



CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 36:	
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 ...	1093

President: Mr. Ismat T. KITTANI (Iraq).

In the absence of the President, Mr. Kamil (Indonesia), Vice-President, took the Chair.

AGENDA ITEM 36

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. A. A. AL-ANSARI (Bahrain) (*interpretation from Arabic*): For me, speaking on the question of Namibia is rather like speaking on the Zionist occupation of Arab territories, for there are several points of similarity between the question of Namibia and that of Palestine.

2. In Namibia, the Pretoria régime commits crimes in disregard of all humanitarian and moral values, strives to divide that country up into several parts and, through such dismemberment, install racist and tribal régimes. In this way it bases its policy on internecine war among the nationalities in Namibia. The racists have tried to impose the so-called internal settlement, which seeks to transfer legal authority to a class which in no way represents the real people of Namibia or its aspirations. Thus, it defies the will of the international community, which considers the South West Africa People's Organization [SWAPO] to be the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people.

3. In the same way the practices of the Zionist authorities in the occupied Arab territories, which take the form of acts of aggression against the values and the traditions of the Palestinian people, oppression, spoliation and attempts at liquidation mean that, in the final analysis, the Palestinian people is suffering the same fate as the Namibian people.

4. The behaviour of the régimes of Pretoria and Tel Aviv is based on racism. They employ the same methods: the liquidation of a people and the violation of its rights by military force, counting on the support they receive from some Western countries whether in the form of military or economic aid or moral support.

5. Quite recently, the two régimes, that of Israel and that of South Africa, have committed flagrant acts of aggression against neighbouring countries. As the South African forces were invading Angola, Israeli aircraft were attacking densely inhabited areas of Beirut. Both régimes stated that they were exercising their right to self-defence.

6. The question of Namibia has become very important on the international scene, especially since the failure of the pre-implementation meeting held at Geneva from 7 to 14 January 1981, within the framework of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which outlines a clear and precise plan for the independence of Namibia.

7. The international community has finally come to realize that the South African régime does not understand the language of dialogue, but only that of force. The reasons for the failure of the negotiations at Geneva were the following. First, the Pretoria régime has steadfastly refused to place Namibia under United Nations trusteeship. As long ago as 1966 the General Assembly adopted a resolution placing Namibia under its direct supervision [*resolution 2145 (XXI)*]. Secondly, there is the lack of co-operation by Western countries that have close relations with South Africa in seeking a solution of the Namibian question, since those countries have vetoed several resolutions in the Security Council aimed at imposing mandatory sanctions on South Africa. Thirdly, there is the continuing support given by some Western countries to the racist régime of South Africa for strategic reasons.

8. Resolution 435 (1978) sets out the minimum requirements for establishing a solid foundation for the solution of the problem of Namibia and to put an end to the tragedy of its people. This question will not be resolved until South Africa withdraws from Namibian territory and there is a transfer of power to its indigenous population.

9. My country hopes that the international efforts already undertaken will be pursued on the basis of a global settlement plan in accordance with Security Council resolutions, in particular resolution 435 (1978), so that a just and comprehensive solution to the Namibian problem may be achieved.

10. Mr. AL-QASIMI (United Arab Emirates) (*interpretation from Arabic*): More than two months ago the General Assembly held its eighth emergency special session, to consider the question of Namibia. A number of circumstances made it necessary for that session to be held, including the failure of the Security Council to take the necessary decisions because of the use of the veto. Another reason was the arrogant attitude of the Pretoria régime and its refusal to apply the resolutions of the United Nations concerning the independence of Namibia and the exercise by its people of their inalienable rights, in particular its right to self-determination.

11. At that time the General Assembly adopted resolution ES-8/2, which reflected the position of the international community on the bases for a settlement of this

problem and the steps which should be taken by the various parties, including the Government of Pretoria, in order to arrive at such a settlement. Two months have elapsed since that resolution was adopted and no tangible progress has been achieved towards settlement of the Namibian problem. This is why the Assembly has to discuss the question of Namibia in the light of the present situation and to make appropriate recommendations. The responsibility of the Assembly flows from the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of 21 June 1971,¹ in paragraph 117 of which that body declared officially:

"A binding determination made by a competent organ of the United Nations to the effect that a situation is illegal cannot remain without consequence. Once the Court is faced with such a situation, it would be failing in the discharge of its judicial functions if it did not declare that there is an obligation, especially upon Members of the United Nations, to bring that situation to an end."*

12. In the light of its activities in connection with decolonization, and since it is the most highly placed, representative and democratic body in the United Nations, it is natural that the General Assembly should assume this historic responsibility and free Namibia from the colonialism which we all abhor.

13. A number of years have passed since that advisory opinion was handed down by the International Court of Justice, following which many efforts have been made in the United Nations and outside to arrive at a settlement of the problem. By way of example I might refer to Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which established very judicious and reasonable foundations for guaranteeing the independence of the Territory, and to the Geneva meeting held in January of this year, in which the various parties to the dispute participated.

14. All these efforts and attempts were doomed to failure because of the stubborn position taken by the Government of South Africa, which refused to recognize the rights of the overwhelming majority of the citizens of Namibia. The racist régime of South Africa could certainly not have adopted their arrogant attitude, which flouts the will of the international community, if it had not been able to rely on the military, economic and political support and assistance given to it, which has enabled it to preserve its economic interests and to continue to trample underfoot the humanitarian principles and norms of international law which prevent continuing its aggression.

15. In order to put an end to the present situation in southern Africa, it is necessary to ensure immediately the independence of Namibia. The only way the United Nations can help to bring about this noble goal is by taking collective measures to force the Government of South Africa to implement the United Nations plan endorsed in resolution 435 (1978), without alteration or amendment of any kind.

16. That is why the General Assembly should do everything possible to put an end to any contacts with the Government of South Africa to ensure that it is isolated politically, militarily, economically, culturally and as regards sport. The isolation of the Government of South Africa

will ensure its eventual submission to the resolutions of the United Nations.

17. My country, my Government and my people support and will continue to support SWAPO as the sole legitimate representative of the Namibian people. We salute the people of Namibia for the struggle they are carrying on under the leadership of SWAPO. We shall continue to support the cause of Namibia for we are convinced that it will never enjoy complete freedom and security until foreign occupation and oppression are eliminated completely from southern Africa and all other parts of the world. We shall therefore support any resolutions adopted by the General Assembly with a view to the attainment of this noble objective.

18. Mr. KOSTOV (Bulgaria) (*interpretation from French*): The people of Namibia, under the leadership of its sole authentic representative, SWAPO, for years now has been carrying on a just struggle for freedom and independence. That is an integral part of the struggle of the peoples of southern Africa against racism, colonialism and *apartheid*, which is supported by all progressive forces in the world. That struggle is being carried on in conditions in which the Pretoria racist régime is intensifying repression and continuing to enjoy the assistance of the forces of imperialism. That is why the problem of Namibia falls within the framework of the antagonism that exists between the forces of neo-colonialism and the anti-colonialist forces in the world.

19. The right of the people of Namibia to self-determination and independence, and its right to struggle against colonialism in order to achieve that objective has been confirmed in many resolutions of the United Nations, including that of the eighth emergency special session of the General Assembly, on Namibia, held from 3 to 14 September of this year. Despite those efforts by the international community, the racist Pretoria régime persists in its insolent refusal to abide by the will of the peoples. There is ample proof of the tragic consequences for the Namibian people of that illegal occupation.

20. The inhuman system of *apartheid* established in Namibia by Pretoria serves as a means for safeguarding the interests of the white exploiter minority and the continued plunder of the natural resources of the country. The Western transnational corporations take part in that plunder on an equal footing with South African corporations, in disregard of the many relevant resolutions of the United Nations and Decree No. 1 for the protection of the natural resources of Namibia, promulgated on 27 September 1974 by the United Nations Council for Namibia.²

21. Certainly such a system can be safeguarded only by means of coercive and repressive measures. There is at present in Namibia a strong occupation force of some 100,000 men who wage a real war against the people. At the same time the escalation of Pretoria's acts of aggression against neighbouring States has reached an extremely dangerous level following the aggression against and continued occupation of parts of Angolan territory.

22. The imperialists see South Africa and occupied Namibia as a forward post in the struggle against liberation movements and independent African States. The existing situation is correctly described in many United Nations resolutions as one of collusion between the United States and other Western countries on the one hand and Pretoria on the other. The delegation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria fully agrees with that assessment. This

* Quoted in English by the speaker.

year alone the United States has twice resorted to its right of veto to prevent the condemnation of South Africa by the Security Council for its acts of aggression against the People's Republic of Angola and to prevent the application of sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations. At the same time, the flow of oil to the *apartheid* régime continues unhindered. Military and nuclear co-operation between the countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization [NATO] and the racists continues also in disregard of the embargo imposed by the Security Council in its resolution 418 (1977). That co-operation has enabled South Africa to become one of the most militarily developed countries in Africa, with nuclear potential. The support given by the West to the racists enables them to intensify and strengthen their military presence in Namibia and their military and political domination of its people.

23. The attempts to destabilize the Governments of the front-line States have not ceased. In that connection, Pretoria acts in concert with certain Western countries on the basis of their common interests. The fact that at a time when aggression against Angola was well under way attempts were being made in the United States Congress to repeal the Clark amendment—which would have enabled assistance to be given to Angolan counter-revolutionary groups—is a clear example of that. At the same time the delegation of the United States in the Security Council blocked adoption of a draft resolution condemning that aggression. And, to complete the picture, we should mention the contrast we find between the warm attitude of the United States Administration towards the Pretoria racists and the fact that SWAPO, which is recognized by the United Nations as the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people, is described as a "terrorist" organization.

24. Many years have passed since the Security Council adopted the United Nations plan aimed at a solution of the Namibian problem, which is approved in its resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978). While adopting a position of obstruction and procrastination, Pretoria has created puppets and organized illegal elections intended to provide a neo-colonialist solution to the problem, changing the form without changing the content of the situation obtaining in Namibia.

25. In January of this year the racists openly defied world public opinion by causing the failure of the Geneva meeting. Once again, it was the Western countries permanent members of the Security Council which saved them from the adoption by the Security Council of enforcement measures under Chapter VII of the Charter. We seriously doubt that in so doing those countries were moved by their desire to assist the Namibian people and to contribute to a solution of the question in its interests. On the other hand, co-operation between Washington and Pretoria in many areas continues to increase.

26. The United Nations has stressed several times that South Africa's policy constitutes a direct threat to international peace and security. The nuclear potential of the *apartheid* régime only increases the already extreme seriousness of that threat. In that context, it is even more curious that the so-called contact group continues to try to change the United Nations plan instead of trying to ensure its strict and rapid implementation.

27. This year the United Nations Council for Namibia, as the legal Administrating Authority for Namibia, has worked actively for the denunciation of the policy of

South Africa and its allies, for the granting of assistance to SWAPO and for the co-ordination of United Nations activities on that question. Many documents have been prepared and have served as a basis for resolutions adopted by the General Assembly. The series of extraordinary plenary meetings of the Council held from 2 to 5 June 1981 in Panama, which led to the adoption of the Panama Declaration and Programme of Action on Namibia [A/36/24, para. 222], were of great importance. Those two documents contain a precise evaluation of the situation in Namibia and point the way towards a solution of the problem.

28. The delegation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria fully supports the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia and the conclusions and recommendations contained therein [see A/36/24]. My country, which is an active member of the Council, considers that the United Nations plan continues, without any modification, qualification or prevarication, to serve as a basis for the comprehensive settlement of the question. We believe that the United Nations has assumed, and will continue to assume, responsibility for the people of Namibia until its accession to complete and legitimate independence. Any attempt to settle that problem outside the framework of the world Organization is contrary to the interests of the Namibian people and its right to self-determination and independence. My delegation wishes to reaffirm its firm position in favour of the immediate cessation of the illegal occupation and the withdrawal of South Africa's administration from Namibia, including Walvis Bay and the offshore islands, as well as the immediate transfer of power to the sole and authentic representative of its people, SWAPO. We unreservedly support the armed struggle of Namibia.

29. In the view of the Bulgarian delegation, the surest way to force the racists to abide by United Nations resolutions is to impose comprehensive economic sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter. Guided by that position of principle, my Government and the people of the People's Republic of Bulgaria will continue to lend their assistance in many ways to the struggling people of Namibia until complete victory.

30. Mr. KLESTIL (Austria): Only a few weeks ago, at the 4th meeting of the eighth special emergency session, devoted to the question of Namibia, I had the opportunity to present in detail Austria's position on this issue, which is now again the subject of a debate. This position has remained unchanged over the years during which the United Nations has been devoting increased attention to the issue, and there is no reason to repeat it today. Suffice it to say that Austria has consistently associated itself with the United Nations plan for Namibia's peaceful and negotiated transition to independence as the most promising way of ending South Africa's illegal occupation of the Territory and fulfilling the inherent right of the Namibian people to self-determination, independence and the free and unrestricted exercise of their political will.

31. In the view of the Austrian Government, any political settlement aimed at stability and durability has to rest on the broadest possible basis comprising all the parties engaged in the problem. The United Nations plan, originally put forward by the five Western Powers and subsequently endorsed by the Security Council in resolution 435 (1978), meets these basic requirements. It provides for true self-determination on the basis of democratic and internationally supervised elections and constitutes the only feasible way for the United Nations to discharge its

special responsibility for that Territory and to arrive at a genuine and peaceful transfer of power to the Namibian people.

32. Three years of intense and painstaking negotiations have resulted in a wide area of agreement on the transition plan itself, the establishment of a demilitarized zone and other aspects of its implementation. During the past year, especially after the failure of the pre-implementation meeting in Geneva and the ensuing discussion in the Security Council,³ it seemed, however, as if the negotiations over the remaining open issues of the plan had reached a stalemate which would be difficult to overcome. Austria is gratified to note that, through a new impetus to the negotiating efforts of the Western contact group and the introduction of new additional proposals, it has been possible to overcome this impasse and that the co-operative and wise attitude of all the Governments involved and of the leadership of SWAPO have brought us a step closer to a successful conclusion of these negotiations.

33. As I have said, resolution 435 (1978) is, and must continue to be, the basis and the established guideline for Namibia's transition to independence. It is, however, a declaration of principle, and, in its implementation we must allow for the necessary leeway and flexibility in accommodating new additional proposals if they are designed to promote the cause of independence for Namibia and meet with the approval of the parties most directly concerned. When one looks at the most recent developments and tries to assess them, there is, above all, one factor which has to be borne in mind, that is, whether they will truly benefit the Namibian people, who have been deprived of their most basic national rights for over 60 years.

34. On that basis, Austria would have appreciated a postponement of the present debate until a date when a clearer and more correct in-depth assessment of these recent developments had been possible. We would now appreciate it if the General Assembly did not take any decision which might have harmful effects on the delicate construction of an agreement and might unnecessarily embitter the climate in which negotiations take place.

35. Before concluding, I should like to take this opportunity to express our appreciation and gratitude to the five Western Powers and to the Secretary-General, his Special Representative and his advisers for their unswerving efforts to implement the plan, as well as to SWAPO and the Governments of the front-line States, which, in a spirit of co-operation and understanding, have participated in and advanced this endeavour. Special appreciation is also due to the United Nations Council for Namibia, which, under the experienced and wise guidance of Mr. Lusaka, represents the interests of the Namibian people with skill and devotion and promotes their cause in world public opinion.

36. Mrs. SAELTHUN (Norway): The Norwegian Government has consistently shared the view that only a political solution can bring about Namibia's independence and thus create the necessary peace and stability in the region of southern Africa. This is important not only for the people of Namibia but also for the future economic and social development of all the new States in the area.

37. We have therefore supported the initiative of the Western contact group which led to the adoption of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) as the best way to achieve a settlement.

38. Since the failure of the meeting at Geneva in January to reach agreement on the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), the situation in and around Namibia has deteriorated. South Africa has tried to strengthen its hold on the Territory and the South African Government has continued its intervention and attacks on neighbouring States, in particular Angola. The Norwegian Government, together with the overwhelming majority of the Member States of the United Nations, has strongly condemned these acts of aggression.

39. This development has taken a heavy toll of the civilian population in the area. Humanitarian assistance is therefore one area in which the international community can make a concrete contribution to alleviating the suffering of the people concerned. The Norwegian Government, for its part, is involved in a number of United Nations and bilateral programmes designed to meet the needs of the refugees. For the work among refugees from Namibia specifically, the Government has granted 21 million Norwegian kroner—approximately \$3.5 million—for the present year. We intend to continue and to strengthen these efforts.

40. The escalation of the warfare in southern Africa underlines, in our opinion, the urgent need for a political solution. The Norwegian Government therefore welcomed the announcement that the Western contact group would make a new effort to see if it was still possible to find common ground for the implementation of the United Nations plan. We understand that the delegation from the contact group which recently visited the capitals in the area presented some proposals and suggestions on how resolution 435 (1978) could be supported and supplemented. These proposals, if they proved acceptable to the parties concerned, would also serve as important confidence-building measures for the next phases of the on-going consultations.

41. The Norwegian Government feels that this renewed effort should be given encouragement and support by the United Nations. We see no other viable alternative if we still want to see the United Nations plan implemented.

42. In conclusion, the Norwegian delegation would like to express its admiration for the Secretary-General and his staff, in particular the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia, for their untiring efforts to identify and solve the remaining problems concerning the United Nations plan. We would also like to pay tribute to the front-line States and SWAPO for their constructive attitude throughout this long and difficult negotiating process. We share their hope that the people of Namibia will soon be able to enjoy their freedom and independence.

43. Mr. MARINESCU (Romania) (*interpretation from French*): This is the third time in the space of only nine months that the question of Namibia has been taken up by the General Assembly. This is unprecedented. It reveals the exceptional seriousness of the topic we are now discussing, the increasingly tense and explosive situation in southern Africa, which quite properly is a matter of concern to Member States. Such a situation tests not only the ability of the Organization to act in order to implement its own unanimously accepted decisions, but also its capacity to intervene promptly and efficiently when international peace, stability and security are threatened.

44. Obviously, what we need to do is to take a responsible look at all the aspects of the situation and to adopt measures without delay which will make it possible for

the Organization to discharge its obligations to the people of Namibia, in order to ensure the immediate accession of Namibia to independence and to protect the peoples of southern Africa and other peoples from the incalculable consequences of the policy of *apartheid* and aggression which is being pursued by South Africa.

45. The need for a political settlement of the question of Namibia is a matter of general consensus among the States Members of the Organization. The General Assembly has frequently had occasion to denounce and condemn the continued occupation of Namibia and to request the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of South Africa's armed forces and administration from this Territory in order that the people of Namibia may freely exercise its right to choose for itself its course of social and economic development in a free, undivided and independent homeland.

46. The will of Member States was reflected in the full support given to Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which approved a plan on the accession to independence by Namibia through the organization of free and democratic elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations, and the efforts which have been made to give effect to that resolution. South Africa continues to defy those efforts. Throughout the three years of negotiations aimed at ensuring the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), South Africa has continued to put obstacles in the way of the accession by Namibia to genuine independence. It has become quite clear that for South Africa these negotiations are simply an excuse in order to gain time to further its destabilizing activities in the region, to serve its expansionist designs and its intention to maintain its domination over Namibia, and to impose a neo-colonialist type of solution on that country.

47. The repeated and overt attempts of South Africa to block the efforts of the United Nations to bring about the independence of Namibia not only prove the lack of good faith of the South African racist régime in the negotiations, but also reveal the true objectives which are being pursued by the Pretoria authorities in southern Africa.

48. The policy of cynical defiance of the most elementary norms of international law has also taken the form of numerous acts of aggression committed by the Pretoria racists against neighbouring African countries; these acts, which have recently taken the form of large-scale aggressive military operations against Angola, thus seriously threatening international peace and security, have been vehemently condemned by the Romanian Government and people and by the overwhelming majority of Member States. The fact that the Security Council has been unable to take the necessary steps to deal with these premeditated acts of aggression by South Africa against Angola has aroused general disappointment and disapproval.

49. These actions of the South African racist régime could not fail to cause legitimate concern among the international community. They justify increasingly resolute demands by Member States that the Organization proceed to adopt the measures provided for in the Charter to restore international legality and to induce South Africa to abide by the resolutions of the United Nations and evacuate the Territory of Namibia.

50. The continuing illegal occupation of Namibia, the intensification of repression of Namibian patriots, the militarization of the Territory and its use as a base for aggressive acts by the South African racists against neigh-

bouring African countries, the gross violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Angola and by other front-line States, the disregard for the norms of international law, have all created an extremely dangerous situation in southern Africa, which threatens international peace and security. Such actions, undertaken when efforts are being made under the aegis of the United Nations to achieve an agreement which will make it possible fully to implement the United Nations plan for the granting of independence to Namibia, reveal the hypocrisy and duplicity of the leaders in Pretoria, who bear a heavy responsibility for the situation that has been created and for its detrimental consequences for international peace and security. This makes clear the responsibility of those who, directly or indirectly, have made it possible for South Africa easily to pursue this dangerous course.

51. We believe that, even more than in the past, the interests of the peace and security of the whole world require the adoption of firm measures by the United Nations and all Member States resolutely and swiftly to implement the resolutions of the Organization aimed at ending the illegal occupation of Namibia and ensuring the realization of the rights of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence.

52. As we are deeply wedded to the cause of peace and international security and to the cause of national liberation, Romania is particularly concerned about South Africa's attempts to prevent the Namibian people from exercising their inalienable right to a free and sovereign existence and to prevent Namibia's accession to independence.

53. The position of my country, which has always supported the heroic national liberation struggle waged by the Namibian people, under the leadership of SWAPO, as well as the efforts of the United Nations to discharge the special responsibilities it has directly assumed *vis-à-vis* Namibia, has often been reaffirmed in the General Assembly during its regular and emergency special sessions, as well as in the Security Council. This position has been described in detail during the contacts that Romania has had with States in various parts of the world, with a view to mobilizing Namibia's accession to independence.

54. The Romanian delegation has repeatedly reaffirmed the militant solidarity of Romania and its people with the just struggle of the Namibian people, under the leadership of SWAPO, to end the occupation of Namibia and fulfil their aspirations to freedom and progress, their right to choose for themselves the way in which they will achieve economic development, with complete independence and sovereignty.

55. We have vigorously condemned the continued occupation of Namibia, the obstructionist position of the Pretoria authorities aimed at sabotaging the United Nations plan for granting independence to Namibia, the manoeuvres intended to perpetuate the most retrograde forms of colonial domination and *apartheid* on the African continent, and the acts of aggression carried out by the South African racists against Angola and other independent African States, and we have vigorously demanded that steps be taken to restore international legality.

56. As we also emphasized during the 4th meeting of the eighth emergency special session of the General Assembly, devoted to Namibia, the Romanian delegation considers that resolute action should be taken to put an end to South Africa's opposition and the obstacles that it

has put in the way of Namibia's accession to independence. No effort should be spared to begin as soon as possible the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), to eliminate the causes of grave danger to the peace and security of the African continent and the whole world.

57. While encouraging and promoting a peaceful settlement of the Namibian problem, we cannot fail to draw attention to the rigid and odious policies of the Pretoria authorities, their manoeuvres to delay the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), their illegal activities in Namibia designed to perpetuate South Africa's domination, activities which have even been stepped up despite the continuing process of a peaceful settlement of the Namibian problem. We have always believed, and we continue to believe, that the Namibian people are entitled to use all political, diplomatic and other means—including armed struggle—to end foreign domination and fulfil their aspirations to freedom, independence and progress.

58. Romania believes that, as was emphasized in the message sent by President Nicolae Ceausescu to the President of SWAPO on 25 August this year, on the fifteenth anniversary of Namibia Day:

“ . . . there is an imperative need to speed up, as well as to intensify, the struggle of the Namibian people and to strengthen the efforts of all the democratic and anti-imperialist forces and international public opinion to put an end as soon as possible to South Africa's domination and to ensure Namibia's accession to national independence”.

That being so, we believe that it is the duty of the General Assembly and the Security Council to heed the demands of the international community and to take energetic steps, by resorting to the provisions of the Charter, to remove the obstacles preventing the Namibian people from exercising their rights to a free and sovereign existence.

59. We believe that the present session should focus on intensifying the support given by the United Nations to the just struggle of the Namibian people.

60. The Romanian people, who have for centuries been waging a struggle full of sacrifices for their national and social liberation, have from the outset shown militant solidarity with and given their full support to the political, diplomatic and armed struggle being waged by the people of Namibia, under the leadership of SWAPO, to win their undeniable right to a free and dignified life. Socialist Romania and the Romanian people will continue to support as far as they can the struggle of the Namibian people to throw off the yoke of foreign domination and achieve their aspirations to freedom, independence and progress, in the firm conviction that that struggle will soon be crowned with success.

61. Romania is firmly resolved to continue in the future to act in close collaboration with the African countries, other non-aligned and developing countries, and all States wedded to the noble aims of the Charter, to ensure that the Namibian people can realize without delay their right to a free, united and sovereign country, so that Namibia may as soon as possible take the place that belongs to it among the free nations of the world, among the Member States of the United Nations, and make its own contribution to the efforts of the international community to further peace and détente and to build a better and fairer world.

62. Mr. LOZINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): Fifteen years have elapsed since the General Assembly adopted the resolution which deprived the racist régime of Pretoria of its Mandate over Namibia. Three years ago the Security Council adopted resolution 435 (1978), confirming the United Nations plan for a settlement of the Namibian problem. Only two months ago the eighth emergency special session of the General Assembly devoted to the question of Namibia was held.

63. However, there have been no real signs of any progress towards guaranteeing the Namibian people their inalienable right to self-determination and independence. On the contrary, the situation in southern Africa continues to be exacerbated. The South African racists are stubbornly continuing their attempts to maintain domination over Namibia, which they have illegally occupied, and are expanding their aggressive actions against independent African States.

64. In those actions the racist régime of Pretoria is relying on the full sympathy and direct support of the United States and a number of other member States of NATO.

65. In that connection, we should like to dwell on the reasons for South Africa's reluctance to leave Namibia and the motives which have prompted leading Western Powers to condone the illegal occupation of that Territory and thus assist the racist régime of Pretoria. The essence of the matter, as has been frequently repeated from United Nations rostrums, is the interrelationship of the strategic, political and economic interests of the most aggressive militarist circles in the West, powerful transnational corporations and the South African racists and their common desire to continue to utilize Namibia as a beach-head against neighbouring African States, in order to strengthen the anti-human system of *apartheid* and to plunder the richest mineral resources of Namibia.

66. As the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia indicates, there are 88 transnational corporations operating in the Territory. Thirty-five of them are based in South Africa and 53 are based in countries of the so-called Western contact group—25 in the United Kingdom, 15 in the United States, eight in the Federal Republic of Germany, three in France and two in Canada.

67. The Pretoria régime establishes for foreign mining companies operating in Namibia even lower taxation rates than those established in South Africa itself. It allows them to write off capital expenses from their current gross profits and to carry out unlimited surveying of the minerals, and it does not require those minerals to be processed on the spot. Because of the possibility of earning these immense profits as a result of the unbridled exploitation of the indigenous population and because of the over-exploitation of minerals, foreign economic circles are supporting the Pretoria régime's illegal occupation of Namibia both politically and financially.

68. In the Declaration of the Conference in Solidarity with the Liberation Struggles of the Peoples of Southern Africa, which was held in New York from 9 to 11 October this year, attention was drawn to the further expansion of economic co-operation between the United States and the Pretoria régime. The Declaration states:

“The growth of this highly exploitive economic system has been vitally aided by the impouring of foreign capital, particularly dollars from the United States. In

1960, the United States share in all foreign investments in South Africa was 11 per cent. Today, it is over 20 per cent. The total of all dollars in direct investment or loans in *apartheid* today exceeds \$6 billion.

“The United States has passed Great Britain and West Germany to become South Africa’s most important trading partner, selling some \$2.4 billion in machinery, chemicals, industrial and military technology, etc., to South Africa in 1980 and buying over \$3.3 billion from them.”

69. The United Nations Council for Namibia has emphasized in its report that:

“... the illegal régime of South Africa continued its military build-up by intensifying its production and importation of arms and military equipment, by expanding and increasing its military bases and installations throughout Namibia, and by recruiting and deploying local armed forces as well as mercenaries from Western and other countries. This massive build-up of the South African military machine and repressive apparatus, together with the acquisition of a nuclear weapons capability designed to suppress resistance by the oppressed people and terrorize neighbouring African States, poses a grave menace to humanity”. [See A/36/24, para. 535.]

70. In order to maintain its illegal occupation of Namibia, South Africa continues to rely mainly on foreign sources of supply of military equipment and techniques. On the other hand, the main purpose of the strategic policies lying behind the investments of South Africa is to achieve self-sufficiency in weapons production.

71. The assistance of Western Powers has made it possible, according to the United Nations Secretariat, for South Africa to produce 70 to 90 per cent of its military equipment. Many firms in the United States and other Western countries have created local affiliates in South Africa, and the arms embargo is not applied to them.

72. Particular concern has been caused to the international community by the co-operation which, as the United Nations Council for Namibia has shown, is being carried out by the United States with the *apartheid* régime and also by the United Kingdom, France and the Federal Republic of Germany, as well as by Belgium, Israel, Japan, the Netherlands and Switzerland. Such co-operation includes assistance in mining, uranium enrichment, the supply of nuclear equipment, the transfer of technology and training and exchange of scientists.

73. One of the recent links in this chain of co-operation was the visit to South Africa in October of this year of a group of four American specialists representing the Government of the United States, in order to hold talks on the supply of nuclear fuel.

74. By relying on the assistance and support of the Western Powers, the racists in Pretoria have quite recently taken further steps to expand their military presence in Namibia. According to available data, there are more than 100,000 South African soldiers and officers in Namibia. That amounts to 10 per cent of the population of the Territory. These forces are being used in order to create an atmosphere of terror and fear in that illegally occupied Territory of Namibia, to impose on its people a so-called internal settlement in order to perpetuate the anti-human system of *apartheid* and South Africa’s domination over

that Territory, to wage a wide-scale undeclared war against neighbouring African States, and to create a military and political buffer zone between South Africa and independent Africa.

75. The crowning point of United States political and diplomatic co-operation and complicity between the United States and other members of the so-called contact group of the Western countries in connection with the Pretoria racist régime’s illegal occupation of Namibia was the threefold veto of the United States, the United Kingdom and France, which, in April of this year, helped to protect the South African racists from the comprehensive mandatory sanctions that had once again been demanded by the international community, last January, after Pretoria had broken off the Geneva talks on Namibia. That was followed by the United States veto that prevented the Security Council from adopting a resolution which would have condemned South Africa for its aggression against Angola. The continuing and expanding co-operation of the United States and certain other Western States with the Pretoria régime is the root cause of the fact that the problem of Namibia has remained for many years now one of the most acute unsolved international problems. The alarm and indignation at that co-operation expressed by a number of States, particularly African States, are reflected in the resolution on Namibia adopted at the thirty-seventh ordinary session of the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity, held at Nairobi from 15 to 26 June of this year. That resolution condemned the overt or covert collusion of certain Western countries, in particular the United States of America, with the South African racists, which has obstructed the efforts of the international community to compel the Pretoria régime to vacate Namibia. The resolution denounced “the emerging unholy alliance between Pretoria and Washington characterized by baseless hostility against Angola and their collusion to intensify acts of destabilization in that country as well as to misrepresent the nature of the colonial conflict in Namibia as one of the global strategic considerations” [A/36/534, annex I, CM/Res. 853 (XXXVII), para. 12]. The Council of Ministers expressed “its profound dismay as regards the demonstrated unwillingness by certain members of the contact group to carry on with the implementation process, which it has itself initiated, and to exert the necessary pressure on the racist Pretoria régime to force it to comply with Security Council resolutions 435 and 439” [*ibid.*, para. 10]. It also rejected “the latest sinister schemes by certain members of the Western contact group, in particular the United States of America, aimed at forcing the international community to abandon Security Council resolution 435 endorsing the United Nations Plan for the Independence of Namibia, and depriving the oppressed Namibian people of their hard-won victories in the struggle for national liberation” [*ibid.*, para. 9].

76. The Soviet delegation subscribes to the just criticisms that have been made of the policies of the Western Powers with regard to the Namibian issue by both African and other States which favour the liberation of the Namibian people and the cessation of the illegal occupation of Namibia by the racist régime of Pretoria, which has frequently been described by the United Nations as a serious threat to international peace and security. In this connection we attach great significance to the statements made this morning [64th meeting] by the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, Mr. Paul Lusaka of Zambia, and by the Chairman of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration of the Granting of Independence to Colonial

Countries and Peoples, Mr. Frank Abdulah of Trinidad and Tobago. The hopes and aspirations of the heroic people of Namibia, who are struggling for their freedom and independence, were very clearly reflected in the statement made by the head of the delegation of SWAPO, Mr. Peter Mueshange [*ibid.*].

77. The Soviet delegation would also like to take this opportunity to pay a tribute to the valiant Namibian people who, despite victimization and privations, through their determined struggle to protect their inalienable rights have rebuffed the mighty military machine of the South African racists. In this connection we should also point to the important role played by the front-line States and all the other peace-loving forces which are lending support to the people of Namibia in their just struggle.

78. We share the feelings of concern that have been expressed in connection with the fact that since the eighth emergency special session, not only has there been no real progress towards a settlement of the Namibian problem, but we have seen further manoeuvres by the Western Powers designed to delay the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). The five Western countries have attempted to impose demands on the Namibian people which would considerably detract from their sovereignty. Circumventing, indeed, violating, Security Council resolutions, Western representatives are holding talks with the Namibian puppets. All these most recent manoeuvres and ploys by the Western Powers must be unmasked and condemned, since their aim is to make it impossible to satisfy the demand of the United Nations that independence be granted to Namibia.

79. The Soviet Union's position on the question of Namibia remains clear-cut and consistent. It is our belief that the long-suffering people of Namibia, as well as other peoples still under the domination of colonizers and racists, should immediately gain freedom and independence and be granted an opportunity for independent national development.

80. We favour a speedy solution of the Namibian problem on the basis of the preservation of the unity and territorial integrity of Namibia, including Walvis Bay. We favour the full withdrawal from Namibia of the troops and administration of South Africa, and a complete transfer of administrative power to the people of Namibia, that is to the people's organization, SWAPO, which has been recognized by the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity as the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people. We are prepared to make our contribution as well to a just political settlement of the Namibian problem under the aegis of the United Nations. For such a settlement to be possible, it is essential that an end be put immediately to the constant equivocation and manoeuvring. The Security Council should impose on the South African racists the strictest and most comprehensive sanctions, as provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

81. As the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union, Mr. A. A. Gromyko, said from this very rostrum during the present session, "It is a matter of honour and is the immediate duty of the United Nations to help the people of Namibia gain their freedom. The racists and all those on whom they rely must realize that the time of colonialism is past". [*7th meeting, para. 156.*]

82. Mr. NGUYEN THUONG (Viet Nam) (*interpretation from French*): I should like to begin my statement by

conveying my warmest congratulations to the Secretary for Foreign Relations of SWAPO on the very important statement he made this morning [*64th meeting*]. I ask him to inform the heroic people of Namibia, its leaders and its armed forces of the respect and admiration of the Vietnamese people, and our fraternal good wishes for ever greater success in their just and inevitably victorious struggle.

83. In the framework of the United Nations, the debate on the painful and horrifying problem of Namibia seems to centre on the plan for a political solution put forward about four years ago by the five Western Powers and adopted more than three years ago by the Security Council. Need we recall that in 1972 those same Powers boasted that they could settle peacefully the problem of the right of self-determination of Namibia in less than six months if it were left to them to convince South Africa? However, since 1978 more than six times six months have gone by but the effort to achieve that political solution adopted on the basis of their initiative, which was entrusted to them, has not made the least progress. On the contrary, it is very seriously threatened by deadlock and delay.

84. African colleagues in this and other forums have bitterly recalled that in 1978 they had to accept concession after concession on the appeal of those same Powers in order to accommodate South Africa, as they said. And this year, given the clearly negative results of four years of goodwill cynically wasted, those colleagues have justly denounced what they consider to be the intransigence, the unilateral imposition, the duplicity and the about-face of South Africa and, to say the least, the "connivance, the procrastination and the diversionary tactics" which are used as one more subterfuge by the five Western Powers, which continue to evade their moral obligation to prevail upon their South African ally strictly to apply the political solution that was accepted by all the parties concerned. The entire world is aware of the particularly harmful role and the arrogant attitude of the new American Administration, which continues to maintain its friendship with South Africa, which it calls its permanent ally, and which is at present working to undermine the agreed solution and to replace it by a new arrangement more to its liking and more to the advantage of its racist friends. Together with all progressive mankind, many delegations, including my own, share the feelings of the African delegations which have clearly expressed from this rostrum their frustration, their anger and their indignation.

85. Public opinion is right to show its indignation because for four years, behind the smoke-screen of the so-called negotiations, the authorities of Pretoria have not ceased to consolidate their illegal occupation and their colonialist and racist domination over Namibia, in order to perpetuate it. They have opened up the Territory further to the exploitation and plunder of the transnational corporations. They have stepped up the recruitment of mercenaries and the training of tribal armed forces in their pay. They have strengthened their military establishments and the network of bases and expanded the system of bantustanization and the creation of puppet parties and administrations, justly described by SWAPO as instruments of the neo-colonialism of South Africa and its protectors. At the same time, the Pretoria authorities intensify their repression of the population and their attacks against the political leaders and armed organization of SWAPO, thus showing their vain desire to eliminate the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people. They also direct their armed aggression against the front-line States, par-

ticularly the People's Republic of Angola. In doing this, with the blessing of their protectors overseas, they further promote what public opinion has rightly denounced as a State policy of international terrorism directed against the people of Namibia and the neighbouring States in the region.

86. Given these clear facts, the time has come for everyone to draw his own conclusions. Representatives of different African countries have assessed the situation as critical, truly critical, and have said that it is high time a decision was reached. Progressive mankind, together with free Africa, demands that effective measures and concrete action be taken.

87. In many forums, including that of the eighth emergency special session of the General Assembly, a firm stand has been taken in favour of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the racist régime of Pretoria, and its complete political isolation. It has not been possible to implement those sanctions because of the vetoes of the Western Powers, led by the United States. The time has come to ask them clearly the following question in order to prevent them from shirking their responsibilities. Which of the five countries is determined to put pressure on South Africa to apply strictly resolution 435 (1978) and, if it does not, declare itself in favour of the application of sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter? Which, on the other hand, by giving an evasive answer to that question, places itself at the side of Pretoria as the enemy of Africa and all mankind?

88. Given the uncertainty of the moment with regard to the political solution of the problem to which SWAPO remains open—but only on the strict basis of resolution 435 (1978) without any prevarication, qualification or modification whatsoever—SWAPO, which has clearly displayed its goodwill and its sense of responsibility, has stated that it will intensify its national liberation struggle at all levels, including armed struggle, which many resolutions of the United Nations have declared to be legitimate. No one could find fault with that; all States that cherish justice and freedom, all progressive mankind, must agree with that and give SWAPO their sympathy and support.

89. At this crucial time, within the framework of the United Nations, resolution ES-8/2, adopted by the General Assembly at its eighth emergency special session, authoritatively endorsing the Programme of Action on Namibia drawn up in Panama [A/36/24, para. 222], set out what I consider to be sensible guidelines, which many statements by delegations, and in particular those of the Secretary for Foreign Relations of SWAPO and the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, have made more precise and amplified. Those statements are fully supported by my delegation, and we would like to emphasize the aspects which we consider to be the most important.

90. The tasks with which the problem of Namibia confronts the Organization are immense and most varied. We should focus our efforts on key tasks, essential tasks, which in our view result from the two principles included in all decisions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, namely: on the one hand unswerving support for the struggle of the Namibian people, in all its aspects and in all the forms which that people may consider necessary to ensure the victory of its just cause; and on the other hand recognition of SWAPO as being the sole authentic representative of that people.

91. In the present period of struggle, when a just and equitable political solution still seems to be a long way off because of the position of intransigence and duplicity of South Africa, made even more obstinate by its strategic alliance with the United States, SWAPO is quite right to devote most of its efforts to the struggle within the country, in the Territory itself, and to persist in the political and military struggle, the consolidation and development of its political forces, its armed forces and their activities. The international community must consequently direct its assistance to the struggle of the Namibian people along these lines and the United Nations Council for Namibia, which is responsible for mobilizing and co-ordinating this assistance, will see that that is done.

92. Faced with the manoeuvres of South Africa, supported by international corporations, to install a neo-colonial puppet régime by means of a so-called internal settlement, the United Nations confirmed by its decisions and acts the position of principle which it has always maintained: That SWAPO is the sole and legitimate representative of the Namibian people; that it must be a participant, and the only participant, as the representative of Namibia in the preparation and implementation of any political solution to the problem of Namibia. Consequently, puppet parties or organizations such as the Democratic Turnhalle Alliance cannot be admitted to any debate or negotiation on Namibia either through the front door or through the service entrance.

93. Mandatory comprehensive sanctions, the urgency of which was stressed in resolution ES-8/2, remain an objective yet to be attained. While waiting for the Security Council to adopt a decision to that effect, the mobilization of public opinion, particularly in the Western countries which are partners of South Africa, could have an influence on their respective Governments and to a certain extent limit the criminal relations of the latter with the Pretoria régime.

94. Another important point in the Programme of Action on Namibia has the full agreement and support of my delegation: it concerns the political, diplomatic, financial, economic and military assistance to front-line States. Those States have made great sacrifices for the principle of solidarity in the struggle of peoples for their liberation. They deserve our admiration and respect. In the face of the alliance between the imperialist, racist and Zionist forces, collective colonialism and transnational corporations, the General Assembly must reaffirm certain relevant principles contained in the annex to resolution 2625 (XXV), principles that affirm the right of peoples, in the conquest of the right of self-determination, to seek and accept all assistance and support in keeping with the Charter; and the consequent right of other States as a matter of honour to respond to that appeal by peoples struggling for their national liberation, including the heroic people of Namibia.

95. The people and the Government of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam are happy at the new victories of the Namibian people under the leadership of SWAPO, notably the success achieved this year in the armed offensives in various areas—as has been recognized in the South African newspaper *Windhoek Observer*—as well as at the failure of the recent manoeuvres by Pretoria to bring the puppets together. We welcome their resolve to fight until their objectives have been attained, as expressed in this statement of the Secretary of Foreign Relations of SWAPO:

“The more determined South Africa is to eliminate SWAPO and its military organization, the more determined are the freedom-fighters and the people of Namibia to put an end by their long struggle to the illegal colonial domination of their homeland by the racists.”

96. We wish to assure the people of Namibia and SWAPO again that they enjoy the firm and continuous support of Viet Nam in all circumstances, and until final victory. In particular, within the United Nations, Viet Nam will support the draft resolutions recommended by the United Nations Council for Namibia and submitted to this session of the General Assembly [*ibid.*, para. 708], and pledge its full support for every effort the Organization may make to hasten the inevitable day when the courageous people of Namibia will achieve its full independence and take its just place in the community of free and sovereign nations.

97. Mr. ANDERSON (Australia): Australia's commitment to the achievement by Namibia of early, genuine and complete independence is absolute. For too long the international community has been calling upon the Government of South Africa to cease its illegal occupation of the Territory and to implement immediately the terms of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

98. In a manner which we have come to expect, but none the less deplore, the South African Government has raised obstacle after obstacle to the effective implementation of the will of the international community.

99. Namibia will be free, and the Government of South Africa should realize that the longer it delays the granting of independence to the Namibian people the greater will be the cost to South Africa itself. If there is one thing that history has taught us over the last 30 years, it is that foreign domination cannot long withstand the struggle of a people for independence.

100. During the 9th meeting of the eighth emergency special session, on Namibia, I outlined in detail my Government's position on this question. I do not need to repeat those arguments again now. As I said at the outset, Australia's commitment to an independent Namibia is total.

101. Australia is a member of the United Nations Council for Namibia and takes an active part in its work. It is therefore a matter of regret to my Government that parts of the draft resolutions prepared by the Council and now before the General Assembly contain formulations which do nothing to assist and could impede genuine efforts by others to achieve a settlement. While there are a number of formulations with which my delegation has difficulties, I should like to concentrate at this time on a single aspect.

102. The Western contact group has recently concluded a further round of consultations with the front-line States, South Africa, SWAPO and the internal parties. These consultations have been aimed at achieving what we all want—the early implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). The Australian delegation commends the contact group for its continuing efforts and urges it to intensify them. We join those other delegations which deplore the delays in the implementation of resolution 435 (1978); but we recognize that, at least for the present, the efforts of the five Western countries are the only constructive and realistic efforts towards a settlement which

are currently being undertaken. We therefore think it both inappropriate and unrealistic to reject these efforts, as is done in one of the draft resolutions before us.

103. If the contact group had discontinued its efforts or had done nothing to pursue its aims we should have regarded the criticism of it as valid. But this is not the situation. It has continued its efforts in good faith. It has received the co-operation of the front-line States. The Australian delegation therefore finds it a matter of great regret that the draft resolutions now before the General Assembly do not pay due regard to the importance and potential of these latest developments.

104. For this reason and for others recorded in full in the Council for Namibia and at previous sessions of the General Assembly Australia is unable to support all the draft resolutions contained in the report of the Council.

105. As a member of the Council for Namibia, Australia would have strongly desired to be able to vote in favour of all the draft resolutions prepared by the Council. The fact that we are not able so to vote should not be interpreted as indicating any change in Australian policy or any lessening in our commitment to an independent Namibia. We will continue to work for a speedy and just solution to the Namibian problem, and we urge that the contact group be allowed to do likewise.

106. Mr. BARMA (Chad) (*interpretation from French*): On behalf of my delegation, I should like first of all warmly to congratulate Antigua and Barbuda, which has just been admitted as the one hundred fifty-seventh Member of the United Nations. We would assure the delegation of this new State of the readiness of the delegation of Chad to co-operate with it.

107. My delegation would like to make a contribution to the discussion on the item before us, which is perhaps not the most controversial case of decolonization but which undoubtedly has been of most concern to the Organization in recent years, namely, the question of Namibia.

108. In this connection we should like warmly to congratulate the United Nations Council for Namibia, the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and the Secretary-General for the extremely valuable reports they have submitted to us.

109. Despite the eighth emergency special session of the General Assembly held in September, South Africa has not yet shown any intention to put an end to its illegal colonialist presence in Namibia. On the contrary, it has since been constantly stepping up its acts of repression aimed at perpetuating its presence on Namibian soil. That is why we are again here today to see where we stand and to ascertain what further steps need to be taken. Together we have to assess the nature and the scope of a challenge such as the Organization has never faced before.

110. Not only is the backward racist régime of South Africa flouting the various relevant United Nations resolutions but, in order to maintain its domination over Namibia, it is also continuing to perpetrate acts of savage aggression against the front-line States, believing that it can in this way force them to withdraw their support for SWAPO. For example, quite recently, after the visit of the

contact group on Namibia to the area, South African soldiers bombed some localities in the People's Republic of Angola, causing many civilian casualties. Given these criminal actions, we may well wonder how long South Africa will continue to defy the international community—with the active support, moreover, of certain Power members of the Security Council.

111. Indeed, it is a matter of public record that the Security Council has been prevented from implementing any decision to apply selective sanctions against South Africa because the veto has been systematically used by certain permanent members, which in so doing, are pursuing but one goal: to maintain at all costs an anachronistic system which has been condemned, in order to continue to demonstrate in the region the virtues of the superiority of a certain civilization.

112. The question of Namibia would already have been settled had not the economic sanctions decided upon by the Security Council in its resolution 253 (1968) become mere pious hopes because of the actions of those permanent members. We know that it is thanks to them that the South African racists today possess a nuclear capability that makes it possible for them to persist in their defiance. No one would still be speaking of an occupied or dependent Namibia if Security Council resolutions 385 (1976), 431 (1978) and, above all, 439 (1978) had been duly implemented. We have reached this pass because the Western countries have tremendous interests in South Africa and could not countenance any action which would harm that country.

113. There can be no doubt that the only peaceful way of leading Namibia to independence is through the comprehensive implementation of the United Nations plan on Namibia endorsed in resolution 435 (1978). But if that does not come to pass, we should then muster all our strength to give SWAPO, the sole legitimate representative of the Namibian people, all the assistance it needs to continue its armed struggle until final victory.

114. We should like here to draw the attention of the members of the contact group to the initiatives of South Africa, which, in order to ensure the political survival of its brain-child, the puppet Democratic Turnhalle Alliance, has suggested that they negotiate a form of constitution to the liking of the Namibian people. We consider that the form of institutions is an internal affair for each country to decide; consequently, it is for the people of Namibia, after independence, to form these institutions in accordance with its aspirations.

115. Resolution 435 (1978) has been accepted by SWAPO at the cost of enormous sacrifice. In my delegation's view, there can be no question of entertaining any amendment which would further weaken it, to the detriment of the Namibian cause. It is obvious that that is the purpose of attempts purportedly to strengthen the document. This manoeuvre has been inspired by the *apartheid* régime, which hopes in this way to secure the participation of the so-called Turnhalle Alliance in the negotiations on Namibian independence.

116. In any case, the Government of Chad recognizes SWAPO as the sole legitimate representative of the Namibian people. Hence my delegation would condemn outright any manoeuvre designed to deprive SWAPO of any of its prerogatives in the forthcoming negotiations. We deplore the decision of the contact group to take up the question of Walvis Bay only after the independence of

Namibia. In my delegation's opinion, Walvis Bay is an integral part of Namibia and, consequently, its fate is necessarily linked with that of Namibia as a whole.

117. Mr. MENDOZA (Philippines): Once again the General Assembly is debating the question of Namibia. In truth, the time for debate has long since passed. For the question of Namibia has been dealt with many times in the past, in terms that are clear and unequivocal. The answer has been given by the Assembly; the answer has been confirmed by the International Court of Justice; the answer has been reiterated by the Security Council. But one nation has had the gall and the intransigence to ignore all this, regrettably with some encouragement from a few others, and in this light the question before us has ceased to be the question of Namibia and has become instead the question of the United Nations: that is, whether the resolutions of the Assembly, the Security Council, the International Court of Justice—the United Nations, in fact—are fit only for the archives and will be no more than eloquent testimonials in history to the impotence and helplessness of the United Nations.

118. We are aware that the Pretoria régime has consistently ignored and obstructed the efforts of the United Nations to bring genuine independence to Namibia, as spelled out in Security Council resolution 435 (1978). The failure of the multi-party pre-implementation meeting, held at Geneva from 7 to 14 January 1981, which had been convened to reach agreement on a date for a cease-fire and the start of the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), was the result of South Africa's odious decision to perpetuate its illegal occupation of Namibia.

119. In view of South Africa's attitude during the Geneva talks, the Security Council considered the question of Namibia last April.⁴ It is unfortunate that the Security Council was unable to adopt concrete political and economic measures to compel South Africa to comply with the resolutions of the United Nations relating to Namibia, in particular resolution 435 (1978). In this connection, my delegation gave its unqualified support to the draft resolutions introduced in the Security Council during its debate on the question of Namibia. We did so in keeping with our firm commitment to a speedy solution to the question of Namibia within the framework of resolution 435 (1978) and the other pertinent resolutions of the United Nations.

120. We cannot and we must not renege on our solemn duty and responsibility to the people of Namibia. For Namibia is the direct and legal responsibility of the United Nations until genuine self-determination and national independence are achieved in the Territory, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966 and 2248 (S-V) of 19 May 1967.

121. South Africa's callous disregard of the will of the international community concerning Namibia flouts the United Nations itself. In the process it has violated every basic principle upon which the United Nations was founded: the right of self-determination of peoples, respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States, the non-use of force and the settlement of disputes by peaceful means.

122. Over the years it has shown total disrespect for the rule of law. In the face of South Africa's continuing defiance of the United Nations, there is no doubt in the mind of my delegation that it is time that comprehensive mandatory sanctions were imposed against that country. The adoption of such measures requires the support of all

the members of the international community. No encouragement should be given to South Africa to thwart the early implementation of resolution 435 (1978).

123. The position of my delegation concerning the question of Namibia is firmly anchored in the inalienable right of the people of Namibia to self-determination, freedom and national independence in a united Namibia, including Walvis Bay and the off-shore islands, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and General Assembly resolutions 1514 (XV) and 2145 (XXI); the legitimacy of the struggle of the people of Namibia against the illegal occupation of their Territory by South Africa; the legitimate right of SWAPO as the authentic representative of the Namibian people; the immediate withdrawal of the South African administration from Namibia, as enunciated by the International Court of Justice in its advisory opinion of 21 June 1971;¹ the unconditional implementation of resolution 435 (1978). In this latter connection, the Philippines was a sponsor of resolution ES-8/2, which was adopted at the eighth emergency special session—on the question of Namibia. Paragraph 9 of that resolution reaffirmed that Security Council resolution 435 (1978), in which the Council endorsed the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia as the only basis for a peaceful settlement.

124. Our position is anchored also on non-recognition of the spurious entities created by South Africa in Namibia and its attempts to institutionalize the bantustanization of Namibia and strong condemnation of South Africa for its brutal oppression of the Namibian people and for its repeated armed attacks against its neighbouring States, particularly Angola. Moreover, we believe that until Namibia attains independence, the efforts of the United Nations Council for Namibia to mobilize international public opinion concerning Namibia must continue. The Council's mandate as the sole legal Administering Authority for Namibia until independence should be reaffirmed.

125. My delegation also supports the Nationhood Programme for Namibia, in particular Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia,² which declares that these resources are the inviolable heritage of the Namibian people and that their exploitation by foreign economic interests under the protection of the repressive racist colonial administration is illegal and contributes to the maintenance of the illegal occupation régime.

126. South Africa has directly challenged the authority of the United Nations over Namibia. We have before us several recommendations of the United Nations Council for Namibia, which will be considered in the course of our debate. We must put an end to South Africa's actions, which constitute a serious threat to international peace and security, by adopting effective and concerted measures against it. There is no room for further delay. We have repeatedly condemned South Africa for its flagrant violations of the Charter and its defiance of the United Nations.

127. Indeed, as I said at the outset, the question now before us is no longer the question of Namibia. That question has been answered clearly, unequivocally and repeatedly. The question now before us is the question of the United Nations—whether the United Nations is helpless and impotent in the face of the intransigence of one nation; indeed, whether the United Nations itself will allow one nation to defy and ignore the collective will of the international community. The answer lies in what we do with the resolutions before us and in their implementation.

128. Mr. BUENO (Brazil): As we consider the question of Namibia, I should like to place on record the sincere appreciation of the delegation of Brazil of the work carried out by the United Nations Council for Namibia and the outstanding leadership of its President, Mr. Lusaka of Zambia. The Council for Namibia has been since its inception an unflinching ally of the people of Namibia in their quest for self-determination and independence.

129. During the current year I have on several occasions expounded the views of my delegation on the subject under discussion: at the 98th meeting of the thirty-fifth session; before the Security Council,⁵ at the International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa; and at the 12th meeting of the eighth emergency special session. I therefore feel confident enough that the Brazilian position is well known to all Member States and requires no further reiteration. I shall be very brief and confine my remarks to the main tenets which should be upheld, in our view, in dealing with the issue. First, the South African occupation of Namibia is illegal and should be terminated forthwith, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) and the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of 1971. Secondly, the Territory of Namibia must become an independent sovereign State, in accordance with countless resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. Thirdly, Namibia should accede to statehood and independence with its territorial integrity preserved, which means that Walvis Bay is an integral part of its territory. Fourthly, pending full independence, the United Nations Council for Namibia has the legal authority to administer the Territory on behalf of the United Nations, in accordance with General Assembly resolutions 2248 (S-V) and 2372 (XXII). Fifthly, SWAPO, as the only liberation movement seeking true independence for the Territory, is the sole and authentic representative of the people of Namibia.

130. The points that I have just listed are the basis of the consensus already reached with a view to bringing about an internationally acceptable settlement of the question of Namibia. They should not be lost sight of in any new effort or initiative designed to make the aspirations of the international community with regard to Namibia come true.

131. I shall refrain from reciting once again the long and painful process designed to lead to the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). Many expectations were shattered before we even approached its initial stages. Only this year, the failure of South Africa to negotiate responsibly at the pre-implementation meeting at Geneva, and the failure of the Security Council to adopt appropriate measures, have led us from the eighth emergency special session last September to the present meetings without any substantive progress to record.

132. We continue to believe that resolution 435 (1978) is the only internationally acceptable basis for promoting the genuine exercise by the people of Namibia of their right to self-determination. Its contents should neither be haggled over nor carped at. Allow me to quote from the statement delivered at the opening of the general debate of this session by the Minister for External Relations of Brazil:

“The question of the independence of Namibia has been dealt with by the international community on the basis of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and of the plan drawn up by the Organization which the Council has embraced by that resolution and which has been

internationally accepted. Brazil fully supports the independence and territorial integrity of Namibia founded on the efforts of the United Nations. The problem, however, has not yet been solved, owing to the intransigence of South Africa, which persists in its illegal occupation of Namibia and deliberately undermines international attempts to achieve a negotiated solution, in sharp contrast to the flexibility and willingness for negotiation shown by the other parties involved." [5th meeting, para. 39.]

133. We have followed attentively the endeavours reported by the contact group of the Western countries to ensure Namibia's independence in 1982. The achievement of Namibia's independence by peaceful means and in compliance with resolution 435 (1978) would bear testimony to the ability of this group, thus crowning the efforts of the United Nations to solve one of its most intractable problems. We would not, however, support any arrangements implying a partial implementation of resolution 435 (1978) and we would consider any attempt in this direction to be tantamount to stripping this resolution of its purpose, which is to guarantee full independence to Namibia and self-determination to its people.

134. The achievement of an internationally acceptable settlement of the Namibian problem is essential so that the countries of southern Africa may rededicate their

efforts for the well-being of their peoples. In conclusion, let me quote again from the speech by the Minister of External Relations of Brazil:

"The illegal occupation of Namibia must cease at once so that it can achieve its independence forthwith and so that all countries of the region, freed at last from the tensions of war, its burdens and commitments, may devote themselves, in favourable circumstances, to the just cause of their own development and to the authentic expression of their national existence in independence and sovereignty." [*Ibid.*, para. 40.]

The meeting rose at 5.20 p.m.

NOTES

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.

² *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-fifth Session, Supplement No. 24*, annex II.

³ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-sixth Year*, 2263rd meeting.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 2267th to 2277th meetings.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 2296th meeting.