aggression by the Pretoria régime does not confine itself to Namibia and the front-line States, but rather it constitutes a serious threat to international peace and security. Relying on the economic and military might, and the collaboration, of capitalist Powers, the South African Government fails to pay the least attention to the repeated expression of world public opinion.

21. The South African Government's refusal to go along with the United Nations plan in Namibia can be deduced from the fact that it aims at a transfer of power to the puppet and illegitimate Administration subservient to its interests, in order to maintain its policies of domination and exploitation of the Namibian people and their natural resources. The attainment by the racist régime of a nuclear capability with the collaboration of some Western countries feeds the continuation of the South African régime's intransigence and poses a serious threat not only to the African continent, but to the security of the entire globe.

22. The collaboration of Western transnational corporations with the Government of South Africa in the exploitation and depletion of Namibia's human and natural resources not only strengthens the policies of domination and repression in Namibia but also encourages South Africa to stand against, and in defiance of, the United Nations and its numerous resolutions. It is not surprising that despite the sincere efforts of the United Nations and the flexibility shown by SWAPO during the so-called pre-implementation talks held at Geneva from 7 to 14 January, the South African Government once again resorted to dilatory tactics and played with the conscience of the international community.

23. It was precisely South Africa's intransigence which led to the failure of the Geneva talks. We also hold responsible those quarters which, according to a

new doctrine, equate national liberation movements with the capitalist phenomenon of terrorism and on this pretext take part in the suppression of national liberation movements.

24. Kuaima Riruako, a member of the so-called National Assembly and of the puppet clique in Windhoek, gave a clear explanation of this new doctrine. In a statement made on the eve of the resumption of this session and distributed to various missions in a newsletter of the US-South West Africa Namibia Trade and Cultural Council, Inc., Washington, he stated:

"The United Nations is no longer a parliament of the world... SWAPO leader Sam Nujoma and SWAPO terrorists are murderers and kidnappers... We will have no truce or parley with Mr. Nujoma or the grisly gang who work his wicked will. Let them do their worst. We will do our best. In God's good time the Reagan doctrine outlawing Soviet-empire terrorism will put SWAPO and Sam Nujoma out of business... The recently announced Reagan doctrine outlaws Soviet-empire-sponsored terrorism, cloaked in the false feathers of 'local liberation' movements... God bless America for once again assuming world leadership to outlaw Soviet-empire use of terrorist surrogates."

I need not elaborate further on this new doctrine.

25. The exercise launched by some countries on the first day of this resumed session on the pretext of rules and procedures was but another encouragement of the racist régime by those countries.

26. The Assembly should once again reaffirm the inalienable right of the people of Namibia to self-determination and national independence under the leadership of SWAPO, the sole legitimate and authentic representative of a united Namibia, including Walvis Bay and the offshore islands.

27. It is once more reiterated that the Governments concerned should take immediate measures to ensure compliance with the provisions of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia [A/35/24, vol. I, annex II].

28. My delegation believes that on no pretext whatsoever should the Security Council be barred from meeting to consider and decide upon imposing comprehensive, mandatory and binding sanctions on South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter. This was demanded by the African States and reaffirmed by the New Delhi Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries and by the OAU.

29. The international community should render all-round assistance to the Namibian people, who are under the leadership of SWAPO, for the immediate termination of South Africa's illegal, racist and colonial occupation of that Territory.

30. The Democratic Republic of Afghanistan expresses its militant solidarity with the people of Namibia in their just struggle for freedom and national independence under the leadership of SWAPO.

31. My delegation fully endorses the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia [A/35/24 and Corr.1 and 2], which was so eloquently introduced by its President, Mr. Lusaka of Zambia [103rd meeting].

The report provided a complete framework within which the General Assembly should take appropriate decisions without further delay.

32. Mr. DOUGLAS (Guyana): The fiasco that took place recently at the Geneva pre-implementation meeting provides a harsh and sobering commentary on the progress made by the United Nations on the question of Namibia 35 years after it first took up the issue. Over this same period dozens of colonies have won their independence and taken their rightful places in the Assembly. Namibia has stood out most strikingly as an exception in this great era of decolonization. This abnormality is due to the determination of one country, South Africa, with the indulgence of powerful friends, to defy the will of the international community as expressed in many resolutions which have sought to remove the illegal South African presence from Namibia and to secure the independence of the Territory.

33. The South African record on the question of Namibia has been a consistent one of prevarication, temporizing and intransigence. The conduct of South Africa at the pre-implementation talks at Geneva brutally dramatized this cynical strategy. At no stage was Pretoria seriously interested in negotiating the substantive issues—the dates for a Namibia cease-fire and the emplacement of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group [UNTAG]. Rather, the South Africans sought to use the occasion to give international legitimacy to collaborators whose venality mocks the deeply felt nationalism of the Namibian people. A forum that should have been used to achieve decisive progress on settling a question fraught with frightening potential for international conflict was used for propaganda, abuse and vilification. The United Nations was savagely treated by South Africa at the Geneva talks. Both the intemperate language used and the deceitful actions of the Pretoria régime at the Geneva meeting have called into question the credibility and authority of the Organization. The Assembly must respond appropriately to the challenge posed by South Africa's outrageous conduct at Geneva. These actions are the culmination of the dishonest negotiating tactics employed by South Africa ever since the adoption of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

34. South Africa's subterfuges at Geneva are in sharp contrast to the restraint and statesmanship displayed by SWAPO at the pre-implementation talks. These heroic fighters for the liberation of Namibia did everything possible to make the meeting a decisive turning-point on the road to Namibian independence, in spite of their justifiable scepticism about the meeting's chances of success. SWAPO repeatedly declared its readiness to sign a cease-fire and to agree on a date for the arrival of UNTAG. However, these laudable efforts by SWAPO to find a peaceful solution to the Namibian problem were not reciprocated by the South African racists bent on retaining the evil *status quo* in Namibia. Just as the Assembly must respond to the challenge posed by South Africa, so must it respond to the willingness shown by SWAPO at the Geneva meeting to negotiate a peaceful settlement of the Namibian problem.

35. In finding ways to deal with the situation that now confronts the international community, it is

imperative that Western countries recognize that the time has come to acknowledge the insincerity and hypocrisy of South Africa in the settlement of the Namibian problem at the bargaining table. It is Western economic and financial involvement in Namibia—not to mention South Africa—that fortifies this racist régime in its determination to maintain its stranglehold on the Territory. Specifically in connexion with the exploitation of uranium in Namibia, the hearings on Namibian uranium conducted recently by the United Nations Council for Namibia [*ibid.*, vol. III] have demonstrated the extent of Western economic involvement, the military implications of this involvement and, most alarmingly, the serious health hazards posed to Namibians already suffering from the illegal presence of the South African occupiers and their system of *apartheid*.

36. Inevitably, therefore, the majority of Member States have reached the conclusion that the Western countries have become so compromised by their involvement in the economic exploitation of Namibia that they cannot play a constructive and objective role in efforts to reach a final settlement of the Namibian question. It is hard to believe that even after the Geneva meeting members of the Western contact group can still accept South Africa's protestations of good faith. If those countries are still unwilling to accept the reality of South Africa's duplicity and to take the measures that such duplicity demands, the international community can only conclude—justifiably—that the Western role as mediator is a smoke screen and a stratagem to conceal a basic identification with South Africa in its unrelenting efforts to maintain control over Namibia.

37. The gravity of the situation at this point does not allow for equivocation or rationalization. The Western countries must decide whether they will join the other members of the international community in applying those measures that will force an obstinate South Africa to remove its illegal presence from Namibia. At a time when international relations are in a state of turbulence and spheres of influence are once more being asserted, South Africa draws strength from its belief that the point of view which sees the world in strategic terms will ensure the survival of its odious *apartheid* régime and the continuation of its occupation of Namibia. Fundamental rights in Namibia must not be sacrificed for narrow geopolitical and economic considerations. All nations must strive to complete the decolonization process with which the Organization is so proudly associated.

38. The international community is at the crossroads in its search for a final solution of the Namibian conflict, and, particularly in the light of developments at Geneva, it must take an important decision on the direction it must now take. South Africa's arrogance at Geneva is one significant indication of its inflexible and unyielding determination to maintain its illegal presence in Namibia. Towards that end it is stepping up its persecution of Namibian patriots and inciting tribal enmity. It is conscripting Namibians to fight Namibians in a desperate effort to undermine the national liberation struggle and to give that struggle the character of a civil war. At the same time the exploitation of the human and natural resources of the Territory continues in violation of United Nations

decisions. Furthermore, acts of aggression are being carried out against front-line States with the futile purpose of intimidating them into withdrawing their principled support of SWAPO's liberation struggle and into acquiescing in the barbarous domestic and foreign policies of the South African régime.

39. What, therefore, is to be done now, given the critical point the Namibian question has reached? The answer must lie in the unanimous support of the Assembly for the draft resolutions that have been submitted by the United Nations Council for Namibia. Key provisions of two of those draft resolutions call upon the Security Council to convene in order to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter. The non-aligned movement and the OAU have recently made similar calls. The United Nations cannot afford to be found wanting. Its credibility has been badly damaged by the Geneva charade. The onus is now on the Security Council, and particularly on the Western States permanent members of that organ, to repair the damage done to the Organization. That can be done only by the early adoption of economic sanctions as a necessary measure in the struggle to drive the South African oppressors out of Namibia.

40. It is abundantly clear that the Pretoria régime has no intention of drawing any lessons from the victory of the liberation struggle in Zimbabwe. But the outcome of national liberation struggles does not depend on the delusions of colonial oppressors but on the commitment, fearlessness and self-sacrifice of freedom fighters. SWAPO is in that great tradition of national liberation movements. With the unstinting and increasing support of the international community for the freedom fighters in Namibia the victory of SWAPO, the sole legitimate representative of the Namibian people, is inevitable.

41. We wish to express our profound thanks to Mr. Lusaka and to the United Nations Council for Namibia for the steadfastness and vigilance with which they have represented the interests of the Namibian people. We have no doubt that the work of the Council, under the dynamic leadership of Lusaka, will continue to serve as an effective complement to the efforts of SWAPO in the field of battle.

42. Mr. AZAR GÓMEZ (Uruguay) (*interpretation from Spanish*): We are meeting once again to take up one of the problems that have been before the United Nations since its establishment: the situation in southern Africa.

43. Through its representatives Uruguay has expressed its unswerving position on this subject and has demonstrated a high degree of consistency in its proposals, which is directly connected with our vision of man and life, and we have worked in consonance with that vision. This constant identification with the humanistic vision of man has led us to express our deep concern that it has as yet not been possible to liberate the people of Namibia from foreign occupation and that recent events such as the Geneva meeting have as yet yielded no results despite the efforts that have been made and the tireless endeavours of the Secretary-General.

44. Uruguay wishes to reaffirm the right of every nation freely to choose its fate, and thus it energetically

condemns all forms of foreign intervention that are now occurring in various parts of the world where the right to self-determination of so many peoples is being trampled underfoot because of the expansionist policies of certain Powers or their surrogates. That position leads us to condemn the illegal occupation of Namibia, which constitutes a flagrant use of force to prevent its people from exercising its legitimate right to self-determination.

45. Uruguay's unchanging position can be demonstrated by recalling what the representative of Uruguay, Mr. Narancio, said at the ninth special session of the General Assembly, devoted to the question of Namibia, on 28 April 1978:

“... we reaffirm that the occupation of Namibia is illegal and contrary to international law, and that it must come to an end; that racial discrimination must be stopped in that country; that the United Nations is responsible for effectively administering that Territory on an interim basis until such time as, through a system of free elections under the direct supervision of the United Nations, its independent and sovereign fate may be determined, as a territory which has not suffered dismemberment, with political systems which it can also choose freely for itself; and that it should be able to establish relations with other peoples, free from all pressures and seeking the good of its people, as Uruguay has done, is doing, and will continue to do.”²

46. The fundamental equality of men is a concept rooted in our philosophy of life. It was recognized in our first political Constitution, which stipulated that all men are equal before the law and that no distinction between them can be recognized save that based on talent or virtue. That fundamental concept has been reiterated in the various versions of the Uruguayan Constitution. This conceptual approach, with which Uruguay emerged into independent life, is deeply rooted in our history and finds its practical expression in the way in which Uruguay has been socially constituted.

47. To the nucleus of the population living in what today is Uruguay, which originated in the indigenous population, Africans and Spaniards, were added persons who came from various regions of the world, in particular Europe and the Middle East. One must bear in mind that the most recent group of immigrants to our country were refugees from the various tyrannical régimes that caused the last world conflagration. The social composition of Uruguay blends with our concept of the world and life and has taught us in practical terms how various races can form a nation. It has led us energetically to condemn all forms of racism and racial discrimination and to incorporate in our penal legislation juridical norms that severely punish such conduct. We have included those norms in our legislation not to punish acts that are perpetrated but rather to demonstrate our profound belief in this respect because we are proud to say that in the history of our country there has never been any serious attempt to engage in this repugnant kind of action.

48. At this time, despite our understanding of the profound indignation of the inhabitants of the Territory

² See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Ninth Special Session, Plenary Meetings*, 9th meeting, para. 2.

of Namibia and our solidarity with those who are under illegal occupation and who must moreover suffer the consequences of racial discrimination, which has been repudiated by the international community, we must emphasize that we must find a peaceful solution to this dispute. We must also be aware that it is a matter of utmost urgency for an equitable and effective solution to this problem to be found, since we are obliged to face the fact that a people is suffering and dying as we engage in debate, and it cannot for ever be kept waiting for the results of our deliberations.

49. Uruguay, which sincerely supports the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and has moreover stipulated in article 6 of its Constitutional Charter that:

“In international treaties which the Republic may conclude there shall be proposed a clause to the effect that all differences which may arise between the contracting parties shall be settled by arbitration or other peaceful means”;

cannot accept the institutionalization of the armed struggle. Resort to blind and indiscriminate violence will make it impossible for there to be peaceful or harmonious coexistence in the future among the various communities.

50. We should like to join in an appeal for action, since the solution of this dispute will be the most eloquent demonstration of this institution's capabilities. It is simply, as in so many other items, a matter of political will.

51. The PRESIDENT: We shall now proceed to hear representatives who wish to introduce draft resolutions, and I first call on the representative of Algeria to introduce draft resolution A/35/L.50 and A/35/L.59.

52. Mr. SEMICHI (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): After many postponements, whether voluntary or systematically imposed on the international community to avoid an urgent discussion of the question of Namibia in the United Nations, we have come to the end of a five-day debate which has seen the participation of 89 delegations. This participation, exemplary in every respect, constitutes in substance an obvious rebuttal to those who still want to delay sanctions against South Africa and to persuade the international community to look on passively while the Namibian people are subjected to oppression by the South African racist régime and while more and more acts of aggression are committed by that régime against all neighbouring African countries.

53. The consideration within the United Nations of the question of Namibia has always called forth the broadest and most spontaneous demonstration of solidarity by the international community in its desire to put an end as soon as possible to the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa. This commitment on behalf of the cause of decolonization, which has been rendered more serious by an occupation that has been recognized as illegal by the United Nations and the International Court of Justice, has given proof, first of all, of the almost universal isolation of the racist South African Administration and also the urgent need to find a solution to the problem of Namibia

which, because of its gravity and its manifold implications, without doubt constitutes a grave threat to international peace and security.

54. In this context, the contribution of the United Nations Council for Namibia, the legal Administering Authority for the Territory until its independence is attained, to the comprehensive examination of the Namibian question in every respect merits the praise accorded to it by the international community. The United Nations Council for Namibia has thus far acquitted itself of all the tasks incumbent upon it under its mandate contained in General Assembly resolution 2248 (S-V) with a keen sense of its responsibilities and has kept the international community fully informed with regard to the situation in Namibia.

55. Bearing in mind the foregoing, and on behalf of more than 60 sponsors, the Algerian delegation has the honour today, in its dual capacity as a member of the United Nations Council for Namibia and a sponsor of all the resolutions on the question of Namibia, to introduce two of the draft resolutions submitted at this session to the General Assembly on this matter. These two draft resolutions are entitled “Situation in Namibia resulting from the illegal occupation of the Territory by South Africa” [A/35/L.50] and “Situation resulting from South Africa's refusal to comply with United Nations resolutions on Namibia” [A/35/L.59].

56. Despite an apparently different approach, these two draft resolutions deal with the same subject and treat all aspects of the political, military, economic and social situation prevailing in the Territory itself and in neighbouring countries. They advocate the measures necessary to end that situation, which is fraught with grave consequences for international peace and security.

57. The first draft resolution is sufficiently well-known to Members of the United Nations, since a similar text has been submitted each year in approximately the same form to the international community in order to enlighten it about the efforts made by the United Nations to promote the emancipation of the Namibian people and about the fact that the South African racist régime persists in its determination to maintain under its illegal colonial and racist domination a Territory which was in principle withdrawn from its administration in 1966 and placed under the direct responsibility of the United Nations.

58. That draft resolution likewise informs the international community about all aspects of the question of Namibia as it appeared at the end of 1980 before the meeting at Geneva. During the period at the end of 1980, we witnessed intense diplomatic activity designed to ensure every chance of success for the implementation of the plan for the peaceful settlement of the Namibian question in conformity with Security Council resolution 435 (1978), activity which subsequently caused twice postponed consideration of the question by the General Assembly during the thirty-fifth session. The elaboration of draft resolution A/35/L.50, which was drafted in its final form at that time, reflected all the now-justified scepticism of the members of the United Nations Council for Namibia regarding South Africa's true intentions and advocated calling for a meeting of the Security Council “to act

decisively against any dilatory manoeuvres and fraudulent schemes of the illegal occupation régime aimed at frustrating the legitimate struggle of the Namibian people, under the leadership of SWAPO for self-determination and national liberation, as well as negating the achievements of their just struggle.”

59. That draft resolution, which logically analyzes the facts of the Namibian situation and the necessity for the mobilization of mankind as a whole against the South African régime, is thereby now submitted for the attention of the Assembly and merits adoption by the broadest possible majority, since it reflects the consensus reached on this question which is now more than ever a priority in the concerns of all nations.

60. The second draft resolution draws a lesson from the latest act of defiance by South Africa at Geneva on 14 January 1981 and takes into consideration the recent evaluation of this question, especially since the beginning of the year, to propose a new international approach to compel South Africa to withdraw its presence from the Territory. Indeed, this draft resolution calmly and realistically envisages in particular, a number of measures which now appear more necessary than ever, ranging from the mobilization of international public opinion with a view to the imposition of sanctions on South Africa to the appeal of the international community itself for implementation of Chapter VII of the Charter. Furthermore, it stresses the legitimacy of the struggle of the Namibian people under the leadership of SWAPO, its sole representative, and calls upon the international community to pursue its efforts to put an end to the acts of aggression and repression perpetrated against the Namibian people.

61. The preparation and presentation of this draft resolution is particularly appropriate after South Africa's latest act of defiance, at Geneva, and lucidly sums up, for purposes which we share more than ever, a course of action that we should all undertake. Those objectives are based on three main ideas.

62. First, the question of Namibia is a colonial problem plus a case of flagrant illegality. The United Nations, the OAU and the non-aligned countries have recently taken up this matter, at Geneva, Addis Ababa and New Delhi, and during those three successive meetings the consensus was to recognize that a solution to the Namibian problem was more urgent today than ever before and that the Namibian problem was a clear threat to international peace and security.

63. Secondly, South Africa, which thus far has demonstrated an implacable determination to oppose the majority of countries in the international community, draws much of its advantage from its special links with certain Western countries that have not yet managed to exert enough pressure on that recalcitrant régime to force it to comply with international law.

64. Thirdly, the Namibian people, whose sole representative is SWAPO, has for a long time now, and most recently at Geneva, given proof of its political maturity and keen sense of negotiation; hence it is now entitled to expect greater solidarity on the part of the international community so that it may step up its struggle by all means and regain its inalienable national rights.

65. In appealing to the international community also to adopt this draft resolution by a broad majority, the Algerian delegation and all the other sponsors of the draft resolution remain basically convinced that South Africa's defiance of the United Nations should not be tolerated indefinitely and that, for reasons bearing on the future credibility of the universal Organization, it is incumbent upon all countries, individually and collectively, to work for the preservation of international legality, while giving the oppressed Namibian people justice, especially since that people is, in principle, under United Nations protection, and its Territory, which has been illegally occupied by South Africa, is the subject of a dispute which has pitted Pretoria against the United Nations for more than 15 years.

66. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of Nigeria to introduce draft resolutions A/35/L.51 and A/35/L.53.

67. Mr. ADEYEMI (Nigeria): My delegation has the honour and the privilege to introduce to the Assembly two draft resolutions submitted by the United Nations Council for Namibia.

68. The first draft resolution, entitled “Intensification and co-ordination of United Nations action in support of Namibia”, has been issued as document A/35/L.51. It has also been published in volume II of the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia.

69. The second draft resolution is entitled “Action by intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations with respect to Namibia”. This has been issued as document A/35/L.53 and has also been published in the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia.

70. In connexion with the Namibian question we have witnessed a full frustrating year of missed opportunities against the sinister background of false promises, unwholesome subterfuge, gross dishonesty and indefensible manoeuvres concocted by the illegal racist Administration in the Territory to paralyse action at the level of the United Nations. While we wait with arms folded, the situation in Namibia continues to slide ominously into near-anarchy. Put in the mildest terms imaginable, this is a matter of grave concern to the entire international community.

71. The South African occupying Administration has not only escalated its provocative policies of repression and suppression within the Territory but has also stepped up its senseless and criminal incursions into the African front-line States, which are themselves sovereign members of this body. It is indeed sad that even today racist gangsters and their paid agents are still busy committing all sorts of atrocities in southern Angola and western Zambia. And yet the Pretoria régime persists in its immoral justification of those reprehensible and criminal acts on the basis of the obnoxious so-called doctrine of hot pursuit.

72. As has been rightly pointed out by numerous delegations in their statements on this agenda item, no one now doubts the fact that the illegal racist Administration in the Territory seems hell-bent on perpetuating its stranglehold over the Territory, in brazen defiance of the general will of the international community as symbolized in countless resolutions

adopted by the Assembly since the historic decision to terminate South Africa's Mandate for Namibia.

73. After years of painstaking negotiations designed to work out a face-saving formula for the Pretoria régime to end its illegal occupation—negotiations that were, in the first instance, initiated by South Africa's Western backers—there is a solid consensus in the Assembly, based on recent developments, to the effect that the illegal racist occupying Power had never at any time abandoned its misguided plan to entrench itself in the Territory. Indeed, it is now clear that the Pretoria régime has merely adopted the course of negotiation all these years in the hope that it can attain United Nations endorsement for the concretization of its long-prepared sinister scheme of foisting hand-picked puppets on the Namibian people. Thanks largely to the efforts of the United Nations Council for Namibia, the continuing heroic struggle of SWAPO and the vigilance of the front-line States and the rest of the progressive world, the Pretoria régime seems to have failed to achieve its objective.

74. It is not surprising, therefore, that it has now chosen the path of confrontation, as is evident from the blatant display of continued racist intransigence, unparalleled arrogance and provocative postures demonstrated by the South African delegation last January at Geneva.

75. In the circumstances, it is of paramount importance that in its response to this serious threat to peace and stability in southern Africa, as exemplified by South Africa's continued illegal occupation of Namibia, the international community—and the General Assembly, in particular—should not only speak with one voice, but also act in a well co-ordinated manner. The racists must be left with no illusions as to the unbending determination of the Assembly to ensure that Namibians are not denied the basic and elementary rights of self-determination, freedom and independence, which are exercised by all other States emerging from colonial bondage and domination.

76. Even more important is the desirability of ensuring that the signals that are sent to the Pretoria régime from our capitals, particularly over the Namibian issue, convey the correct message if co-ordinated efforts at the level of the United Nations are to attain the expected results.

77. We have found to our dismay and frustration that many pious declarations in favour of the Namibian cause have been lavishly made in the past by certain delegations in the Assembly, while the Governments they represented connived in the illicit activities of the transnational corporations emanating from their own States, activities which have strengthened the economy of the *apartheid* State and have thus fostered its current colonialist adventure in Namibia. In draft resolution A/35/L.51 the General Assembly not only calls for the preparation of an indexed handbook on transnational corporations operating in Namibia in defiance of its resolutions; it also broadens the mandate of the United Nations Council for Namibia to enable it to take up with defaulting States the issue of the prevailing ruthless exploitation of Namibian resources in flagrant violation of the Council's Decree No. 1.

78. The central thrust of draft resolution A/35/L.53 is to gain full membership for the United Nations Council for Namibia in the specialized agencies and other organizations and conferences within the United Nations system so that the Council, as the Administering Authority for Namibia, can participate in the activities of those agencies and other organizations. At the same time it is also requested that the specialized agencies grant a waiver of the assessment for Namibia during the entire period in which Namibia continues to be represented by the United Nations Council for Namibia.

79. My delegation believes that no opportunity should be missed and every avenue must be explored in the direction of the proper co-ordination of all United Nations activities for the purpose of placing in the correct perspective the extent to which the policies of co-operation and collaboration with the Pretoria régime have strengthened racist intransigence and have thus brought about the state of paralysis in which the United Nations finds itself today over the Namibian question.

80. Nigeria was an active participant in the negotiations preceding the adoption of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). We have played an active role in the activities of the United Nations Council for Namibia since its very inception, and we shall continue to make our modest contributions to the Council's relentless efforts to bring about genuine freedom and independence for all the people in the Territory.

81. Our sincere hope is that, even at this late hour, when all patience seems to have practically evaporated, when racist acts of repression in Namibia and aggression on our continent have reached explosive levels, those Member States in the Assembly with known links with the Pretoria régime will yet take bold and decisive steps to salvage whatever is left of their own credibility by exerting proper and adequate pressure on South Africa to withdraw totally and unconditionally from Namibia. It is also in this same spirit that I express the hope that the same delegations will join in the overwhelming consensus emerging in this body by supporting the draft resolutions I have just introduced.

82. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of India to introduce draft resolution A/35/L.52.

83. Mr. MISHRA (India): I have the privilege of introducing, on behalf of its sponsors, draft resolution A/35/L.52, entitled "Programme of work of the United Nations Council for Namibia".

84. In my statement on 4 March [107th meeting] on the question of Namibia, I observed that a new response was necessary to the challenge posed by South Africa's virtual rejection of the United Nations settlement plan for Namibia. To us, South Africa's rejection of the United Nations plan was a foregone conclusion. But we are indeed surprised that even the authors of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), who had so laboriously negotiated for its implementation, also seem to be retreating from it. It appears from their statement of 5 March in this Hall [109th meeting] that there is no determination any longer to seek the implementation of the plan. Instead they have merely reaffirmed their commitment to certain

so-called basic principles, some of which ignore the lessons of history and reject even the rationale of certain measures specifically recommended in the Charter to meet certain situations. We regret that the measures proposed in the draft resolutions before the Assembly have been dismissed as inappropriate, even when the Governments concerned are stated to be engaged in conducting an extensive review of their policies.

85. In these circumstances the United Nations Council for Namibia, as the only legal Administering Authority for that Territory, has a paramount role to play this year. The draft resolution on the programme of work of the Council has been drawn up in recognition of the imperative need to intensify its efforts to fulfil its mandate in the face of South Africa's persistent intransigence. The activities outlined in the draft resolution chart a new course of action which, if pursued with the support of the entire membership of the United Nations, will lead to the early independence of Namibia. In essence the draft resolution seeks to approve the report of the Council for the year 1980, which has been praised universally during the debate, renews the mandate of the Council to discharge its responsibilities as the legal Administering Authority for Namibia and outlines the major activities it should undertake during 1981. The draft resolution also seeks to sanction adequate financial provision for the Council's activities, including support for the Office of SWAPO in New York.

86. Among the activities being entrusted to the Council this year is a new programme of co-operation with non-governmental organizations which are actively engaged in supporting the struggle of the Namibian people. This programme is designed to complement the significant efforts being made by a number of dedicated individuals and organizations to influence public opinion in Western Europe and the United States, where there is a considerable dearth of appreciation of the plight of Namibia. The Assembly would request the Council actively to co-operate with those organizations to enable them to be more effective. Such co-operation between the Council and the non-governmental organizations was demonstrated during the uranium hearings last year, at which a number of researchers provided valuable evidence which enabled the Council to make suitable recommendations to counter the illegal activities of foreign economic interests in Namibia.

87. The programme of work of the Council as contained in the draft resolution places a heavy responsibility on the Council. The member countries of the Council have always been enthusiastic about taking on additional responsibilities in keeping with their commitment to its mandate. My delegation wishes the Council well during the decisive struggle ahead and renews its determination to spare no effort in discharging its responsibilities as one of the Council's Vice-Presidents.

88. The sponsors hope that the draft resolution will be adopted by the General Assembly by an overwhelming majority, if not unanimously.

89. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Turkey to introduce draft resolution A/35/L.54.

90. Mrs. ÜNAYDIN (Turkey): It is my privilege to introduce to the General Assembly draft resolution A/35/L.54, entitled "Support for the United Nations Institute for Namibia".

91. The United Nations Institute for Namibia commenced its operations in 1976 within the framework of General Assembly resolution 3296 (XXIX). The Institute was established in order to enable Namibians, under the aegis of the United Nations Council for Namibia, to undertake research, training, planning and related activities, with special reference to the struggle of the Namibian people for the establishment of an independent State of Namibia.

92. The Institute now has six divisions, dealing with history and politics, economics, agriculture, social and educational questions, constitutional and legal affairs, and documentation. At present the Institute has 298 students, and its training programme, in addition to the topics already mentioned, has been expanded to include short-term courses for the upgrading of teachers, the training of secretaries and special preparatory courses in English and mathematics.

93. The first graduation took place in December 1979; 66 students were awarded the Diploma of Management and Development Studies, endorsed by the University of Zambia.

94. In addition to training, the Institute undertakes applied research on topics which are intended to produce the necessary documentation that will be used as a basis for policy formulation by the liberation movement and the future Government of an independent Namibia.

95. The Institute, which is autonomous, is administered by a Senate consisting of 15 members, which reports to the United Nations Council for Namibia. The Institute is financed by the United Nations Fund for Namibia and more specifically by a component of the Fund known as the Trust Fund for the Institute.

96. The Institute's charter, in which all those dispositions have been laid down, has been approved by the General Assembly.

97. The cost of operating the Institute is approximately \$2 million per annum, derived from voluntary contributions to the Trust Fund for the Institute, together with an allocation from UNDP.

98. The draft resolution on the Institute for Namibia, which it is my pleasure to introduce, affirms the support of the United Nations for the Institute and commends the efforts of the Institute to provide substantial support for the struggle for freedom of the Namibian people. It expresses appreciation to all States, specialized agencies and other organizations within the United Nations system, as well as to non-governmental organizations, which have made contributions to the Trust Fund for the Institute and have provided assistance to the Institute. In addition, it requests the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia to renew his appeals for generous voluntary contributions to the Trust Fund of the Institute for Namibia.

99. On behalf of all the sponsors, I express the hope that this draft resolution will obtain the Assembly's approval.

100. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Finland to introduce draft resolution A/35/L.55.

101. Mr. PASTINEN (Finland): On behalf of its sponsors, it is my privilege to introduce to the Assembly draft resolution A/35/L.55, entitled "Nationhood Programme for Namibia".

102. The Nationhood Programme, which is conducted within the framework of the United Nations Fund for Namibia, was launched by the General Assembly in 1976. Its goal is to provide further assistance to the Namibian people during the present period of struggle for independence and the initial years following the attainment of independence. My Government had the honour of initiating the action that led to the General Assembly decision in 1976. The Nationhood Programme is intended to encompass all measures of assistance to Namibians and to ensure that their planning and implementation are channelled into a harmonious and comprehensive plan of action within the United Nations framework.

103. The General Assembly called upon the United Nations Council for Namibia to plan and implement the Nationhood Programme in consultation with the representatives of SWAPO. I shall give a few figures on the practical achievements of the Programme.

104. By the end of last year the Council had approved 46 pre-independence projects. By the time those projects are completed they will have required a total expenditure of \$9.6 million. The projects deal with the productive sector of the economy, the physical infrastructure and services, including transportation, trade and energy, and administrative services.

105. For its part, UNDP has made a contribution to the Nationhood Programme amounting to \$2.5 million for the year 1981. The sponsors of the draft resolution greatly appreciate that valuable contribution.

106. A particularly important project approved by the Council in 1980 was entitled "Assistance to establish a pilot vocational training centre". It is expected that that Centre will become operational at its location in Angola during 1981. The Government of Angola is to be commended for its continued co-operation in this respect.

107. The essence of the operative part of the draft resolution is to request the Secretary-General and the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia to continue to implement the Nationhood Programme and to appeal to Governments and other organizations for additional financial contributions to the Nationhood Programme for Namibia. I therefore trust that this draft resolution will meet with the overwhelming support of the General Assembly.

108. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of Venezuela, who will introduce draft resolution A/35/L.56.

109. Mr. SORENSEN MOSQUERA (Venezuela) (*interpretation from Spanish*): It is my honour to introduce draft resolution A/35/L.56, entitled "United Nations Fund for Namibia".

110. Since its establishment in 1971, the Fund has grown to become an important means of support for the Namibian people in its struggle for independence. From its precarious beginnings to its present stage,

the Fund has increased its activities significantly. For the year 1980, voluntary contributions to the Fund reached the total amount of \$5.5 million, thanks to voluntary contributions from many countries. In addition, in 1980 the Fund received an allocation of \$500,000 from the regular United Nations budget as a provisional sum until the Assembly should consider the question of Namibia, and there has been a contribution by UNDP to the United Nations Institute for Namibia, at Lusaka.

111. For Venezuela, as a member of the United Nations Council for Namibia, this situation is highly gratifying. With the increase in its activities, the Fund has had to channel its resources through three accounts: the general account, which deals with the usual activities of the Fund; the account of the Nationhood Programme for Namibia; and the account of the United Nations Institute for Namibia. The general account must also keep the financial status of the accounts of the Nationhood Programme for Namibia and the United Nations Institute at satisfactory levels.

112. The draft resolution is concerned specifically with the general activities of the Fund. Draft resolutions on the Nationhood Programme for Namibia and the United Nations Institute for Namibia will be introduced separately.

113. The General Assembly's decision to establish the United Nations Fund for Namibia came about as a result of the request addressed to the Assembly by the Security Council in its resolution 283 (1970) and in large measure because of the international community's commitment to the self-determination, freedom and independence of the Namibian people. The Security Council determined the need to establish a Fund to assist Namibians who were suffering persecution at the hands of the racist régime of South Africa and to finance a comprehensive programme of education and training for Namibians, with special emphasis on the future administrative responsibilities they will assume in the Territory.

114. After a period during which the United Nations Council for Namibia acted as adviser to the Secretary-General on matters relating to the Fund, the Assembly, in 1973, designated the Council itself as the body responsible for the operation and administration of the Fund in the capacity of trustee. The Council also drew up the guidelines for the Fund, which were approved by the General Assembly in 1976 and were revised in 1979.

115. The general activities of the Fund are aimed mainly at providing aid in the educational, social and relief fields. In the educational field, this aid meets needs at the primary and secondary educational levels and those of remedial education, vocational training and university education. At present, 129 Namibians pursuing their studies with scholarships provided by the Fund. In the social field, medical and health assistance is provided, and there are nutrition and social welfare programmes as well. The Fund also provides assistance to refugees, and a new project started in 1980 helps more than 5,000 Namibian refugee children of less than seven years of age.

116. The draft resolution takes note of the Council's report on the Fund and approves the conclusions and recommendations contained in it. The draft resolu-

tion expresses thanks to all those who have made voluntary contributions to the Fund and requests the Secretary-General and the President of the Council to appeal to Governments and to intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations to contribute generously to the Fund. The draft resolution also expresses thanks to the specialized agencies for the aid they provide to Namibians.

117. The delegation of Venezuela would be remiss in its duty as a member of the United Nations Council for Namibia if it did not avail itself of this opportunity to echo the appeal made in the draft resolution to Governments to make generous contributions to the United Nations Fund for Namibia. The present situation in Namibia requires this.

118. With regard to the additional allocation provided under the regular United Nations budget, it must be taken into consideration that when it approved document A/35/761, the Assembly decided to grant the sum of \$500,000 to the Fund for the year 1981. Thus, that matter requires no action by the General Assembly at this time.

119. The sponsors of the draft resolution hope that it will meet with the unanimous approval of the General Assembly.

120. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of Bulgaria, who will introduce draft resolution A/35/L.57.

121. Mr. DENICHIN (Bulgaria): Since its inception, the United Nations Council for Namibia, mindful of the solemn commitment to the people of Namibia expressed in General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966, has stressed the importance of the dissemination of information on the struggle for freedom and genuine independence waged by the people of Namibia led by their sole and authentic representative, SWAPO.

122. In furthering its mandate, the Council has considered and carried out a wide range of activities relating to the acceleration of the dissemination of information on the question of Namibia and has recommended appropriate measures to the General Assembly, thus assisting the Namibian people in the achievement of the goals of their struggle.

123. At this point, on behalf of the United Nations Council for Namibia and the more than 40 sponsors, I should like to introduce draft resolution A/35/L.57, entitled Dissemination of information on Namibia".

124. The draft resolution is based on resolutions 2145 (XXI), 2248 (S-V) and all subsequent resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council relating to Namibia, in particular the Declaration on Namibia and Programme of Action in Support of Self-Determination and National Independence for Namibia, contained in General Assembly resolution S-9/2 of 3 May 1978, as well as on the Algiers Declaration and Programme of Action on Namibia adopted by the United Nations Council for Namibia in Algiers on 1 June 1980.

125. The preambular part of the draft resolution stresses the urgent need to mobilize international public opinion on a continuous basis with a view to effectively assisting the people of Namibia to achieve self-determination, freedom and independence in a

united Namibia and, in particular, to intensifying the world-wide and continuous dissemination of information on the struggle for liberation being waged by the people of Namibia under the leadership of SWAPO, their sole and authentic representative.

126. The draft resolution also reiterates the importance of publicity as an instrument for furthering the mandate given by the General Assembly to the United Nations Council for Namibia and emphasizes the pressing need for the Department of Public Information of the Secretariat to intensify its efforts to acquaint world public opinion with all aspects of the question of Namibia.

127. This year the world community has again been confronted by the intransigence of South Africa, which deliberately wrecked the Geneva meeting convened by the Secretary-General to implement Security Council resolution 435 (1978). This continued defiance by Pretoria of the United Nations resolutions on Namibia emphasized the urgency of the need to press for the withdrawal of South Africa from Namibia and the termination of its illegal occupation of the Territory, as well as to put an end to South Africa's repression of the Namibian people.

128. No less urgent is the need to expose the assistance rendered by certain Western States to South Africa; this assistance represents the material basis for the confidence with which the racists continue to challenge the world community and the decisions of the Organization.

129. Based on those premises, the draft resolution in its operative part proposes that the General Assembly decide on the launching of a world campaign to support United Nations resolutions for a free and independent Namibia according to a programme of activities to be formulated by the United Nations Council for Namibia in co-operation with the appropriate United Nations organs. A general outline of the activities to be included in that programme is also given in the operative part.

130. In addition, this year the Secretary-General is requested to undertake, in consultation with the Council, the preparation of a comprehensive United Nations economic map of Namibia.

131. The operative part of the draft resolution also provides that the implementation of the programme of dissemination of information on Namibia shall be carried out by the United Nations Council for Namibia, assisted by the Department of Public Information. In this respect all specialized agencies and other organizations within the United Nations system are also requested to intensify the dissemination of information on Namibia in consultation with the Council.

132. On behalf of the United Nations Council for Namibia and the sponsors, I should like to express the sincere hope that the draft resolution will meet the approval of the overwhelming majority of the members of the General Assembly.

133. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Yugoslavia to introduce the draft resolution in document A/35/L.58.

134. Mr. STARČEVIĆ (Yugoslavia): On behalf of the sponsors, I should like to introduce draft resolu

tion A/35/L.58, entitled "Question of Namibian uranium".

135. The draft resolution deals with an extremely important aspect of the illegal occupation of Namibia by the racist South African régime, that is, the plunder of its natural resources, among which uranium has a particular significance.

136. The draft resolution is based on the findings of the hearings on Namibian uranium conducted by the United Nations Council for Namibia from 7 to 11 July 1980. The hearings confirmed in full and further clarified what had already been known. The continuing exploitation of Namibian uranium by South Africa and foreign economic interests, notably of some Western countries, in contravention of Security Council resolutions 276 (1970), 283 (1970) and 301 (1971), as well as of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia, constitutes one of the main obstacles to the independence of Namibia.

137. As stressed in the draft resolution, this exploitation also represents an increasing threat to international peace and security because of the development by South Africa of a nuclear capability using Namibian uranium and poses dangers of nuclear proliferation arising from the sale of Namibian uranium without safeguards by South Africa.

138. In addition to the provisions which correctly qualify the continuing exploitation of Namibian uranium, in accordance with the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia, the draft resolution contains requests for specific action. Governments which have not yet done so are requested to adopt the necessary measures to put an end to the enterprises of their nationals operating in Namibia. Governments of States whose corporations are involved in Namibian uranium are requested to prohibit their activities in Namibia.

139. The Security Council is requested to take appropriate action in respect of the violation of its resolutions and to ensure that South Africa does not continue to acquire nuclear technology from other countries.

140. All States are called upon to refrain from supplying the South African régime, directly or indirectly, with installations that might enable it to produce uranium, plutonium and other nuclear materials, reactors or military equipment.

141. The draft resolution condemns all activities regarding illegal exploitation of Namibian uranium and the collusion of the countries involved with South Africa in the nuclear field.

142. The action proposed by this draft resolution is urgently needed. The exploitation of Namibian uranium should cease and the obstacle to the independence of Namibia that it constitutes should be removed.

143. I therefore recommend this draft resolution for adoption by the General Assembly.

144. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes before the voting.

145. Before doing so, I should like to remind members that the General Assembly decided that explana-

tions of vote should be made from their seats and should not be longer than 10 minutes.

146. Mr. de ALBUQUERQUE (Portugal): The adoption of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) had rekindled our hopes for a peaceful transition to independence in Namibia, but it has become abundantly clear since then that the Government of South Africa is intent on resorting to all kinds of tactics to delay the implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of that Territory. Meanwhile, showing a strikingly conciliatory attitude, the front-line States and others have made important concessions, as evidenced in the case of the proposal for the creation of a demilitarized zone along the Namibian border put forward by President Agostinho Neto of the People's Republic of Angola.

147. South Africa has instead continued to launch unprovoked attacks against the territory of neighbouring countries, sowing death, suffering and destruction amidst the inhabitants of those countries. None of the pretexts invoked by the South African authorities in those instances can, in the opinion of my Government, justify the breach of the internationally accepted principles of sovereignty, territorial integrity and non-interference in the internal affairs of States. Furthermore, my Government is convinced that such acts run counter to the search for a peaceful solution of the problems afflicting the whole of southern Africa.

148. Portugal deeply regrets that despite the strenuous efforts of the Western contact group, the front-line States, and the Secretary-General and his staff, it was not possible to set a calendar for the independence of Namibia during the pre-implementation meeting at Geneva. But it is none the less true that for the first time all the leaders of the Namibian people agreed to meet face to face with a view to settling their differences through negotiated means. My Government welcomes this important step and expresses the hope that the mutual mistrust which has long existed between the parties will thus gradually disappear, paving the way for the creation of a spirit of co-operation and understanding among those who in the future will have to share the heavy responsibility of shaping the destiny of their country.

149. We are at a critical juncture, for the dangers underlying the current standstill are indeed very grave both for southern Africa and for the world at large. My country therefore addresses a pressing appeal to the Government of South Africa to reconsider its position and once again to join the negotiating forces so that a final agreement may soon be reached on a cease-fire. We feel that this can be achieved if the international community throws its full weight behind, and reiterates its support for, the United Nations plan, whatever difficulties are encountered, because it is the best possible basis for the settlement of the Namibian problem.

150. Those are the fundamental guidelines that have inspired the attitude of the Portuguese delegation in considering the different draft resolutions before us. Our firm commitment to the cause of the independence of the Namibian people prompts us to vote in favour of all draft resolutions that would contribute to achieve that goal as expeditiously as possible. However, my delegation has some reservations concerning draft

resolutions A/35/L.50, A/35/L.58 and A/35/L.59, and we will therefore abstain in the votes on them because, on the one hand, there are some references with which my Government cannot agree, and, on the other, because they contain certain paragraphs which in our view seem to lack the necessary balance. I should like to stress that in each case we have exclusively borne in mind the interests and legitimate concerns of the Namibian people as a whole, to whom I wish here today to pay a public tribute for the courage, restraint and statesmanlike attitude their leaders have shown during the lengthy negotiating process. We urge them to continue to explore all possible avenues for a peaceful transition to independence in Namibia. Portugal, for its part, will not fail to give continued support to their struggle to attain that goal.

151. Mr. VILLARREAL (Panama) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Panama wishes to indicate that despite our having some difficulties with the wording of operative paragraph 12 of draft resolution A/35/L.58, on the question of Namibian uranium, we shall vote in favour of that draft resolution as well as for all the other draft resolutions that are to be put to the vote this afternoon.

152. Mr. BELTRAMINO (Argentina) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Argentina has supported and will continue to support self-determination and independence for the people of Namibia whenever it is discussed, both within the United Nations and in other forums. It is a very clear and long-standing case. Its historical development and the activities undertaken by the United Nations, and in particular by the United Nations Council for Namibia, as well as those undertaken by a group of countries when appropriate, are well known, so it is unnecessary for me to list or recapitulate all the decisions, efforts, moments of frustration, moments of progress, moments of backsliding, moments of deadlock and times when hopes were dashed.

153. The situation that currently exists in Namibia is a matter of great concern to the broad majority of the international community. As a direct result of that concern, and in order to speed up the independence process, the General Assembly is meeting in the resumed thirty-fifth session. There is natural impatience to see peace restored and to satisfy the national aspiration of a people to choose its own destiny like any other State. That explains the attitude that has been taken by the United Nations in this emergency. However, the obstructionist policy of the Power occupying the Territory disregards the historical evolution leading to decolonization, the process wisely set forth in the Charter, and that may have negative consequences for that Power.

154. My delegation considers that the draft resolutions that have been submitted to the Assembly reflect our objective and we shall therefore support them, while, as in the past, reserving our position regarding provisions calling for armed struggle, which we consider to be incompatible with the provisions of the Charter and the norms of coexistence that should govern relations among peoples and nations, as well as specific references to countries whose positions have been condemned, as our delegation considers that to be an improper policy for the United Nations to adopt. Rather the United Nations should

invite Member States to co-operate and to commit themselves to the lofty objectives to be pursued for Namibia.

155. Despite all of the difficulties inherent in the question of Namibia at this time, we hope that a final, equitable and just solution that accords with the provisions of the Charter will be reached as soon as possible. The time has come for the occupying Power to abandon its present attitude and to negotiate, before it is too late for it to preserve what it considers to be its own interests.

156. Mr. DLAMINI (Swaziland): The General Assembly has before it a number of draft resolutions on the question of Namibia stemming from the debate over the past four days. It is true that the people of Namibia have waited too long for their independence and that it is incumbent upon us as States Members of the United Nations to do all we can to help them proceed speedily and peacefully towards full nationhood.

157. Because of those considerations my delegation will vote in favour of all the draft resolutions before us. Furthermore, we should like to join the sponsors of draft resolutions A/35/L.53, A/35/L.54, A/35/L.56 and A/35/L.58. However, for reasons we have stated many times in the past, my delegation reserves its position with regard to operative paragraph 29 of draft resolution A/35/L.50 and operative paragraph 13 of draft resolution A/35/L.59.

158. Mr. FRANCIS (New Zealand): New Zealand has joined with other delegations at this resumed session in deploring South Africa's continued illegal occupation of Namibia and the inhumanity of the policies it has been pursuing in that Territory. We especially regretted South Africa's failure to seize the unique opportunity offered at the meeting at Geneva to implement the United Nations plan, a plan which we had all hoped would this year lead to the independence of Namibia. Nevertheless, we believe that efforts to achieve a negotiated settlement in Namibia must continue. New Zealand will therefore support the seven draft resolutions under consideration which appear to us to encourage a peaceful and just settlement.

159. We will abstain, however, on three draft resolutions—A/35/L.50, A/35/L.58 and A/35/L.59. These contain a number of elements which my Government cannot endorse.

160. New Zealand accepts the proposition that SWAPO has a major and indispensable role in any settlement, but we do not recognize that organization as being the sole authentic representative of the people of Namibia. To accord such recognition would, in our view, prejudice the outcome of the elections still to be held in Namibia.

161. Neither do we accept the endorsement of armed struggle, for that is not in keeping with our commitment to peaceful change.

162. For the same reason, we cannot support the call to the international community to render all possible military assistance to SWAPO.

163. Finally, we have reservations about the strong criticism which has been directed at certain States. This is not because we in any way endorse those

policies which are criticized in the draft resolution. It is simply because we believe that the way in which that criticism has been expressed does not accord with the traditions of the Assembly.

164. Mrs. SYLVESTER-HENRY (Grenada): Once again the Assembly is convened to deliberate on the question of Namibia, a country that is being ruthlessly plundered by a minority racist régime which unashamedly boasts that it is the legitimate heir to the thinking of Adolf Hitler and company.

165. Grenada fully supports draft resolutions A/35/L.50 to A/35/L.59 emanating from the debates of the previous days, and in doing so we wish to state that Grenada is unequivocal on the question of Namibia. Our position rests on our belief that the people of that ravaged country, like other peoples, have an inalienable right to self-determination and genuine independence. Moreover, our belief finds eloquent expression in General Assembly resolutions 1514 (XV) and 2621 (XXV), both of which assert the need for an end to the repugnant system of colonialism.

166. It is undoubtedly true to say that we have come a long way since 1945, but for those of us who cherish freedom and genuine independence, the maintenance of colonialism is inadmissible. The convening of the talks at Geneva rekindled our hopes that the decolonization of Namibia could be achieved through negotiations. The failure of those talks could be attributed only to the racist nature of the South African régime. We praise SWAPO, the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people, for its willingness to sign a cease-fire and to set a date for the arrival of the UNTAG in Namibia.

167. South Africa continues to occupy Namibia in defiance of the relevant resolutions of the United Nations and opinions of the International Court of Justice. Pretoria stubbornly refuses to recognize the

United Nations Council for Namibia, which is the only legal administrative body for the Territory. The genocidal repression of tens of thousands of men, women and children continues. The rape and plunder of the natural resources of Namibia by South Africa and some Western countries persist in contravention of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia, enacted by the Council on 27 September 1974.

168. South Africa, in defiance of decisions taken by the Assembly, continues in its attempts to alter the national and territorial integrity of Namibia.

169. Grenada is a poor country suffering as a result of exploitation of the third world by imperialist countries and large multinational corporations, added to the obvious repercussions of world-wide inflation and worsening economic conditions. Yet we understand the necessity of making greater sacrifices to support the struggles of our brothers and sisters in their fight for survival. We must indeed move beyond verbal expressions of solidarity to responses that are more tangible and concrete. Thus, Grenada three weeks ago took a decision and pledged a contribution of \$US 16,000 to the United Nations Fund for Namibia in the aftermath of the failure of the Geneva talks. Grenada also endorses and fully supports every initiative which would enable SWAPO to pursue its strategies in the military, political and diplomatic fields. The People's Revolutionary Government and the people of Grenada reaffirm their full support for the valiant struggle of our Namibian brothers and sisters, under the leadership of SWAPO, their sole authentic representative. We are steadfast in our conviction that Namibia will be free.

170. At this point we wish to join in sponsoring draft resolutions A/35/L.50 to A/35/L.59.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.