

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-THIRD SESSION

Official Records



**101st
PLENARY MEETING**

Friday, 25 May 1979,
at 11.05 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
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	1727

President: Mr. Indalecio LIEVANO (Colombia).

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. ZAITON (Malaysia): May I first of all express the pleasure of my delegation at seeing you, Sir, preside again this time over the resumed thirty-third session of the General Assembly, which is devoted to the very crucial question of Namibia. We are confident that under your continued able and distinguished leadership our resumed session will be a productive and successful one.

2. It is timely indeed that our session resumes at this moment. The unfortunate fact is that the situation in Namibia has now assumed very serious dimensions and there is urgent need to find an early solution to the problem before that situation erupts into wider conflict and bloodshed. We are, of course, very concerned that despite the dedicated and untiring efforts of the United Nations Council for Namibia, independence has still continued to elude the people of Namibia. It is clear that in the South African Government the United Nations has to contend with a ruthless and unscrupulous régime which is systematically employing all manner of deceptive and obstructionist tactics to deny the people of Namibia their basic rights of self-determination and independence.

3. There is no doubt that the serious situation in Namibia is caused by South Africa's intransigence and obstructionist tactics. Reports have revealed the dastardly methods resorted to by the racist régime for the purpose of exploiting the rich resources of that country and by so doing to deprive the Namibians of their inherent right to the wealth of their land.

4. Unless the Namibians are accorded total independence the situation will continue to pose a threat to the peace and

stability of the whole area, with implications for world peace and security. We should not at this crucial stage allow the initiative of the five Western Powers to be aborted. That initiative, which we had all welcomed, has led to the adoption by the Security Council of resolution 435 (1978) with the support of all members of the Council as well as of all other Members of this Organization. It is unfortunate that the South African régime has chosen to defy the United Nations and frustrate all attempts at bringing about the effective implementation of that resolution. By so doing, the South African Government is clearly showing that it has no desire to see a free and independent Namibia. On the contrary, it is intent on perpetuating its control of the Territory and on preserving the *status quo*.

5. These acts of utter defiance and contempt of the United Nations should not be tolerated. We firmly believe that Security Council resolution 435 (1978) is the best way out for all parties concerned, and, unless South Africa co-operates in effectively implementing this resolution, there is no other choice but to call for the strongest measures against this recalcitrant régime.

6. The South African Government must realize that time is of the essence for an early implementation of the independence plans for Namibia. It cannot go on with its illegal occupation of that Territory against the wishes of the people and of the international community. It cannot pretend that the United Nations is not the responsible authority for that Territory. Also, it cannot but be aware of the dire consequences if, as the reports suggest, it should go ahead with a possible unilateral declaration of independence in Namibia. In this regard the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, at its recent meeting in Belgrade, has already voiced serious concern over a possible attempt by South Africa to launch a unilateral declaration of independence in Namibia.

7. We cannot accept any form of political action in Namibia which is contrary to the United Nations principle of self-determination. It is crystal clear that the South African Government wants to have its own way in Namibia, a way which we regard as being fraught with danger. The United Nations should, therefore, undertake all possible actions to prevent any move by the racist régime to install a unilateral declaration of independence, a step which, we all agree, would serve only to create more complications and unnecessary bloodshed in that Territory.

8. The situation as it is is already complicated by the recent aggressions committed by South Africa against the neighbouring African States which we all condemn. We are

aware that their objective is to eliminate bases of the South West Africa People's Organization [SWAPO], but the wanton aggressions are also meant deliberately to create chaos and instability in order to divert world attention from South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia. These acts will not serve the best interests of peace in the area. They will instead create serious tensions, bring more hardships to the people of Namibia and obstruct and negate our efforts to solve this crucial question.

9. If South Africa continues its obstructionist policies, it is the view of my delegation that it would be appropriate and timely for this body to consider effective counter-measures. Time is fast running out, and all this while the people of Namibia continue to suffer, not only because of the denial of the enjoyment of their inalienable rights, but also because of the continued repressive measures and brutal police tactics resorted to by the racist régime. It is imperative that we now consider the imposition of measures that would bring about the effective and total isolation of the South African racist régime. There is need for appropriate measures under Chapter VII of the Charter, including a total oil embargo against that régime. My Government stands ready to support all measures, including sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter.

10. Malaysia's record in support of the cause of the Namibians is well known. My delegation wishes on this occasion to reaffirm once again our continuing support for the people of Namibia, led by SWAPO, their legal and authentic representative, in the just struggle to achieve freedom, self-determination and independence in a united Namibia. We realize that the United Nations task of finding a conclusive and peaceful solution to the problem of Namibia is not going to be easy, particularly in view of the deception and manoeuvres of South Africa. But we call on South Africa to see reason and heed the United Nations, for we firmly believe that the only lasting and just solution of the problems will be a solution in accordance with the relevant decisions of the United Nations.

11. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): Since I understand that no other speaker listed this morning is ready to speak at this time, I am regretfully obliged to suspend the meeting.

The meeting was suspended at 11.15 a.m., and resumed at 11.25 a.m.

12. Mrs. CARRASCO (Bolivia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. President, first of all, may I say that we are greatly pleased to see you once again presiding over the meetings of the thirty-third session of the General Assembly on agenda item 27.

13. At the same time we should like once again to express to the Secretary-General of our Organization the support of the Government of Bolivia for his political wisdom and the humanitarian approach to problems which he has brought to bear in his leadership of our Organization, so that the latter may achieve the aims for which it was created, namely: social and democratic progress for all peoples and peace and security for all men.

14. Also we should like to express the satisfaction of our delegation at what is being done by the United Nations Council for Namibia. That Council under the effective and intelligent leadership of Mr. Lusaka continues to be an irreplaceable instrument for the implementation of General Assembly resolutions.

15. This meeting represents beyond any doubt a crucial stage in our deliberations; we are endeavouring to bring about a speedy and just solution to the problem of Namibia.

16. The position of Bolivia is well known; it is a position that my delegation put forth at the ninth special session of the General Assembly¹ and a position repeated in the Security Council.

17. Aside from the question of principle, that is, the elimination of one of the greatest obstacles to decolonization, we have been guided by another purpose: to contribute to the most genuine freedom of the people of Namibia. Bolivia recognizes that some Western Powers have made constant efforts to create the conditions necessary for a negotiated solution, one which, in accordance with the general consensus of Africa, envisages participation by SWAPO in the negotiations.

18. This position is one which Bolivia shares with the majority of the countries of the world. However, although 12 years have passed since General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) was adopted, the situation, far from improving, has been deliberately aggravated by the Government of South Africa.

19. In 1966, the General Assembly adopted resolution 2145 (XXI) putting an end to South Africa's Mandate to administer Namibia. The United Nations decided to assume responsibility over the Territory of Namibia and to see to it that the people of Namibia obtained autonomy.

20. The Government of Pretoria has ignored that resolution and has placed itself beyond the pale of civilized nations in so doing.

21. Since 1966, both the General Assembly and the Security Council have adopted numerous resolutions urging the Government of South Africa to put an end to its illegal presence in Namibia and to recognize the inalienable right of the Namibian people to self-government and their right freely to determine their own form of government.

22. Far from heeding these urgings, far from abiding by the resolutions, the legitimacy of which was reaffirmed by the International Court of Justice in 1971,² South Africa has strengthened its arbitrary occupation by extending to Namibia the odious system of *apartheid*, the existence of which is considered by the international community to be an offence to mankind.

¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Ninth Special Session, Plenary Meetings*, 6th meeting, paras. 180-199.

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

23. In 1976 the Security Council, in consistency with the line taken by the General Assembly, adopted resolution 385 (1976), in which, in addition to repeating its appeal to South Africa to withdraw from the Territory, proposes that a time-table be set for the holding of free elections under the auspices of the United Nations.

24. Although it was predictable that the Government of South Africa would flout that resolution, too, the way in which it did so is particularly worthy of condemnation. In fact South Africa's version of decolonization propounded at the so-called Turnhalle Conference is but an attempt by that country to maintain the privileges of the minority and to appear in the international community as a country which supports the spirit, if not the letter, of United Nations resolutions.

25. There is another aspect of the problem about which I must express the profound concern of my Government. The Government of South Africa has made an attempt—an arbitrary one, no matter how it is viewed—to annex Walvis Bay, which is an integral part of Namibia and to which Namibia is bound—as was pointed out at Maputo—by geographical, economic, cultural and ethnic ties. Although the United Nations has condemned that annexation, we must be aware of the fact that South Africa may try to win recognition for that annexation in exchange for respect for United Nations resolutions—which in any case it will have to respect sooner or later. An enclave of that kind, if created, would deprive Namibia of a port which is indispensable for its development, in addition to constituting a centre of what would in the long term be intolerable economic and political pressure. It would be an enclave which could be used later by South Africa as an argument to justify its economic and political trusteeship of Namibia or perhaps even to justify territorial claims to areas around the enclave.

26. What is of particularly great concern to us is the fact that not everyone thinks that the ambiguity of the situation created by this annexation is particularly grave, and many maps published in certain developed countries present the sovereignty of South Africa over Walvis Bay as an accomplished fact.

27. In admittedly different historical circumstances, Bolivia was the victim of the lack of interest of certain countries. Although they recognized the legitimate right of our country to certain territories which other countries were disputing, they did not do anything to prevent our coastline from being taken from us, and that situation led to our land-locked status, which has now existed for a century.

28. We must not forget that one of the factors which led to the loss of prestige and the failure of the League of Nations between the two World Wars was its inability to cope with the various problems.

29. So this is an historic turning-point. If this is the last opportunity for the Government of South Africa to change its policy and adopt urgent measures to abide by the General Assembly resolutions, perhaps this is also a time when we can say that the credibility of the United Nations is at stake and would be challenged if, in view of Pretoria's

refusal to co-operate, we were unable to take the necessary and appropriate action, including action under Chapter VII of the Charter, to bring about the total and unconditional withdrawal of the illegal occupiers of Namibia.

30. In the interest of international concord, it is our hope that South Africa will respond quickly to the appeals made by our Organization and avoid the dangers of an even more serious situation in that part of the world.

31. Mr. ANDERSON (Australia): The Australian Government views 1979 as a crucial year for the Namibian people in their efforts to achieve self-determination and independence. It is, therefore, a matter of deep disappointment and concern that the General Assembly has had to resume its thirty-third session because progress in plans for United Nations supervised elections in the Territory, after two years of patient and painstaking negotiations, appears to have stalled.

32. My Government has given strong and consistent support to the plan initially proposed by the five Western Powers³ and adopted by the Security Council in its resolution 435 (1978). We commend the efforts of the Secretary-General, his Special Representative, the members of the Security Council and, in particular, the representatives of the contact group and the front-line States, who have all done so much to resolve major differences which existed between the parties. Our commitment to the United Nations proposals is reflected in the willingness of the Australian Government to contribute to the United Nations Transition Assistance Group, which would be established to organize and supervise elections in the Territory.

33. It is my Government's firm belief that the United Nations proposals represent the best, and probably the only, course capable of bringing about the early independence of Namibia by peaceful means. If this opportunity is not grasped, if the momentum of the past two years is lost, the prospect must be one of mounting violence and a protracted struggle, with disastrous consequences for the Namibian people and serious effects upon neighbouring countries.

34. We welcomed the agreement in principle to the United Nations proposals by the two main parties last year. We were encouraged by the agreement that implementation of the United Nations plan would proceed at an early date. However, progress has now been stalled as a result of difficulties that the South African Government has raised in relation to certain aspects of the proposals. The South African Government has so far refused to shift its position on these aspects.

35. It is also a cause for regret that the South African authorities have introduced new internal measures in Namibia. These changes, especially at this time, cannot but lessen the prospects for a settlement and Australia deplors all actions which diminish such prospects.

36. Australia likewise deplors the recent detention of leading members of the internal wing of SWAPO. Those detentions, together with other repressive acts directed at

³ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-third Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1978*, document S/12827.

the suppression of this major Namibian political movement, can only make it still more difficult to create the conditions necessary for a peaceful transition to majority rule and genuine independence.

37. In this resumed thirty-third session of the General Assembly, we have the opportunity to demonstrate that the world community is united in its attitude toward the fundamental issues in respect of Namibia. It is important that we manifest this unity in the form of a resolution which can draw upon the widest support and preferably be adopted by consensus. To attempt to include secondary and controversial issues on which division exists among United Nations Members as to principle may well only give encouragement to those who do not wish to see a prompt and peaceful transition to a genuinely independent Namibia.

38. My delegation has taken an active part in the work of the two United Nations bodies entrusted with responsibility for Namibia: the Council for Namibia, the legal Administering Authority for the Territory, and the Special Committee. Australia joined other members of the Special Committee in a special meeting on southern Africa held in Belgrade in April this year and we supported the consensus reached there on both Namibia and Southern Rhodesia.

39. We attach particular importance to the work of the Council for Namibia under its able President, Ambassador Lusaka. I refer, for example, to its decisive role in representing the interests of the Namibian people at international conferences, as a result of which the Council is now a member of such international bodies as FAO, ILO and UNESCO. We have, as a supporter of General Assembly resolutions 31/149 and 32/9 E, supported the Council's membership in these specialized bodies. We have taken part as a member of the Council in a number of missions organized by the Council with a view to increasing international awareness of its work.

40. We strongly support the Council's programme of assistance to Namibia from which has evolved the United Nations Fund for Namibia, the United Nations Institute for Namibia in Lusaka and the Nationhood Programme. We are gratified that 25 of the first 45 projects under the Nationhood Programme were formally initiated a fortnight ago. In this respect I should like to pay a particular tribute to the work of the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia and his staff.

41. In conclusion, I wish to reaffirm my Government's conviction that the few remaining obstacles to the implementation of the United Nations settlement proposals are capable of being resolved if the parties concerned are genuinely committed to an internationally acceptable solution and act accordingly. Although Australia dissociated itself from the action taken yesterday on the question of South African credentials, we do not accept that that action could in any way justify a move by South Africa to reject or evade a commitment to implement the United Nations proposals. We call upon South Africa to demonstrate that commitment in its still-awaited reply to the Secretary-General.

42. Mr. MARINESCU (Romania) (*interpretation from French*): Recent developments in Namibia and the deterior-

ation of the situation in southern Africa in general provokes legitimate concern among States Members of the United Nations and in the international community. Over recent months, as heretofore, we witnessed a whole series of provocative actions undertaken by the racist régimes to perpetuate in southern Africa the most retrograde, aggressive system of domination and colonial oppression, racial discrimination and *apartheid*.

43. The resolutions and decisions of the United Nations, including those of the Security Council, regarding the territories of southern Africa, continue to be cynically violated by the racist régimes. It is now quite clear that, notwithstanding their formal commitments to participating in the process of a negotiated settlement of the Namibian and Zimbabwean situation, the period of negotiations was used by the régimes to cover up their shady manoeuvres.

44. By suppressing the fundamental rights of the peoples of southern Africa to self-determination and independence, by stepping up repressive measures and by perpetrating repeated acts of aggression against neighbouring States, the Pretoria and Salisbury racists have shown themselves to be out-and-out enemies of the liberation of peoples and have aggravated already very dangerous sources of tension and conflict on the continent and throughout the world.

45. It becomes ever more clear that United Nations efforts to build a new economic and political international order and a better and more just world are inseparable from the struggle to eliminate the policy of force and domination and finally to do away with colonialism and all forms of racial discrimination and *apartheid*.

46. The militant solidarity of Romania and the Romanian people with the peoples and countries of Africa, their courageous struggle for the exercise of their legitimate right to decide on their future themselves and to be masters of their own national riches, for the full triumph of freedom and independence on the African continent, was vehemently reaffirmed during the official visits of friendship made this year in April by President Nicolae Ceauşescu to several African countries.

47. The progress of each people, as was stated by our President, and the establishment of a policy of peace and co-operation throughout the world cannot take place unless imperialist and colonialist domination and all national oppression are ended once and for all. First and foremost this entails the need to make effective, as soon as possible, the right of the Namibian people to independence and the support for the struggle of that people for their freedom and independent development. These are essential prerequisites, the very *raison d'être* of our Organization. They demand attention in this debate and call for co-ordinated efforts on the part of all Member States and a staunch will for action to support people still struggling to win their national independence.

48. The development of the situation in Namibia leaves no doubt regarding the true intention of South Africa to resort to a unilateral, illegal solution, running counter to the will of the Namibian people and its national liberation movement, SWAPO, notwithstanding the demands of the international community, which had been frequently ex-

pressed in General Assembly and Security Council resolutions.

49. The unilateral illegal actions of the South African régime of occupation in Namibia, the duplicity practised by the authorities of Pretoria during the negotiations entered into on the organization of free and democratic elections in Namibia under Security Council resolution 385 (1976), as well as the delaying tactics used throughout the negotiations, have clearly shown up the intention of South Africa to preserve its interests and its control over a region of such importance by reason of the exploitation of its resources and its strategic value. These shady goals are quite transparent in the attempts of South Africa to attribute a so-called legitimacy to the results of the rigged elections held last December, so as to obtain international recognition for them. That is why we think that it is particularly important to take energetic steps to put an end to the delaying tactics of the Pretoria régime to impose on the Namibian people a so-called internal settlement and a bogus decolonization of the Territory, by establishing there a neo-colonialist régime held in bondage.

50. In order to implement their neo-colonialist racist designs, the South African régime of occupation, while involved in negotiations, has had recourse to brutal repression of the struggle of the Namibian people for independence and of their national liberation movement, SWAPO, which is recognized by the United Nations, as their sole authentic representative. It is to this end that the régime made mass arrests, especially of members of SWAPO, and indulged in diversionary acts to undermine the national unity of the Namibian people and the territorial integrity of their country.

51. These illegal actions, which have been repeatedly condemned by the United Nations, are flagrant violations of the Namibian people's legitimate desire for liberty and independence; they defy the demands of the people of southern Africa; and they are an affront to the entire African continent and a direct provocation to this Organization. If this situation continues it cannot but lead to a further heightening of the tension in southern Africa and a further increase in the number of elements of conflict throughout the continent. By its policies of expansion, colonialist domination, *apartheid* and racial discrimination, South Africa is attacking the universal principles which are the very basis of the United Nations and of international co-operation.

52. Even a cursory analysis of the situation shows that the General Assembly is faced once more with a particularly complex problem which has far-reaching implications and which cannot be dealt with merely by reaffirming the political and juridical positions of the United Nations on Namibia and on South Africa's illegal occupation of the Territory. This debate is a test of the responsibility of this Organization and of its ability to act. They are also a test of the resolve of all Member States to take energetic action, on the basis of the Charter, including Chapter VII, under which South Africa can be compelled to abide by United Nations resolutions. One of those is Security Council resolution 385 (1976) concerning the implementation of the right of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence. It is imperative to ensure the immediate and

unconditional withdrawal of South Africa from Namibian territory and the cessation of attempts to impose on Namibia a régime running counter to the interests and will of its people, as well as to United Nations resolutions.

53. We believe that, if that goal is to be attained, United Nations efforts must be backed up by the full co-operation of all, particularly those who, by their policies and because of economic interests have made the Namibian people's accession to independence more difficult and who have contributed, directly or indirectly, to the maintenance of the colonialist régime of domination and occupation in Namibia, with all its deleterious consequences for the already grave situation in the Territory and throughout southern Africa.

54. The decision by which the United Nations, in 1967, assumed responsibility for Namibia was an historic act expressing the will of the international community. It was followed up by intense activity to eliminate the illegal occupation of Namibia and to prepare the Namibian people for independence. Despite all the efforts that were made, we still have not managed to bring the occupation and colonial domination of Namibia to an end and thus enable Namibian people to enjoy the fruits of independence.

55. The Romanian delegation is of the opinion that all the conditions have been met to enable the United Nations to take resolute action to discharge immediately, effectively and completely responsibilities which are unique in its history. But the General Assembly and the Security Council, particularly the latter, will have to take new and energetic steps to put an end to the continued defiance of United Nations authority and to force South Africa to abide by the Organization's demands.

56. Special attention should be given to the needs of Namibia and its national liberation movement, SWAPO, for assistance, especially at this crucial stage of the legitimate struggle they are waging by all possible means to eliminate the illegal régime of occupation and to win national independence. We must act in a concerted way to ensure the cessation of all acts of violence against the Namibian people, to bring about the immediate and unconditional liberation of Namibian patriots and freedom fighters, and to ensure the national independence of their homeland. The special responsibility of the United Nations to maintain international peace and security and to look to the future of the Namibian people demands of it the greatest possible vigilance in view of South Africa's attempts to impose on the Namibian people a neo-colonialist régime in violation of United Nations resolutions.

57. Romania actively supports the United Nations in its efforts to achieve its aspirations for the removal of the last vestiges of colonialism and domination, the implementation of its resolutions on the accession of colonial countries and peoples to independence, and, in particular, the fulfilment of its special responsibilities vis-à-vis Namibia. At the same time the Romanian people resolutely supports and gives multilateral assistance to colonial peoples and their national liberation movements in their legitimate struggle by all means to attain freedom and independence.

58. The Romanian people resolutely condemned the maintenance of South Africa's illegal domination in Namibia and its repressive actions against the Namibian people and SWAPO. We also condemned South Africa's illegal, unilateral action, taken in defiance of the will of the Namibian people and of United Nations resolutions, to organize a so-called internal settlement in Namibia which would perpetuate colonialist and racist domination of the people and their national resources.

59. In a message addressed to a solemn meeting of the United Nations Council for Namibia, as well as during meetings with SWAPO leaders, in official signed documents and in speeches made during recent visits to several African countries, the President of the Socialist Republic of Romania, Nicolae Ceaușescu, stressed that Romania would continue to give the Namibian people full political, diplomatic, moral and material support in their just struggle for national liberation. In the aforementioned message he stated:

“We consider that at present international solidarity must be strengthened with the Namibian people which, while it engages in political and diplomatic activity, pursues negotiations and draws on United Nations support, has the inalienable right to continue its fight, including armed struggle, until it realizes its sacred aspirations to freedom and independence.”⁴

60. We believe that in present conditions all States must act, as energetically as possible to implement, within the framework of the United Nations, measures which will assure the Namibian people of independence and will strengthen the solidarity of all peoples with those of Namibia and Zimbabwe by giving them full support in all forms, so that they may achieve national independence.

61. It is high time for all, including South Africa, to understand that the progress of a contemporary society peremptorily demands the final elimination of this colonial phenomenon in all its forms and manifestations. Resolute action must be taken to bring about the immediate and unconditional cessation of South Africa's occupation of Namibia so that the Namibian people may exercise, without let or hindrance, their inalienable right to a free and dignified life in their homeland in accordance with their legitimate aspirations.

62. The Romanian delegation is convinced that the United Nations has a special responsibility towards Namibia and has the solemn obligation to guide the Namibian people to independence. The General Assembly should conclude the present deliberations by establishing clear guidelines for action which will contribute decisively to restoring legality in Namibia and help the Namibian people to exercise without further ado their inalienable right to self-determination and independence.

63. In line with this position, the Romanian delegation will make its contribution to elaborating necessary measures to ensure the immediate accession of Namibia to independence in order that the Namibian people can devote all their efforts to reconstruction and to the development

of their country so that they can occupy their rightful place among the free sovereign nations of the world.

64. Mr. KAMIL (Indonesia): After having followed the developments of the past few months in Namibia with close attention, my delegation has arrived at the conclusion that the efforts towards implementing the United Nations independence plan for that Territory by peaceful means, as envisioned in Security Council resolution 435 (1978), appear to have reached a dead end. This cold realization is certainly disconcerting, but it is, I believe, an accurate evaluation of the present situation.

65. On this point there is much that could be said, but, upon reflection, one realizes that all that could be said has already been said time and time again. We all know what the situation is and the consequences of the failure to implement the United Nations independence plan. Therefore, the only relevant question before this body is, In the light of the failure to implement this plan, what can the Assembly do in order to fulfil its obligation to bring freedom and independence to the people of Namibia?

66. It is the considered view of my delegation that the first act of the Assembly in this regard should be to reaffirm once more the special responsibility of the United Nations over Namibia until independence in accordance with resolution 2145 (XXI). Such a reaffirmation, it might be added, should be backed up by a pledge of stepped-up political and material support for the people of Namibia and their sole and authentic representative, SWAPO. Secondly, South Africa's illegal manoeuvres aimed at perpetuating its domination and exploitation of the Territory should be condemned. In the same light, South Africa's repression of the hope of the people of Namibia, its harassment and imprisonment of followers of SWAPO, and its attacks upon neighbouring countries should also be condemned. Thirdly, it is imperative that the members of this body adopt the common stance that the so-called Constituent Assembly established in Namibia by South Africa is an illegal assembly and that no recognition be granted it or any of its members by the international community. The establishment of that assembly is further proof—if indeed any was needed—of South Africa's intention to establish a puppet régime in the Territory in disregard of the wishes of the people of Namibia and the international community.

67. Having condemned all the illegal actions South Africa has resorted to with regard to Namibia and its people, what is our next step? What can we collectively do to further the cause of Namibia's freedom? My delegation believes that at this stage the General Assembly might consider drawing up a list of possible sanctions for submission to the Security Council, for it to take action against South Africa in conformity with Chapter VII of the Charter. Included in this list might be comprehensive economic and trade measures, as well as an oil embargo.

68. Additionally, the severing of all diplomatic and commercial links with South Africa in order to isolate it from the international community might also be considered.

69. In reaffirming its special responsibility for Namibia, this body might also take action to entrust the Council for

⁴ See document A/AC.131/PV.300, p.33.

Namibia—established, as we are all aware, by General Assembly resolution 2248 (S-V) of 1967, as the legal Administering Authority in the Territory until independence—with a greater role in the processes leading to independence.

70. The Council has served the aims and aspirations of the people of Namibia most admirably since its inception and is in a position to render additional valuable service in the very difficult days ahead. The various visiting missions dispatched to different parts of the world are just recent examples of the untiring efforts made by the Council to generate support for the people of Namibia in their quest for freedom and independence.

71. In conclusion, I should like to renew to the people of Namibia and SWAPO the unwavering commitment of the people and Government of Indonesia to their struggle for freedom and independence in a united and consolidated Namibia.

72. My delegation is convinced that the present session of the General Assembly will not fail in its duty to the people of Namibia.

73. Mr. THUNBORG (Sweden): The General Assembly is resuming its debate on Namibia at a time when the future of the whole region of southern Africa seems very uncertain. Despite many differences, recent developments in Rhodesia and Namibia have followed parallel lines in several respects. Against a background of increasing violence, risks for the stability in the whole region, and heavier involvement from Powers outside, strenuous diplomatic efforts have been made to find political solutions to bring the two Territories into free and independent nations in peaceful and orderly forms.

74. In accordance with the plans that have been elaborated for the two Territories, all political groupings would be given equal opportunities to compete democratically, under international supervision, for leadership in their future nations. Both in Rhodesia and in Namibia, however, a development now seems imminent which would fall far short of the basic principles worked out. The apparent similarities in the Rhodesian and Namibian problems do not, of course, lead us to assume that the same solutions are applicable in the two Territories. Differences in the basic constitutional status as well as dissimilarities in the political situation may call for different approaches and procedures. But the goal is the same: independence, majority rule and democracy. And the risks of failure are the same: continued civil strife with severe repercussions not only for southern Africa but for international peace and security.

75. Within the United Nations much work has been done and effort spent with the aim of establishing basic principles for bringing about independence in the case of Namibia.

76. The General Assembly and the Security Council have repeatedly reaffirmed that only the Namibians themselves have the right to decide about their future and that the United Nations has the exclusive and direct legal responsibility for the administration of the Territory until the independence of Namibia has been achieved. In resolutions

385 (1976) and 435 (1978) the Security Council has laid down more specific principles which should govern the political process leading to independence.

77. The actual situation in Namibia has always been in discord with these basic principles, however. The reason for this has been, and still is, South Africa's refusal to comply with the principles. South Africa is obligated under international law to withdraw its military and political presence from Namibia. Yet, it continues its illegal military occupation of the Territory. This policy of obstruction has made the international efforts undertaken during the past two years to reach a negotiated settlement extremely difficult. At present these negotiations seem to be at a standstill.

78. It has not been possible to reconcile the objectives of the South African policy with the aspirations of the Namibian people. Recent developments seem to bear out the long-harboured suspicion that South Africa is determined to maintain a *de facto* domination in Namibia and to use its economic power to continue to exploit the natural resources of the Territory. The Namibian people, and notably SWAPO, which has fought a long and arduous struggle for a free and independent Namibia, see no reason why they should compromise their aspirations. In their view the end of the South African occupation cannot be a question of compromises. The world community supports this view. It is, moreover, in full harmony with the principles of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples [resolution 1514 (XV)], which has guided the process leading to self-determination and independence in all other parts of the world.

79. The aim of the negotiating process which has been tried with so much patience, was never, of course, to achieve compromises deviating from those basic principles. Had it been otherwise, SWAPO, the front-line States and the international community at large would hardly have supported these efforts. The aim of the negotiations was simply to seek practical ways and means to apply those principles so as to achieve a peaceful and orderly transition into independence for the Territory. This was to be done through a process, under the supervision of the United Nations, by which the Namibian people could transform their country in a free, fair and democratic way into an independent nation.

80. The five Western countries were thought to be in a favourable position to promote practical solutions in view of their influence with the Government in Pretoria. It was further hoped that, as a last resort, those five States would use their combined weight to convince South Africa to abide by the generally accepted principles for a solution.

81. At times, during the months that have passed since Security Council resolution 435 (1978) was adopted, prospects for a successful outcome have seemed quite promising, only to give way to diminishing hopes when new obstacles were raised at the last moment. In this connexion, we would like to pay a tribute to the unceasing efforts by the Secretary-General and his Special Representative in Namibia. Today the prospects for the initiation of the transitional process seem very uncertain. Regretfully we

must ask if all our efforts to activate the international machinery in order to give a new nation a successful start have not been made in vain.

82. It would be futile to speculate about South Africa's intentions when it embarked upon the negotiations two years ago. In view of South Africa's conduct during these years we have been suspicious of these intentions on several occasions. Today, however, we can only note, as a fact, that South Africa has used this time to strengthen its position in the Territory, not least militarily. South Africa may try to make its presence a little less conspicuous, dressing it in the cloak of so-called internal solutions and internal leaders. That intention became most obvious when the South African Government proceeded with the elections in December last year in an attempt to boost leaders of its own choice, thus jeopardizing the whole transitional process under United Nations supervision.

83. We have gradually become convinced—not least in the light of recent arrests of SWAPO members—that South Africa, in its striving for long-term domination, has never accepted the possibility of a government in Namibia under the leadership of SWAPO. This attitude is obviously in blatant conflict with the principle that no party enjoying popular support must be excluded from taking part in the process of independence, or from the possibility of forming the government of the new nation. The legislative powers bestowed lately upon the so-called Constituent Assembly in Windhoek confirm our conviction. The action is an affront to the United Nations. If persuasion does not work upon South Africa, the response to its manoeuvres must be increased pressure to bring about compliance with the principles laid down by the Security Council.

84. The Western Powers involved in the negotiations continue to play a crucial role in this respect. So far, they have not shown any readiness to back up their negotiation with effective pressure. The Government in Pretoria has obviously felt confident that the world would not carry out the threats of sanctions embodied in a number of Security Council resolutions. Recent discussions in some countries about a unilateral lifting of the United Nations sanctions against Southern Rhodesia and about recognition of the government established as a result of the elections in that country have increased South African self-assurance. Those elections, in our view, fell far short of the basic principles in the Anglo-American plan⁵ and were rightly declared null and void by the Security Council.

85. A similar development in Namibia would bring disappointment, frustration and fury. A deep worry now prevails in all quarters about the disastrous effects that an application of unilateral measures could have on the region of southern Africa itself, and on peace and security in a much larger context, not to mention the prestige and credibility of the United Nations.

86. Our confidence in sanctions, internationally decided on and accepted, as an important means of pressure to make intransigent parties comply with Security Council

resolutions runs the risk of being shattered. The prospect of more fighting and more bloodshed and suffering in the region of southern Africa is, indeed, frightening. The reality is that those who for years have risked their lives in the fight against racism, discrimination and oppression see no alternative but to continue their armed struggle until they have achieved their basic goal: freedom and independence for their countries. Instability and insecurity will thus continue to loom large in the area. Aggression against neighbouring countries will continue to be an almost daily phenomenon. Outside powers might feel tempted to intervene militarily in the region. South Africa's potential as a nuclear power adds a particularly ominous and perilous dimension to the picture.

87. Is there still time to steer away from a disastrous course? Those directly involved in the negotiating process will be in a better position to judge the basis for whatever hopes remain for a negotiated solution along the lines laid down by the United Nations. We can only repeat that the leading principle in the prevailing situation must continue to be the exploration of every possible peaceful means of furthering and supporting the legitimate interests of the whole Namibian people.

88. We shall continue to show willingness and readiness to support the United Nations in its efforts to exercise its legal responsibility with regard to Namibia.

89. We shall continue to give humanitarian support to the many victims of the liberation struggle, in particular the refugees. Our hope is that this assistance will in the future be transformed into long-term development co-operation with the new state. Our support to the Nationhood Programme and to the Institute for Namibia, we believe, is a start in that direction.

90. The amounts allocated to SWAPO during recent years have increased substantially. In addition Sweden also makes contributions to educational programmes, legal aid and so on, which is channelled through various United Nations bodies and international and national non-governmental organizations.

91. We shall continue to stress that South Africa's failure to comply with relevant Security Council resolutions must prompt the Council to initiate appropriate action, including sanctions.

92. As we have pointed out on several occasions before, the arms embargo against South Africa was an important break-through in the efforts to mount pressure. But to secure the full implementation of Security Council resolution 418 (1977) and to make the arms embargo truly comprehensive is not enough. It has to be supplemented with other measures.

93. In a number of resolutions, the General Assembly has recommended to the Security Council a whole range of measures that could possibly be adopted to increase pressure. Together with the other Nordic countries, Sweden has been particularly active behind efforts in the United Nations to achieve the cessation of further foreign investments and financial loans to South Africa. On various occasions we have presented the arguments why we

⁵ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-second Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1977*, document S/12393.

consider such steps decided on by the Security Council of special importance. The Swedish Government has, for its part, announced plans to prohibit new Swedish investments in South Africa. The Parliament is now considering a bill the aim of which is to prevent the establishment of new enterprises, as well as to prevent Swedish enterprises conducting manufacturing and other business in South Africa today from expanding.

94. I have stressed the matter of foreign investments and financial loans also in view of the decision of the Nordic Governments in March last year to work for a programme of joint action against *apartheid* in South Africa, and to seek widest possible support for such efforts in the United Nations. Needless to say, South Africa's policy versus Namibia can only further strengthen the arguments for such action.

95. It is difficult to talk about effective United Nations sanctions against South Africa without mentioning the possibility of an oil embargo. South Africa's oil industry is more vulnerable to external influence than any other sector. It is a key component of South Africa's military strength, the importance of which can hardly be over-emphasized.

96. But the discussions on the possibility of Security Council sanctions in this field should be widened to include also nuclear energy. As was made clear at a United Nations seminar in London recently on nuclear collaboration with South Africa, the danger of the acquisition of nuclear-weapon capability by South Africa has now become a matter of utmost concern to the international community. In this context, I wish to refer also to General Assembly resolution 33/63 of last year regarding the implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa. We therefore find it important besides ensuring that Security Council resolution 418 (1977) be effectively implemented to bring to discussion nuclear transfers to South Africa, including, for instance, transfers of equipment, technology and services. This is important not only because of the links that exist between military and civilian nuclear development but also because of the special interest to the South African economy in general that nuclear energy may have.

97. In our discussions on selected sanctions against South Africa we should also include the possibility of the Council's applying measures directed against air traffic with South Africa.

98. In this presentation of various possible measures against South Africa which could be considered by the Security Council we have chosen to be selective rather than general. We have done so in the hope that selective measures will be sufficient to bring about a change in South African policy and make the South African Government comply with United Nations decisions. Should this not be the case, we remain as committed as before to supporting proposals in the Security Council resulting in binding decisions against trade with South Africa.

99. I wish to stress that the time has now come for exerting effective pressure on South Africa. We all share a responsibility for achieving a solution in Namibia which is in accordance with the basic principles that have been

laboriously elaborated by all of us within the United Nations system and that we have stood by for years. We cannot recognize solutions which do not square with those principles. We must continue to remain committed to solutions which really serve the interest of the whole Namibian population and which will lead to a truly free and independent nation.

100. Mr. DJIGO (Senegal) (*interpretation from French*): Quite obviously the resumption of the thirty-third session of the General Assembly to discuss the question of Namibia has come at a time of some rather disturbing developments. Only two days before we resumed our work South Africa characteristically threw down a new challenge to the international community and more specifically to the Western Powers which, with it, were trying to bring about a negotiated settlement of the Namibian problem. The decision to transform the so-called Constituent Assembly of Windhoek into a national assembly and to confer executive powers on some of its members means, at the least, the end of any hope that the settlement plan adopted by the Security Council will be implemented.

101. So once again the frequently demonstrated desire of South Africa to achieve its objectives has proved stronger than the warnings of the international community and those of its Western friends.

102. It will be recalled that two years ago the five Western Powers—France, the United Kingdom, Canada, the United States and the Federal Republic of Germany—then members of the Security Council, took the initiative and brought about negotiations with the parties concerned with the aim of setting in motion the process which would lead to an internationally acceptable solution to the Namibian problem.

103. As is well known, that initiative met with differing reactions. Certain States, like my own, appreciated the constructive efforts made individually or collectively by States Members of the Organization to find a solution to that distressing problem on the basis of the relevant resolutions and decisions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. Others, however, expressed scepticism regarding the genuineness of South Africa's willingness to renounce its colonial domination. Indeed, the efforts of the United Nations in the course of this decade to put an end to the illegal presence of South Africa in Namibia have always met the intransigence of the South African Government.

104. Yet it was clear that the Western initiative for the solution of the Namibian problem was unprecedented. It was the first time that five Powers with special responsibility in this matter had decided on collective action. The international community therefore had every reason to hope for its success.

105. But just as those efforts to bring about a negotiated settlement were under way the South African racist régime adopted a whole range of repressive measures and unilaterally appointed an Administrator-General for the Territory.

106. Thus, today we are faced with a new situation. From 21 May, South Africa, according to Judge Steyn, would

guide Namibia “into the promised land of full responsibility”. However, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Federal Republic of Germany, speaking in the Security Council, said:

“We cannot believe that the Government of South Africa will now leave a road on which it has gone a long way with us and thus decide against a peaceful settlement under international control . . .”⁶

And the Foreign Minister went on to say:

“No one in the Republic of South Africa should overlook the consequences such a step would be bound to have.”⁷

107. We can only be reassured by such statements, for the South African decision is in effect a unilateral declaration of independence, and we are convinced that no one would claim the contrary. As the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Federal Republic of Germany went on to say:

“ . . . President Nujoma’s letter of 8 September 1978 to the Secretary-General . . . means unqualified acceptance by SWAPO of the settlement proposal and the Secretary-General’s report. Consequently, the responsibility for a further delay in reaching an internationally acceptable solution would now rest exclusively with the Republic of South Africa.”⁸

108. Thus South Africa has just openly defied the five Western Powers, which, according to the United States Secretary of State, Mr. Vance, showed by their initiative that the international community is committed to the implementation of the programme set out in the report of the Secretary-General.⁹

109. That is to say that the situation thus deliberately created by South Africa is in fact grave and unusual. It is grave because South Africa is threatening “to abandon any subsequent negotiations with the Western Powers”, as its Foreign Minister said on 20 May, but, above all, unusual inasmuch as South Africa has accused the five major Powers of distorting the settlement plan. Since this is not the time for invective, we shall for our part refrain from dwelling on that affront.

110. On the other hand, the South African decision regarding an alleged “internal settlement” has prompted Senegal to ask the General Assembly to take action to isolate South Africa in the international arena.

111. In Senegal’s view, the powers of the United Nations Council for Namibia must be increased. That Council continues to be the legal authority in Namibia as long as that country is not truly independent. The Council has been vigorously endeavouring to strip the South African Government of the responsibility which it claims illegally over the Territory of Namibia. In this connexion the

Council deserves the full support of all Members of our Organization in its activity.

112. In Senegal’s view SWAPO, the sole genuine liberation movement of the Namibian people, must be given the material, moral, diplomatic and military assistance that it needs fully to realize the aspirations of the Namibian people and to bring about genuine independence within a united Namibia. A tribute should be paid to SWAPO’s spirit of initiative, openness and co-operation, its sense of reconciliation, and, in brief, political maturity and willingness to co-operate demonstrated throughout the activity that led to the settlement plan adopted by the Security Council.

113. Senegal considers also that all States must put an immediate end to their economic, military and financial relations with South Africa as long as that régime persists in occupying Namibia illegally and in practising its policy of *apartheid* there.

114. In this connexion, the continued illegal operation of multinational corporations in Namibia in collusion with the administration of South Africa should be denounced. Their plundering of the natural resources of the Territory is in contravention of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia enacted by the United Nations Council for Namibia.¹⁰

115. The United Nations, and more specifically the Security Council, are primarily responsible for international peace and security and they must no longer allow any obstacle to the accession of Namibia to genuine independence.

116. The elimination of the policy of domination and oppression require joint efforts on the part of all members of the international community. Regrettably, all initiatives aimed at having mandatory sanctions decreed against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter have always encountered a veto.

117. If the United Nations has thus far been unable to adopt appropriate sanctions against South Africa, it is because some have felt that proposals along those lines have been ill-timed.

118. The reasons advanced were the pressure of public opinion, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, the conviction that South Africa could be brought to reason. But the results are there and require no comment. The problem now is to know what assurances the Western countries can still give to move the negotiations out of the impasse.

119. Now that South Africa has clearly rejected the efforts of the five Western countries to bring about peace, inasmuch as its decision of 21 May is far from being in line with the settlement plan endorsed by the Security Council which the five Powers have committed themselves to have implemented; now that South Africa has taken no account

⁶ *Ibid.*, *Thirty-fourth Year*, 2087th meeting, para. 32.

⁷ *Ibid.*

⁸ *Ibid.*, para. 39.

⁹ *Ibid.*, *Thirty-third Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1978*, document S/12827.

¹⁰ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-ninth Session, Supplement No. 24 A*, para. 84. The Decree has been issued in final form in *Namibia Gazette No. 1*.

of the constructive efforts of African Governments, supported by the Western Powers; now that South Africa has clearly taken the risk of a bloody racial war, which is the only option now open to the oppressed people of Namibia to recover their fundamental rights; and now that South Africa, in acting thus, has responded to the concerns expressed by the Foreign Minister of the Federal Republic of Germany speaking on behalf of the nine States members of the European Economic Community at the 2087th meeting of the Security Council, we now are wondering with curiosity what the attitude of the Western Powers will be.

120. This shows the importance for these discussions of what the five Western Powers will have to say about current events.

121. More than the credibility of the United Nations, it is the credibility of the five Western Powers which this time is directly at issue.

122. In any case, the constant violations by the South African régime of the principle laid down in the United Nations Charter prompt my delegation to call on the General Assembly to question the legitimacy of the presence of the Government of South Africa within our Organization.

123. Unquestionably South Africa is continuing persistently to transgress those Charter principles. Consequently, the General Assembly has an obligation to invite the Security Council to look further into the question of the legitimacy of the presence of that State within our Organization.

124. This question, which was raised recently at the session of the Commission on Human Rights, deserves special attention from the General Assembly.

125. In any case, Senegal believes that the application of Article 41 would be the minimum step that would contribute to the isolation of the racist régime called for the day before yesterday by Mr. Sam Nujoma, the President of SWAPO [97th meeting].

126. The resumption of this session is taking place at a time when the United Nations is celebrating the International Year of Solidarity with the People of Namibia. Senegal hopes that, 13 years after the adoption of General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI), putting an end to South Africa's Mandate, our decisions will measure up to the hopes which the courageous people of Namibia place in us, the "peoples of the United Nations".

127. Mr. ABDEL MEGUID (Egypt) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The General Assembly is resuming its thirty-third session at a time when the cause of Namibia has reached one of its most critical stages as a result of the unsuccessful efforts which have been made so far to achieve just and authentic independence for the Namibian people and in view of the arrogant attitude adopted by the racist occupying authorities and their refusal to abide by United Nations resolutions and the will of the international community.

128. General Assembly resolution 33/182, adopted on 21 December 1978, in which it was decided to hold a resumed session, shows perspicacity and a just appreciation of the possible results of the situation in that region and the need to review the situation thoroughly and to decide on other decisive measures which might be taken against South Africa to force it to withdraw from Namibia, thus ensuring self-determination and true independence for the people of Namibia. The adoption of the resolution, which proclaimed 1979 as the International Year of Solidarity with the People of Namibia, constitutes another important step so as to alert world public opinion to the situation, to support the Namibian people, to isolate further the *apartheid* régime and to encourage the application of deterrent measures against that régime.

129. The recent developments of the situation have proved the validity of the fears we have repeatedly expressed. We were not exaggerating when we reaffirmed that the Government of South Africa was not being serious in its intention to withdraw from Namibia and accept just and free elections under United Nations control and supervision. Those who have followed the efforts made during the past two years to achieve a peaceful solution to the problem can realize how true that was. Everyone has been witness to the plots and intrigues perpetrated by the Pretoria Government during the negotiations, when SWAPO showed much flexibility and proved that, unlike the racist régime, it was really trying to achieve a genuine peaceful solution to enable the Namibian people to attain their legitimate national aspirations and to try to save the people of the region from suffering the misfortune of a bloody war. No alternative is acceptable, if that settlement were to fail.

130. Under the pressure of the international community and in the light of the escalated armed struggle under the guidance of SWAPO, the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people, South Africa was obliged to pretend to accept the plan of the five Western Powers, endorsed in Security Council resolution 431 (1978), followed by resolution 435 (1978), for achieving independence in that region.

131. The international community waited impatiently for the beginning of the implementation of that international plan, when the Government of South Africa declared its decision to organize internal elections, in contravention of Security Council resolutions 385 (1976), 431 (1978) and 435 (1978). Notwithstanding the adoption of resolutions by the Security Council, especially resolution 439 (1978), which stated that such elections and the results of those elections would be considered null and void, and although the Security Council warned South Africa that it should not take such measures or it would be subject to steps to be taken to implement Chapter VII of the Charter, the Pretoria Government nevertheless flouted those resolutions and organized the illegal elections which gave rise to the so-called Constituent Assembly. It tried to deceive the world, pretending that the internal elections did not mean that it abandoned the idea of elections under the control and supervision of the United Nations as stated in resolution 435 (1978). Yet South Africa placed more and more obstacles day after day in the way of the implementation of the United Nations plan and tried to place false inter-

pretations on the various points of the programme, especially regarding SWAPO bases both inside and outside the region and regarding the composition of the United Nations forces. This duplicity was rejected by the entire international community, including the five Western Powers.

132. To carry out its preconceived plan, South Africa has just declared that the Constituent Assembly will be transformed into a national assembly vested with all legislative and executive powers. Thus it would become a sort of interim government in Namibia. Before this the authorities of racist occupation arrested the SWAPO leaders in Namibia, within the context of their plan to impose a puppet régime on that country. Thus the danger to which we drew attention has emerged. We knew it would arise.

133. The Government of South Africa, while pretending to accept the plan of the five Western Powers, used the time to achieve its own goals. It was certainly not prepared to allow the organizing of free and fair elections, for it knew that SWAPO, to which the Namibian people is attached and which enjoys international support, would gain the upper hand if that were to take place.

134. We have placed the facts before the Western Powers. We have shown up the real intentions of the South African Government. We have pointed out the plots of the racist occupying forces. We have requested those Powers to heed the will of the international community by imposing economic sanctions on South Africa, to compel it to withdraw from Namibia and to abide by United Nations resolutions. The arguments adduced by the Western Powers were to the effect that a chance should be given to South Africa to show good faith, to respond to United Nations demands, before any sanctions were imposed.

135. However, the reasoning we followed in this forum and in the Security Council and in all international bodies was that the experience of these past years was enough proof of the real intentions of South Africa—ever since the United Nations resolution of 27 October 1966 ending the Mandate over the Territory and establishing United Nations responsibility for it, followed by the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of 21 June 1971, which stated that the South African presence in Namibia was illegal as a result of the rejection by the Pretoria Government of the numerous resolutions adopted by the United Nations. Now the Pretoria Government has stepped up its domination over the region by perpetrating all sorts of cruel oppression against the people of Namibia, by brutally attacking neighbouring African countries and by bombing refugee camps and SWAPO bases in an inhuman and merciless way. That happened, for example, during the Kassinga massacre a year ago where more than 1,000 casualties were caused among those innocent refugees.

136. Now that South Africa has revealed its true intentions and hampered the implementation of the United Nations plan, now that all efforts made by the five Western Powers, the most recent being the talks undertaken in New York on 19 and 20 March 1979 to try and convince the Government of Pretoria to implement that plan have stumbled, we should not hesitate in taking a staunch decision to force that régime to respect the will of the

international community, so that no silence on the part of the United Nations can be interpreted as recognition of a fait accompli that that régime wants to impose on the region, or as an inability to confront such a problem.

137. The General Assembly must now shoulder full responsibility, in accordance with the historic resolution 2145 (XXI), of 1966, which put an end to the Mandate of South Africa over the Territory and which transferred responsibility for it to the United Nations until independence in Namibia could be attained.

138. In view of that responsibility, the international community, at this historic moment in the struggle for Namibian independence, expects the General Assembly at its resumed session to agree on the adoption of decisive measures to counter that racist colonial plan. The people of Namibia have suffered for over a century under this imperial power and their sufferings have been increased because of the inhuman policy of *apartheid* and the system of bantustanization applied by the racist occupying authorities. But those people have never stopped struggling for their rights to self-determination, freedom and national independence, despite all forms of injustice and oppression to which they have been exposed and despite the maltreatment of their leaders, who have been arrested. There is still proof that the Government of Pretoria wishes to execute its plan in the region. It wants to step up its military potential and to increase its military presence in Namibia. It is preparing for an armed struggle against the national resistance led by SWAPO, to destroy that resistance and to eliminate SWAPO. It would have a free hand to set up its puppet régime, the régime the Government of Pretoria has been trying to establish in the Territory. And they feel encouraged in this because they have the constant assistance of the Western Powers which are against the application of any economic sanctions. South Africa has been encouraged by the events that have occurred in Southern Rhodesia, by the success of Ian Smith and his plots for imposing an illegal régime on that country despite the will of the international community and United Nations resolutions, as well as by the efforts being made by certain circles in the United Kingdom and the United States of America which sympathize with the racist régimes of southern Africa at the expense of the legitimate rights of the black majority.

139. The situation can brook no further delay. The United Nations must meet the responsibilities incumbent upon it. The General Assembly now has no alternative if it is to avoid a catastrophe in Namibia that is bound to occur if the occupation by South Africa is perpetuated and if an internal settlement is imposed. Such a catastrophe would give rise to civil war and that would in turn threaten international peace and security. Therefore the General Assembly must adopt decisive measures that would be approved by the Security Council to apply the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter against South Africa. It should be clear to the great Western Powers, especially the permanent members of the Security Council, that it is no longer logical for them to ally themselves with those régimes, since it is counter to the will of the international community. The time has come to compel that régime to abide by United Nations resolutions. There is cogent proof of a lack of serious intent on the part of the Government of

South Africa to accept a peaceful solution, given the manoeuvres undertaken by that régime during the negotiations which were initiated by the great Powers and which produced no positive results because of the arrogant, opinionated attitude of the Government of Pretoria.

140. The entire international community must denounce the internal settlement being imposed upon Namibia, in the same way as it must denounce the one being imposed upon Southern Rhodesia. We must refuse to recognize any illegal régimes South Africa would try to impose upon the Territory. We should reaffirm the role of the United Nations Council for Namibia. That is the body in which power is vested. It has responsibility for the territory of Namibia until independence. All political detainees—the leaders of SWAPO—should be released. In view of the serious developments now happening in the region, all member countries, international organizations and specialized agencies must increase their military and material aid to the Namibian people through their sole and legitimate representative SWAPO, so that that people can continue their struggle for the liberation of their territory, so that they can accede to national independence in a united Namibia.

141. The position of Egypt vis-à-vis the heroic Namibian struggle under the leadership of SWAPO is known to all, and there is no need for me to repeat it here. I merely wish, in this respect, to refer to the statement made by a

responsible member of the Foreign Ministry of Egypt on 17 May 1979, who indicated that the Arab Republic of Egypt had received with great concern the news concerning the decision taken by the racist Government of South Africa to establish an interim government in Namibia and to transform the Constituent Assembly of Windhoek into a National Assembly with legislative powers.

142. Such decisions taken by the racist régime of Pretoria are considered to be in flagrant defiance of the resolutions of the United Nations and of the will of the international community and constitute a challenge to Africa, which has continuously condemned that flagrant aggression on the part of the racist régime in South Africa which is contrary to all international criteria, values and principles.

143. The Arab Republic of Egypt proclaims its staunch opposition to these racist plans, which tend to consecrate illegal racist sovereignty over African land. All international and African resolutions affirm the rights of the struggling people of Namibia, under the leadership of SWAPO, for freedom, independence and self-determination.

144. The Arab Republic of Egypt reiterates its affirmation that the United Nations must play a more active role to put an end to all this defiance on the part of the Government of Pretoria.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.