



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 ...	1143

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

**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. PASTINEN (Finland): The General Assembly resumes its debate on the question of Namibia in circumstances which are only too familiar to us all. The illegal occupation of this United Nations Territory by South Africa continues. Not only is the people of Namibia denied its right of self-determination but also, under the present administration, it is denied the exercise of its fundamental human rights. As long as Namibia is not independent it constitutes a constant challenge to the authority of the Organization and to the clearly expressed decisions of its Member States. Yet there is no doubt about the end result. The will of the international community will prevail. Namibia will be independent. It is the firm belief of my Government that at its next session the General Assembly should no longer have to consider this problem. Instead, it will hear the voice of the people of Namibia through the representative of an independent Namibia.

2. The international community has determined that Namibia will gain its independence next year. Just prior to the pre-implementation talks held at Geneva from 7 to 14 January 1981, Namibian independence seemed at hand. The wishes of the African nations at that time were more than reasonable. Throughout, the South West Africa People's Organization [SWAPO] and the front-line African States showed statesmanship and restraint. The Geneva talks failed for one reason and one reason only: South Africa.

3. While South Africa continues its illegal occupation of Namibia, it has intentionally escalated tension in the region by its attacks on Angola. By committing acts of aggression against its neighbours South Africa violates basic principles of international behaviour. Its actions against its neighbours show that policies of internal repression breed external aggression. The new dimension of this violence is another proof of the structural tension which is endemic

to the region. The absence of a peaceful solution to the question of Namibia aggravates that tension.

4. Fifteen years have passed since the General Assembly terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia [resolution 2145 (XXI)]. Ten years have passed since the International Court of Justice, following an initiative of the Government of Finland, gave its advisory opinion<sup>1</sup> which determined that South Africa's continued presence in Namibia was illegal. In spite of those historic decisions Namibia is still unfree. The anger and frustration of Africa is not only understandable; it is justified.

5. Resolution 435 (1978) of the Security Council remains the basis for a peaceful solution to the question of Namibia. South Africa has committed itself to the United Nations plan. The enlightened self-interest of South Africa itself speaks in favour of early independence for Namibia.

6. The position of the Government of Finland on the question of Namibia is well known and remains unchanged. The illegal occupation of Namibia should be brought to an end. The people of Namibia should be given the right to self-determination. This is to be achieved through free and fair elections designed to create a democratic society and justice for all.

7. To expedite the achievement of the independence of Namibia, a negotiating process under the auspices of the United Nations was initiated in 1977. From the beginning, the Nordic Governments have given their support and co-operation to that effort. The Finnish Government, for its part, holds in readiness peace-keeping troops for service in Namibia, should it be requested to make them available. We continue to believe that the way of negotiation is the most effective method to achieve the independence of Namibia. We therefore continue to support the efforts of the Western contact group. Obviously, the success of that effort demands the co-operation of all the parties concerned. That co-operation has been forthcoming from the Organization of African Unity [OAU], the front-line African States and SWAPO. With the co-operation of all, Namibia will be independent next year.

8. Mrs. JONES (Liberia): As I stand here to speak for the first time, may I congratulate you, Mr. President, on the able and effective manner in which you are conducting the affairs of the General Assembly at its thirty-sixth session.

9. Once again we have assembled because a part of humanity is still held in bondage against its will. The United Nations will not cease to press for the release of Namibia as long as it is in captivity. The Organization has no other choice, no matter how long this captivity lasts, because it was created to guarantee the freedom of all peoples. The case of Namibia has become a test of the will-power of the United Nations—whether it will coexist with evil or strive relentlessly for good to overcome evil. The worst thing that could happen is for good men to

keep silent while evil holds a part of humanity in captivity.

10. It is now nearly 15 years since Namibia became the direct responsibility of the United Nations. The most eventful decision taken for the liberation of Namibia was resolution 435 (1978), which was adopted by the Security Council more than three years ago. That resolution has not been successfully implemented because there are those who have no faith in themselves and in a future that they cannot control. The question now before us is whether the notion of confidence-building measures, which are considered necessary to make the resolution workable, is really what is at stake here. The Namibians have not created the nightmare of Namibia. Those who have caused the nightmare about the Namibian situation need to have confidence in themselves and confidence that they are doing the right thing for peace and security in southern Africa. Lacking confidence in themselves, they find it difficult to discern it in others. The members of SWAPO, the legitimate and recognized representative of the Namibian people, have by their actions since the adoption of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), proved that they possess confidence in themselves and even in their oppressors, believing that the future can bring about a completely transformed Namibia, one different from what their oppressors are making it at present.

11. The Liberian delegation therefore calls upon the friends of and investors in South Africa to help South Africa build confidence in itself so as to enable it to free Namibia. No amount of military hardware will contribute to confidence-building measures. It can only erode the delicate balance of confidence that is required by both sides. Frustration and dismay on one side and condemnation and isolation on the other cannot continue forever.

12. The policies of *apartheid* and bantustans, extended into Namibia to make puppets of the Namibians, will not work. They will not work because they are uncivilised, barbaric and un-African, and there is no place in the African mentality to accommodate caricatures of justice.

13. The political deceptions played out in Zimbabwe before its independence are too recent to be forgotten, and Namibia will be no different. What is needed is the laying of a solid foundation for the new Namibia that is bound to appear and which everyone living there can call his own native land. South Africa cannot take comfort in the making of this new Namibia while it perpetrates constant acts of defiance of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and illegally occupies Namibia. The peace and security that should be enjoyed in southern Africa must begin to take root now, when it is perhaps not yet too late. The friends of South Africa must prove to be friends by extending to it a genuine hand of friendship, leading it from darkness into light. South Africa cannot come out of darkness into light alone; it will take more than its own efforts. It has been a long night of darkness for it, to which it has grown accustomed, and it is now fearful of the daylight.

14. Our meetings here from year to year reaffirm our faith in human justice and fair play and in the institution of the United Nations as a means to ensure them. These meetings may appear to be a routine activity, but they are necessary and vital to assure the people of Namibia, and all other peoples still oppressed, that the United Nations is committed to their liberation and remains man's only hope to achieve freedom and to protect the weak from the strong.

15. The United Nations must therefore continue to work along many fronts and on many levels for the liberation of Namibia, with resolution 435 (1978) as its basic blueprint. It must remain determined to safeguard the rights of the Namibian people to write their own constitution, to establish their own institutions of government and to elect the Government with which they must live from day to day.

16. The United Nations should uphold the principles of democracy and human rights for all Namibians, without discrimination. It must work out a time-frame for the independence of Namibia. Security Council resolution 435 (1978) was the result of intensive, serious and long negotiations and provided the solid basis for the peaceful solution of the Namibian problem. More significantly, that resolution is an international consensus in which South Africa participated. No effort should therefore be spared to prevent the breaking of that consensus, which continues to enjoy the full approval of the United Nations as the only acceptable formula for the liberation of Namibia and which also provides for a secure future for all its inhabitants.

17. Mr. LEGWAILA (Botswana): In normal circumstances this debate would have been considered ill-timed and unnecessary. It would have been possible to persuade us to be patient, to allow the five Western States to resuscitate their three-year-old initiative and to sell their proposals to the front-line States and the United Nations. But there are no normal circumstances in southern Africa. There is nothing there to justify complacency and contentment on our part, for Namibia, for so long a tortured and tormented land, remains tortured and tormented.

18. Last year the debate on this vexing question was postponed because we did not want the Geneva meeting to be convened in a polluted atmosphere. We have learned a bitter lesson, for little did we realize that we were being taken on a journey of blind faith until we got to Geneva, only to be told that the five Western States' friend was not ready to co-operate in the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). Thus ended the Geneva meeting, as though it had never taken place. Indeed, it was a disaster of catastrophic proportions. It gave South Africa the opportunity—not without encouragement—to find loopholes and weaknesses in the United Nations plan where none had existed before.

19. No sooner had we left Geneva than we were told that as long as Cuban troops remained in Angola, resolution 435 (1978) would become ever more difficult to implement. We were told that constitutional guidelines now had to be agreed upon in advance in order to ensure that whichever party won the free and fair elections in Namibia would not dominate the drafting of the constitution of an independent Namibia.

20. But, worst of all, the impasse that has characterized the period between the collapse of the Geneva meeting and now has been too costly to the peace and stability of southern Africa. It has encouraged South Africa to embark on more and more deadly adventures against its neighbours, particularly Angola. The southern part of that sister State has been turned into a battlefield where innocent Namibian refugees and Angolan villagers alike are being massacred by South African troops.

21. We are neither habitual pessimists nor spoilers. We know that the envoys of the five States have recently visited the capitals of the front-line States, and we have

wished them well. But there is, in our view, nothing tangible enough thus far to encourage us to believe that we are any nearer a solution to the Namibian problem than at any time before. We have to be ever conscious of the fact that the past three years in particular have been years of frustrated expectations, dashed hopes, unfulfilled promises and breaches of faith. And, quite frankly, nothing that we have heard from the five Western States has convinced us that this time South Africa is reliably ready and willing to reciprocate our good faith.

22. We are once again being asked to keep hoping, even against hope itself. Not that we doubt the influence that the five States have over their friend; not at all. We have always felt and insisted that they have a great deal of clout with South Africa, which, unfortunately, they have seemed unwilling or unable to use with effect. We would be only too happy to know that at long last they have found a formula for getting South Africa to co-operate in good faith.

23. However, I can assure representatives that the front-line States, Nigeria and, indeed, Africa as a whole, always faithful to their principles, will not be found wanting in their determination to co-operate with the international community in our common endeavour to give the Namibian people the opportunity to rebuild their shattered lives in a free, independent and peaceful Namibia. We are ready to listen to constructive suggestions, provided no attempt is made to subvert in any way the United Nations plan as we have always known it.

24. But South Africa must not be allowed to determine the pace at which resolution 435 (1978) will be implemented or in what form it should or will be implemented. It must not be allowed to set the rules of conduct for SWAPO and the United Nations in the negotiations. Namibia is a United Nations responsibility. It is the duty and responsibility of the United Nations to ensure that its own plan is implemented without any further unnecessary delays and in a fair and democratic manner. Therefore, any attempts—and there have been many in the past eight months—by South Africa to bantustanize resolution 435 (1978) must be resisted. Any attempt by South Africa and its internal henchmen to annex the Turnhalle bantustan constitution to resolution 435 (1978) must be resisted at all costs.

25. If the purpose or objective of all the sinister manoeuvres that we have seen pursued with so much gusto since the collapse of the Geneva meeting is intended to enhance the chances of the Democratic Turnhalle Alliance at the polls, our response is simply that there would be nothing to stop SWAPO's winning free and fair elections in Namibia if the people of that Territory, in the exercise of their freedom of choice, decided to elect SWAPO to be the custodian of their aspirations. This would be so even if the elections were to be held 10 years from now. And so the Democratic Turnhalle Alliance must simply face the wrath of the Namibian people now and hope for the best, for it is no use delaying the inevitable. If the inevitable turns out to be the total electoral annihilation of the Alliance, so be it. In free and fair elections only democracy wins.

26. Our fundamental anxiety is that as long as Namibia remains a colony of South Africa, so long will southern Africa remain an area of perpetual conflict. We have seen that South Africa cannot hang on to Namibia without attempting to destroy the Territory's neighbours as punish-

ment for their support for SWAPO, and we are frightened by the possibility that the longer the Namibian conflict remains unresolved, the more tempted the super-Powers will be to transfer their cold war to southern Africa, if they have not done so already. We were told not long ago and in no uncertain terms that whether we like it or not we must consider our region a contested powerhouse of strategic minerals vital to the security not of southern Africa but of the West. Our opinion on the matter is not important and has therefore not been solicited. We simply are expected to accept the geopolitical strategic realities of our bipolarized world as perceived not by us but by those who believe, not without reason, that they hold the destinies of the weak and the powerless in their hands.

27. But for us the freedom of our people, their independence, peace, stability and orderly economic development override everything else. We do not wish to be part of some extra-continental Power's sphere of influence. SWAPO has not been fighting for so long in order to turn Namibia into a puppet of a foreign Power or foreign Powers. It has been fighting for the independence of Namibia, for the freedom of its people, for the peace and stability of southern Africa and for the total liquidation of colonial and racist oppression in that troubled tip of our continent.

28. But the hour is not too late. The five Western States need only to look back and wonder how they, close friends of South Africa, were able, three years ago, to persuade a skeptical United Nations and a terribly suspicious Africa to buy a plan for Namibia that had been worked out by a group of capitalist Western countries, some of which are not only former colonial masters but are also heavily involved in the exploitation of Namibian resources, in contravention of the decisions of the United Nations. Nothing can demonstrate good faith and trust on the part of Africa better than the fact that, despite our very serious misgivings and suspicions, we bought the plan. To this very day we remain firmly committed to Security Council resolution 435 (1978) as the only workable and realistic blueprint for peaceful change in Namibia, thanks to the genius of its original authors, the five Western States. The alternative to this blueprint is, of course, armed struggle to the bitter end, armed struggle which the oppressors of Namibia cannot win, for there is no price the people of Namibia under the leadership of SWAPO will not pay for the liberation of their motherland.

29. Mr. SILWAL (Nepal): Since 1966, when the United Nations terminated South Africa's Mandate and assumed direct responsibility for Namibia, the General Assembly, at its regular and special sessions, and the Security Council have made considerable efforts to ensure the achievement of independence for Namibia. It is indeed a matter of deep regret that South Africa continues to occupy the Territory, in open defiance of General Assembly and Security Council resolutions and of world public opinion. My delegation has often reiterated its view that the persistent refusal by South Africa to abide by the international consensus on Namibia must be met by a systematic and effective implementation of the provisions contained in the Charter of the United Nations. We are deeply disappointed that the Security Council has failed to act in accordance with the wishes of the overwhelming majority of Members of the Organization. Indeed, the Council's failure has put to a critical test the commitment of the United Nations to genuine independence for the people of Namibia.

30. Nepal shares the indignation of the international community at racist South Africa's defiance of all norms of international law and justice. We condemn South Africa's policy of persistent oppression of the Namibian people through mass arrests, torture and massacre. Its policy of *apartheid* has rightly been described by the United Nations as a crime against humanity. To compound its arrogance, South Africa has been trying to create an administrative apparatus that will lead to a so-called internal settlement. To this end, South Africa continues to follow the process of fragmentation and bantustanization of the Territory. In the face of such intransigence the Namibian people has no choice but to continue its struggle for national independence under the leadership of SWAPO.

31. South Africa's illegal presence in Namibia poses a grave threat to the peace and security of the neighbouring States and of the whole continent. Nepal condemns the repeated acts of aggression by South Africa against the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of the front-line States. Its premeditated and unprovoked aggression against Angola is a grave reminder of the threat the racist régime poses to international peace and security.

32. Nepal commends the people of Namibia and its national liberation movement for the remarkable spirit of restraint and political maturity they have displayed since the adoption of the United Nations plan for Namibia. This spirit provides a remarkable contrast to the growing provocation and equivocation on the part of South Africa.

33. My delegation fully supports the activities of the United Nations Council for Namibia and wished to pay tribute to the Council for the efforts it has been making for the early attainment of the goal of Namibian independence.

34. My delegation also wishes to avail itself of this opportunity to express our appreciation to the Secretary General and his Special Representative for the serious efforts they have made towards the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia.

35. Nepal fully shares the concern of Africa over the situation in Namibia. We reiterate our view that Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978) constitute the only basis for the achievement of the internationally accepted independence of Namibia. We appeal for the implementation of these resolutions without qualification, dilution or delay. The contact group of five Western countries which was the author of the United Nations plan has undertaken a solemn responsibility to enable the people of Namibia to exercise its right to self-determination by means of free and fair elections. We have been watching with great interest recent developments in this regard. We appeal to these five countries to fulfil their obligations without any further delay, for delay can only aggravate the situation, with incalculable consequences.

36. Mr. SIKAULU (Zambia): On Monday, 14 September 1981, on the eve of the thirty-sixth session, the General Assembly concluded its eighth emergency special session, which was devoted to Namibia. At that session the General Assembly, as it has done repeatedly over the years, condemned South Africa's continued illegal occupation of Namibia and demanded that Territory's long-delayed accession to independence.

37. As long as South Africa persists in its illegal occupation, meetings of the General Assembly and other United Nations organs on Namibia can never be too many

or too frequent. It can never be too much to condemn South Africa for its illegal occupation of Namibia in utter defiance of the decisions of the United Nations. Indeed, it can never be too much to demand that South Africa withdraw from Namibia and to support the quest of the oppressed people of Namibia for freedom and independence.

38. For the past three years there has been a concerted effort by the international community to implement Security Council resolution 435 (1978). That resolution concerns a plan which offers South Africa an honourable exit from Namibia, with the accession of the Territory to independence after free and fair elections. If South Africa had co-operated, as was expected, Namibia would have been independent three years ago and would be in our midst as a Member of the United Nations. The sad chapter of South African illegal occupation of the Territory, characterized by intransigence and arrogance, would have long been behind us.

39. Since the eighth emergency special session, there have been renewed efforts to break the impasse in the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). Last month the Western contact group submitted a set of proposals to South Africa, SWAPO, the front-line States and Nigeria and the current Chairman of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity. These proposals have been carefully analysed, and our collective reaction has been conveyed to the contact group.

40. Let me just stress here that there has never been a lack of will on the part of SWAPO, the front-line States and Nigeria or indeed the OAU and the United Nations to do everything possible to facilitate the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). The problem has always been and remains South Africa. For instance, it was South Africa which sabotaged the pre-implementation meeting held at Geneva in January this year.

41. Thus, the following questions become inevitable. Does South Africa now have the political will to move forward on the question of the independence of Namibia? Is South Africa genuinely in favour of a settlement on the basis of resolution 435 (1978)? Is South Africa reconciled to the democratic idea of free and fair elections in Namibia, whether or not it means a victory for SWAPO?

42. Our co-operation is assured as long as there is no attempt to compromise the independence of Namibia. We will accept nothing less than the genuine independence of Namibia in accordance with the letter and spirit of resolution 435 (1978). We will not usurp the right of the Namibian people to decide for themselves, through their elected representatives, on vital issues such as a national constitution. We will not be party to and will in fact fight against any attempt to undermine SWAPO. For us, SWAPO remains the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people.

43. The onus must surely be on the contact group to ensure that South Africa is brought on board and does not again go astray. It should co-operate with the rest of the international community so that Namibia can accede to independence at long last, and not later than 1982, on the basis of the decisions of the United Nations and in particular resolution 435 (1978). By what stretch of the imagination can those who profess democracy deny the Namibian people this democratic right? The communist bogey that South Africa and some of its friends have so often



evoked is certainly no justification. As my President, Mr. Kenneth David Kaunda, has succinctly put it:

“The threat to South Africa is not communism but its own policy of racial separation. As long as *apartheid* remains the official and economic doctrine in South Africa, the people who are adversely affected by it will fight for their freedom and democracy”.

44. Against the background of South Africa's deceptive manoeuvres, it behoves us all in the General Assembly and in other appropriate United Nations organs to remain vigilant on the question of the independence of Namibia. The United Nations should continue to insist on the implementation of the plan for the independence of Namibia under resolution 435 (1978). The United Nations cannot remain silent on the situation in Namibia. It should continue to speak out against the attempts by South Africa to undermine SWAPO, the intensified repression of the Namibian people, the massive militarization of Namibia and the repeated South African acts of aggression against independent African States, particularly Angola and my own country, Zambia.

45. Last August the Security Council considered<sup>2</sup> South Africa's aggression against Angola. Because of a United States veto, the Council was unable to take even the minimal action of condemning the aggression and demanding the withdrawal of South African military forces from Angola. To this day South African troops continue to occupy parts of southern Angola. This is a grave situation, about which the international community cannot remain silent. South African troops must withdraw from Angola. The South African régime must respect the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Angola.

46. I wish, in conclusion, to commend the United Nations Council for Namibia for its important work in the cause of freedom and independence for Namibia.

47. Mr. KOROMA (Sierra Leone): It is timely and appropriate that the question of Namibia is again being taken up by the Assembly, because, as a matter of daily routine, while we sit and discuss Namibia in this chamber, notwithstanding the relaunching of negotiations by the Foreign Ministers of the five Western countries, that is, the contact group, the South African Government, as a sequel to its policy of bad faith, betrayal of the Namibian people and defiance of the will of the international community, is engaged in the execution of a deliberate and cynical policy of denying the people of Namibia their inalienable right to self-determination and independence.

48. This deliberate and cynical policy, which is at once both despicable and a challenge to the Organization, involves, first of all, the amputation and vivisection of vital areas of Namibian territory with the aim of destroying its territorial integrity, thus making it unviable politically and economically and completely dependent on South Africa. Secondly, while the Pretoria régime has unabashedly been accusing this Organization of lack of impartiality, it has been and is at present engaged in a gigantic but none the less fraudulent attempt to deny the Namibian people and their vanguard, SWAPO, of the fruits of their victory by feverishly organizing sham elections and installing its own henchmen and hand-picked puppets, the alternative mouthpiece of the Pretoria régime, who incessantly bombard our missions with offensive and crudely written leaflets, as a power base to exclude the legitimate representatives of the Namibian people. Thirdly, and in line with this cynical and pernicious policy of the Pretoria racists to

deny the people of Namibia their birthright to independence with their territory intact, the South African Government has escalated the militarization of the Territory, and according to the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia [A/36/24], the South African occupation army today stands at 110,000 troops and paramilitary soldiers, including 30,000 Namibians recruited by conscription. Furthermore, and again in line with this odious policy of preventing genuine independence in Namibia, the Pretoria régime has encouraged and set up tribal armies with a view to implanting chaos which it could later exploit and use as a pretext for interfering in the Territory when it eventually gains its independence.

49. The foregoing is the policy which South Africa has planned with respect to Namibia and is executing at this very moment of our consideration of this item here in the Assembly. It is a deliberate and calculated policy designed to thwart any move by the Namibian people towards genuine independence. It is at once a policy of defiance and of playing for time, designed to hoodwink the international community.

50. But it is wishful thinking for the Pretoria régime to believe that it can deny the Namibian people the exercise of their right to self-determination, let alone frustrate, through shameless intrigues, the relentless efforts of the Namibian people and the international community to achieve independence for Namibia.

51. In fact, over 15 years ago, this body pronounced itself unequivocally and terminated irrevocably South Africa's Mandate over Namibia, declaring at the same time that South Africa had failed to carry out that Mandate with regard to the administration of the Territory. In 1976, the Security Council adopted resolution 385 (1976), in which it called for free and fair elections to be held under the supervision and control of the United Nations. In 1978 the Security Council adopted its now famous resolution 435 (1978), in which it endorsed the United Nations plan calling for a cease-fire in Namibia and the withdrawal of South African troops from the Territory and decided to establish UNTAG to assist the Special Representative of the Secretary-General to ensure the holding of free and impartial elections, thus leading to the establishment of a constituent assembly.

52. Even though South Africa was a party to the negotiations which led to the adoption of resolution 435 (1978) and eventually accepted all its terms and conditions, when the time came to implement it South Africa claimed that it was premature to do so and accused the United Nations of partiality.

53. Unfortunately, the contact group of Western States, wittingly or unwittingly, would seem to have taken seriously this hypocritical claim by South Africa. The records will show that it is South Africa that has been guilty of duplicity in seeking a solution to the Namibian problem. It is South Africa and not the United Nations that is guilty of the illegal occupation of Namibia. It is South Africa that is executing a policy of amputation and vivisection, leading to the undermining of the independence and territorial integrity of Namibia. Yes, it is South Africa that has, contrary to Security Council resolution 435 (1978), embarked on a two-year strategy, contained in its secret plan, to reach an internal political *fait accompli* by installing its own puppets as a power base to counter and exclude the legitimate representative of the Namibian people, SWAPO. It is South Africa that has increased the militarization of the Territory and estab-

lished tribal armies to pit the Namibian people one against the other. It is South Africa that has intensified its repression of the Namibian people. It is South Africa, and not this Organization, that has engaged in all these machinations and criminal activities. That is why it is imperative that this myth about the partiality of the United Nations must be exploded once and for all. It is a myth which ought not to have been tolerated in the first place.

54. But, notwithstanding the cynical accusation levelled against the United Nations by the Pretoria régime, the only action the United Nations has deemed appropriate is to recognize SWAPO as the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people. That recognition of SWAPO has been earned, for it is SWAPO that has borne the brunt of expelling the South Africans from their territory. It is SWAPO, not the Democratic Turnhalle Alliance, that has sought to induce the South African Government and its forces of occupation militarily, politically and diplomatically to liberate the Territory. It is SWAPO that has embarked on a nationhood programme for Namibia, sending Namibians to schools and universities and organizing social and health facilities for thousands of Namibian refugees.

55. The Pretoria Government's accusation of this Organization therefore ought not to have been taken seriously. South Africa's continued illegal occupation of Namibia, on the other hand, should continue to be viewed as a matter of grave concern to the Organization, for it not only disregards international legality but constitutes a grave threat to international peace and security in that region. The neighbouring States of Angola, Botswana and Zambia have become victims of South Africa's armed military aggression launched against their territories from Namibia, under the pretext that they are harbouring SWAPO freedom fighters.

56. As I stated earlier, it is 15 years since the United Nations revoked South Africa's Mandate over Namibia, and during this period numerous organs of the Organization have called for its evacuation of the Territory. South Africa has refused to implement resolution 435 (1978). The Security Council was therefore called on to impose on it the punitive provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter, but South Africa was saved on that occasion by the use of the veto by its friends in the Council. As if encouraged by such action, in August of this year South Africa launched naked and premeditated armed aggression against Angola. Again sanctions were called for, but this time they were opposed by the Government of the United States, for reasons best known to it but manifestly contrary to the Charter and against the interest of the suffering Namibian people and the victimized people of Angola.

57. Now another round of negotiations has been embarked upon but with very little hope of their being successful, given the nature of the Pretoria régime and its proclivity for prevarication and evasiveness. While we are prepared to wait, although not beyond the spring of 1982; for the latest round to set a firm date for Namibian independence, the Pretoria régime must be left in no doubt that this time around, should it fail to fulfil its responsibility for the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) and continue on its path of lawlessness and defiance, action will be substituted for debate and negotiations and the full force of Chapter VII of the Charter will be brought to bear against it.

58. Miss DEVER (Belgium) (*interpretation from French*): The Belgian delegation would like to add the following comments to the statement of the 10 States members of the European Community made by the representative of the United Kingdom at the 67th meeting.

59. Belgium would like to see Namibia accede to independence as soon as possible. Belgium is doing its utmost to play a constructive role in the United Nations Council for Namibia, of which it has the honour of being a member. In that capacity it has always tried, despite certain reservations, to abide by the principle of consensus that is customary in that body.

60. This year Belgium was unfortunately unable to go along with the consensus in the United Nations Council for Namibia on draft resolutions A and B [*see A/36/24, para. 708*]. Our attitude was prompted by the content of those texts, in particular their selective and unjustified condemnation of certain Western countries and their inadmissible attacks on the contact group of five Western States. We are firmly convinced that such an approach can only jeopardize the successful outcome of the dialogue which the contact group has been seeking to conduct with a view to the peaceful and rapid transition of Namibia to independence.

61. Mr. DJALAL (Indonesia): This year there have been numerous important meetings and conferences which were specifically convened to deal with the Namibian question, the latest being the eighth emergency special session in September of this year. It was convened because of the failure of the Security Council in April 1981 to adopt a draft resolution on comprehensive and mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations. During that series of Security Council meetings, members of the non-aligned movement and other Members of the United Nations urged the adoption of mandatory sanctions against South Africa as the necessary step to implement resolution 435 (1978).

62. Unfortunately, the Security Council was unable to act because of the negative votes of three permanent members, making impossible any meaningful progress in the effort to achieve independence for Namibia. Therefore, the great majority of Member States considered it imperative to have an emergency special session of the General Assembly. At that session the Assembly adopted resolution ES-8/2, in which it

*“Demands the immediate commencement of the unconditional implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) without any prevarication, qualification or modification and not later than December 1981”.*

63. We are all aware that to this date there has not been any meaningful progress in the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). However, it is important to stress that the continuing efforts to achieve independence for Namibia must conform to the spirit and letter of resolution 435 (1978). Furthermore, any negotiations must be based on the understanding that independence for Namibia can be attained only through the participation of SWAPO, the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people. Furthermore, it is also important to stress that Walvis Bay and the off shore islands of Namibia are an integral and indivisible part of Namibia, as recognized in the relevant United Nations resolutions.

64. On this occasion, I wish to pay a tribute to the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, Mr.

Paul J. F. Lusaka, for his tireless efforts and dedication in fulfilling his duties.

65. In our efforts to seek a speedy solution to the question of Namibia, the role of the five nations comprising the Western contact group is extremely important, since they were the architects of resolution 435 (1978) and command great influence over South Africa. We believe that those countries should move towards a firmer position, urging South Africa to be more forthcoming in implementing resolution 435 (1978).

66. We know that the only obstacle facing United Nations efforts to achieve the independence of Namibia is the defiant attitude of South Africa. Not only has it not co-operated with the United Nations in the effort to implement resolution 435 (1978), but it has also continued to use Namibian territory to launch attacks against neighbouring countries, the latest aggression being against Angola. It is now 15 years since the United Nations assumed responsibility for Namibia, and three years have elapsed since the adoption of resolution 435 (1978), and still the situation has not changed. If the present situation continues without our doing our utmost to help our Namibian brothers, are we not demonstrating an unconscionable toleration of that odious régime? It should be apparent to all that in the event that South Africa continues to thwart the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), or if it seeks to alter fundamentally the substance of the provisions in the resolution and, furthermore, if it continues to attack the front-line States, the international community will be faced with a great crisis, threatening the region and even international peace and security.

67. If there is to be progress in implementing resolution 435 (1978), South Africa's régime must be made to feel the impact of the resolve of the international community. This requires concrete action to end South Africa's stalling tactics, which can only be brought about through the immediate adoption of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa. We are convinced that through vigilance, and as more and more Members of the United Nations impose sanctions against South Africa, that régime will be forced to relinquish its control over Namibia, the Namibian people will then enjoy freedom and independence and the world will have made a major stride in the quest for justice, peace and security. It is for this reason that my delegation supports the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia, including its conclusions and recommendations to the General Assembly.

68. Mr. RUPIA (United Republic of Tanzania): The Assembly is indeed considering the question of Namibia in an atmosphere characterized by uncertainty and confusion, but not without hope. As the Assembly is well aware, the Western contact group has submitted proposals regarding the implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia. In this connection, the front-line States' Foreign Ministers, SWAPO and ministers from Nigeria and Kenya held a meeting at Dar es-Salaam on 17 November this year. In arriving at a joint position on the latest initiatives by the five Western countries, the meeting was guided by the following principles, which will eventually govern the implementation of the United Nations plan.

69. The meeting upheld Security Council resolution 435 (1978) as the basis for Namibian independence under United Nations supervision and control. The Dar es-Salaam meeting was concerned and determined to safeguard the right of the Namibians to write the constitution of an

independent Namibia, establish their own structures of government and elect a Government of their own choice. The meeting sought to uphold the principles of democracy and human rights for all Namibians without discrimination. The meeting stressed the need to see Namibia independent as soon as possible, but not later than the end of 1982. The meeting reiterated that the source of the delay in Namibia's independence and the destabilization in southern Africa was South Africa.

70. While we do agree that none among us here is opposed to the independence of Namibia or would attempt to legitimize South Africa's occupation of Namibia, we see certain developments as both impeding Namibia's independence and serving to perpetuate the South African illegal occupation of Namibia. We shall continue to underline the primary responsibility of the five Western countries in implementing the United Nations plan. While we do so, we must continue to see that all these initiatives fall within the orbit of the United Nations, which has the central role in the independence process.

71. While we also agree that certain measures of confidence are necessary in any negotiating process, we must guard against attempts to make the confidence-building process an end in itself. It has become evident that disproportionate attention has been given to placating South Africa, which has in turn demanded concession after concession, instead of redirecting our attention to eventual solutions of the problem.

72. In this connection one cannot fail to commend the resolute determination of SWAPO, the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people, in the prosecution of the liberation struggle. If the people of Namibia have indeed accepted the United Nations as their partner in the struggle against colonialism and *apartheid*, it is because they believe, and rightly so, that by nature the United Nations must be anti-colonialist and anti-*apartheid*. It is the complementary nature of their purposes which must continue to link SWAPO and the United Nations.

73. It is a fact that the independent Namibia for which we have laboured for so long may not have a future at all if the situation in the area continues to be a state of tension. Consequently, the future of all States in the area will depend on the prevalence of peace and stability. That is why we continue to view with the utmost concern the destabilization being perpetrated by the racist régime of South Africa. In full realization of the fact that the future stability of the region will hinge squarely on the independence and territorial integrity of the African States of the area, all of us must contribute to this process and desist from any temptation to participate in or sustain any activity that would undermine the independence of Angola or any other African country in the area. In this regard, the General Assembly can do no less than to condemn the *apartheid* régime of South Africa for its continued acts of aggression against Angola and other front-line States.

74. In the meantime, while we welcome the peaceful avenues to the independence of Namibia, we are aware of the dangers involved. We hope it will not be another time-buying ploy. A year ago we went to Geneva for the pre-implementation meeting. We are all aware of the optimism that was expressed by those who were instrumental in the initiative. South Africa was not ready to negotiate, and by all measures of judgement it was guilty of sabotaging the negotiations. We went to the Security Council, where our hopes were quashed by the triple vetoes. The Assembly met in an emergency special session and reite-

rated its commitment to the Namibian struggle against colonialism and *apartheid*. This session must, in considering this question, further underline its commitment to and responsibility for the international Territory of Namibia.

75. In this connection, we should like to pay a deserved tribute to the United Nations Council for Namibia under the able presidency of Mr. Paul Lusaka of Zambia. The role it continues to play in preparing Namibia for eventual accession to independence is commendable, and it should continue to serve as the nerve centre of the Organization's activities regarding the Territory.

76. Mr. SOURINHO (Lao People's Democratic Republic) (*interpretation from French*): Fifteen years have elapsed since the General Assembly in resolution 2145 (XXI) terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia. Yet the illegal occupation of the Territory by the *apartheid* régime has none the less continued, and indeed seems to be consolidated and strengthened with each passing day. That assessment of the situation is solidly based both on actual events and on the legal situation.

77. From the point of view of the facts, South Africa has over the last few years considerably consolidated its military grip over the Territory; some 100,000 South African soldiers are in Namibia, and many military and strategic bases have been established throughout the Territory of Namibia, thus turning it into a stronghold for launching criminal aggression against various independent neighbouring countries, particularly the People's Republic of Angola and Mozambique. The latest act of aggression, committed with unspeakable barbarity against Angola last August, is the clear proof of this. This military grip has been accompanied by an economic grip: South African and foreign capital investment in Namibia has grown considerably and there has been a proliferation of multinational corporations which shamelessly exploit and plunder the natural resources of the Territory in flagrant violation of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia, enacted on 27 September 1974 by the United Nations Council for Namibia.<sup>3</sup>

78. In the legal sphere, the minority racist régime has by a series of *faits accomplis* done its utmost to set up a puppet régime, including the Turnhalle clique which, despite the great publicity campaign to give it a nationalist veneer and despite the fanfare about it in certain Western capitals, remains none the less only the shadow of its Fascist masters in Pretoria.

79. The same is true of the so-called administrative and legislative institutions created in recent months to give legal substance to the puppet clique.

80. Although this series of *faits accomplis* convinces no one but the South African racists and their faithful Western protectors, they are of greatest concern to us because, together with the military and economic support activities, they are a powerful negative element, indeed, a very grave obstacle to the accession of Namibia to independence in keeping with Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

81. That is why this session, while once again vigorously condemning South Africa's military and economic activities in Namibia, must also reiterate its firm condemnation of the criminal efforts being made by South Africa, with the support of those in certain Western circles, to impose an internal settlement in Namibia.

82. For some time now, and particularly since the adoption of the United Nations plan for a negotiated settlement of the Namibian question, it has become almost a habit, when the General Assembly is preparing or beginning its discussion of this question, for some new event to occur designed to influence, if not to mislead, the course of the deliberations here. Last year that new event took the form of South Africa's sudden announcement of its agreement to participate, after so much vacillation, in the Geneva pre-implementation meeting on the United Nations plan, which ended in resounding failure because of the sabotage of the racist régime. In September of this year, just before the opening of the eighth emergency special session—the second special session on Namibia—the new event took the form of the theatrical tour, described as an “exploratory” tour, by a highly placed foreign affairs official of the United States to various African capitals and to South Africa, after which a major South African military offensive was launched against Angola, accompanied by serious efforts in the diplomatic sphere to inject an ideological element into the Namibian conflict. Today, the new factor has taken the form of the false announcement made by certain Western agencies according to which an agreement had been reached between the front-line States and the Western contact group, which had been engaging for almost a month in a diplomatic ballet.

83. Without dwelling on the purpose of that announcement and the consequences of the relatively positive result that had been falsely announced, my delegation wishes to emphasize that that announcement was not made fortuitously, and given that we are used to that kind of surprise we cannot but be highly sceptical with regard to the psychological effect it was designed to produce and particularly about South Africa's real intention to implement the plan.

84. It is no secret that, having accepted the plan after so much vacillation and delay, the racist régime was doing its utmost to sabotage it by employing all kinds of manoeuvres, particularly by making new and unacceptable demands at each phase of the negotiations on giving effect to the plan. Nor is it a secret to anyone that, given this new and shocking position taken by South Africa, the five Western Powers of the contact group, instead of adopting a firm attitude towards the racist régime, as they had been asked to do, while continuing to reaffirm indefatigably their devotion to resolution 435 (1978) have themselves started nibbling away at the resolution by constantly putting forward new proposals which, despite their carefully applied cosmetics, are designed only to extract new concessions favourable to the *apartheid* régime.

85. With all these efforts—the outcome of which is totally uncertain—by the five Western Powers, it is difficult to avoid the thought that the negotiated solution to the Namibian question to which we are all dedicated is moving inexorably towards an imposed solution, or at least to one that is tailor-made to suit the five Western Powers and South Africa.

86. It is in order to help to prevent such an outcome, which would be disastrous for the cause of genuine independence for Namibia, and because we believe that the exercise of the right to the self-determination and independence of the Namibian people belongs in the first place to that people as a whole, free from constraint or outside interference, that my delegation has become a sponsor of the draft resolutions now before the General Assembly. Massive support for those draft resolutions, which advocate the full implementation of resolution 435



(1978), would provide a powerful impetus to Namibia's progress towards genuine independence, in keeping with the internationally accepted United Nations plan.

87. Any attempt aimed at making changes or modifications, whether minor or major, to that plan could only encourage South Africa to make new demands and gravely jeopardize the efforts of the international community to bring Namibia to independence with national unity and territorial integrity. Therefore, my delegation calls yet again for the full, strict and immediate implementation of resolution 435 (1978).

88. In conclusion, I wish to reaffirm my Government's firm solidarity with and unshakable support for the Namibian people and its vanguard movement, SWAPO, in their just cause, as well as for the front-line States, particularly Angola and Mozambique, which have been the victims of repeated aggression by the racist Pretoria régime.

89. We should also like to pay a tribute to the Secretary-General and to the United Nations Council for Namibia, which has been presided over by Mr. Paul Lusaka of Zambia with such far-sighted competence, for having shown such dedication to the cause of the independence of the Namibian people and for having worked so tirelessly in this noble cause, thereby making a major contribution to the liberation struggle of the oppressed peoples of all continents and to the eradication of colonialism in all its forms.

90. Mr. ERSUN (Turkey): The long era of colonialism is finally drawing to a close as a result of the successful efforts carried out by the Organization in this field over recent decades. The peoples of a large majority of such colonial territories have happily been able to exercise their right to self-determination and independence. The people of Namibia should have been no exception in this process. However, the rightful aspirations of the Namibian people, as well as of the whole international community supporting that people, have been continually frustrated by the stubborn resistance of South Africa to ending its illegal occupation of that Territory.

91. It is not futile to repeat here that 20 years have passed since the adoption of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples [resolution 1514 (XV)]. Fifteen years have passed since the General Assembly terminated the Mandate of South Africa over Namibia and subsequently established the United Nations Council for Namibia to exercise the responsibility of the United Nations for that Territory until independence.

92. Since then, the question of Namibia has continuously engaged the concern of the international community. The annals of the United Nations are filled with the records of the untiring efforts of the Organization—of the Secretary-General, of the General Assembly and the Security Council, of the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia, of Member States individually or as a group, and, most significantly, of the United Nations Council for Namibia—to fulfil the pledge made to the people of Namibia.

93. However, the unfortunate fact remains that South Africa is still able to flout the resolutions of the United Nations and to challenge the will of the international community. Its policies of oppression of the Namibian people and exploitation of the Territory's natural resources, its *apartheid* and its aggression against neigh-

bouring African States, particularly Angola, continue. This attitude of South Africa constitutes a violation of international law and the Charter of the United Nations and has a destabilizing effect in southern Africa. It therefore poses an increasing threat to international peace and stability.

94. Either South Africa must realize at once the futility and the danger underlying its stubborn and unlawful practices or it must be pressed to do so without further delay. A strong basis for movement in the right direction exists in the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, adopted by the Security Council in resolution 435 (1978). However, even that internationally acceptable and conciliatory plan met with intransigence and evasion from South Africa during the pre-implementation meeting held at Geneva in January 1981 under the auspices of the United Nations. There, in spite of the goodwill of all the other parties concerned and acceptance by SWAPO—the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people, as recognized by the General Assembly—of an immediate cease-fire, South Africa managed to formulate new demands for guarantees of the impartiality of the United Nations.

95. South Africa's desire to cast doubt on the impartiality of the United Nations cannot be justified. On the other hand, if this criticism is directed against the support and protection given by the United Nations to the rights and interests of the people of Namibia, then the absurdity of this criticism is self-evident. There can be no justifiable excuse for the way South Africa acted at Geneva; it could only have been a deliberate attempt to obstruct and delay the peace process.

96. The failure of the Geneva meeting was followed by inconclusive Security Council meetings. The deep concern of the international community in general and of the members of the OAU in particular led to the convening of the eighth emergency special session last September.

97. Despite South Africa's continuing refusal to end its occupation, the intense efforts that we have made so far have not been in vain. Each effort has formed a basis for the next, stronger step. The commitment of the international community to obtaining the withdrawal of South Africa from Namibia and the exercise by the Namibian people of its right to self-determination has only increased.

98. Every necessary effort must be made with a view to compelling South Africa to implement the United Nations decisions. My Government, for its part, fully abides by all the United Nations resolutions to this effect. Turkey does not maintain any kind of relations with South Africa, whether in the diplomatic and political or the economic, commercial or military fields. Turkey is pleased to contribute, although in modest terms, to the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa, the United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa and the Trust Fund for Publicity against *Apartheid* as a sign of its support for this cause.

99. We believe that it is the responsibility of each and every Member State to assist in this process. Particular responsibility in this regard lies with the members of the Western contact group, which were instrumental in the formulation of resolution 435 (1978). We are following with interest the recent initiative undertaken by that group in renewing contacts with all the parties concerned. We hope that a consensus can emerge from these contacts

which will lead to a rapid solution of the problem in the framework of resolution 435 (1978).

100. At this important time, my delegation would like to commend the United Nations Council for Namibia for the vital role it has played under the most able leadership of Mr. Paul Lusaka, in safeguarding and promoting the rights and interests of the Namibian people. Turkey will continue to participate actively in the Council's work and will continue to do everything in its power to contribute to the efforts being made to overcome the remaining obstacles in the process towards the full independence of Namibia.

101. Mr. ROA KOURÍ (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Although we are witnessing the demise of colonialism, several regions of the world are still suffering the ignominy of colonial domination, despite the unremitting efforts of their peoples and the international community to put a definitive end to that excrescence of the policy of plunder.

102. This is the case with Namibia, the Territory of South West Africa illegally occupied by the racist South African troops in flagrant violation of the relevant resolutions of the United Nations and the will for independence of the Namibian people.

103. In the years that have elapsed since the revoking of the Mandate over that Territory given to South Africa by the League of Nations, the policy of the South African régime, with the support of known Western countries, has been to strengthen its military presence in Namibia, where it has installed the abominable practice of *apartheid* and carries out the systematic plunder of the Territory's human and natural resources, while at the same time it expands its role as the man of straw for imperialist interests and acts as a spearhead for those interests against independent African countries.

104. We cannot overlook its attempt in 1975 to prevent, through armed aggression planned in connivance with the Government of the United States, the triumph of the revolution in Angola, or the fact that after six years, still encouraged by that Government, it should pursue its efforts to overthrow the legitimate Government of Angola, while promoting counter-revolutionary activities and carrying out military incursions against it by air and land from the illegally occupied territory of Namibia.

105. The independence of Namibia and the consequent expulsion of the South African racists, therefore, are not only political and moral commitments of the United Nations—Namibia being a Territory under its direct responsibility and falling within the terms of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV)—but also and equally a *sine qua non* for peace and security in the southern African States, the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of which are constantly threatened by the hegemonist and expansionist policy of South Africa.

106. There are few today who would dare to question openly the right of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence, but there are still some who are reluctant to recognize as its legitimate representative the organization which has won that right, weapon in hand, after years of heroic struggle and sacrifice—SWAPO.

107. Actually, that reluctance has nothing to do with the existence of other organizations which might lawfully claim such title—those who do claim it, the so-called

Democratic Turnhalle Alliance, among others, are but instruments of the Pretoria racists—but with the perverse intention of cheating the people of Namibia of its true independence.

108. Those who oppose SWAPO, alleging “democratic scruples” which convince no one, are the same people who attempted to impose a puppet régime in Zimbabwe at the service of the white racist minority, of *apartheid* and of their own economic interests. They are also among those who for some years now have been taking the international community from pillar to post in quest of a peaceful solution to the Namibian question, which they evade when it is about to materialize.

109. Once again, much is being said about the “great efforts” the so-called Western contact group is making with the representatives of Pretoria and the front-line States with a view to the implementation of the plan which was elaborated by that group and which the Security Council endorsed in its resolution 435 (1978).

110. However, we all remember how the efforts made by SWAPO, the front-line States and the Secretary-General to achieve concrete progress in the talks held at Geneva at the beginning of this year with the Pretoria representatives once again met with rejection by the racists, who throughout the negotiating process initiated by the contact group have simply played for time to strengthen their hold over Namibia and to pursue their undeclared war against Angola, Mozambique, Zambia and other independent States.

111. The apparent obstinacy of the South African racists—like that of their closest relatives, the Israeli Zionists—has but one explanation: the decisive economic, political and military support they receive from their imperialist partners.

112. How else can we explain the supposed difficulties encountered at every step by the contact group in trying to convince the Government of Mr. Botha? Where does the responsibility lie for that obduracy in the face of the majority will of the peoples of the world if not with some of those same countries?

113. Without entering now into a discussion of the true motives and intentions of those who act in this manner, we must recall that, in the final analysis, historically, the policy of appeasement has served only to embolden aggressors and to stimulate their rapaciousness, not to put an end to their misdeeds.

114. The conduct of the South African racists during the last 15 years tragically confirms this assertion.

115. Be that as it may, repeated delays in the implementation of the so-called United Nations plan for Namibia, of Western concoction, the chronic prevarication of Pretoria's imperialist partners and the aggressive policy of the racists against the front-line States, as well as their crimes against the Namibian people, call for energetic and resolute action by the international community in order to compel them to comply with the decisions of the Security Council and the Assembly with respect to that occupied Territory.

116. The United Nations Council for Namibia, the sole legal Administering Authority of that Territory, the non-aligned movement and the OAU have agreed on the need to increase the economic, political, military and other

assistance rendered to the SWAPO patriots so that they may intensify their struggle for the liberation of Namibia.

117. On 30 November there will be held at United Nations Headquarters the Plenary Pledging Conference of the Non-Aligned Countries for the Non-Aligned Solidarity Fund with Namibia, established by the non-aligned States. That Fund, together with support by the OAU, represents a necessary support for the just cause for our Namibian brothers. We appeal to all member States to contribute as much as they can to this initiative for the benefit of the freedom and independence of Namibia.

118. For its part, Cuba, like many other non-aligned and progressive States, is making its modest contribution to the national liberation movement of Namibia and its staunch rearguard, the front-line States, and will continue to do so until that people achieves independence in a united and whole Namibia and until the South African racists cease to promote subversion in the independent States of southern Africa and to attack them.

119. My delegation unreservedly supports the position of SWAPO and of the front-line States in their efforts to achieve a negotiated peaceful solution leading to the independence of Namibia without restrictions or conditions detrimental to its sovereignty and territorial integrity and without humiliating conditions or neo-colonialist strait-jackets, through the strict implementation, without further delay, of resolution 435 (1978), through free elections held under United Nations supervision and in keeping with the supreme interests of the people of Namibia.

120. We therefore condemn any attempt to bend the legitimate will of the Namibian people, led by its liberation movement, SWAPO, with the aim of guaranteeing the spurious interests of South Africa and its imperialist partners in a diminished or simply neo-colonized Namibia.

121. In this connection, we condemn the collusion of the three Western permanent members of the Security Council with the South African racists, which prevented the majority of members of that world body from adopting the political and economic measures provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter to isolate the terrorist régime of South Africa and compel it to withdraw from Namibia.

122. It bears repetition that Namibia is the direct responsibility of the United Nations until that Territory achieves self-determination and genuine national independence, and only the United Nations Council for Namibia can exert legal administrative authority over that Territory until then. All measures adopted by the South African occupiers are thus null and void.

123. The Assembly must unequivocally condemn the shameful collaboration of several Western countries and Israel with the racist South African régime in the military, and particularly the nuclear, field, and request all other Governments to refrain from providing it, directly or indirectly, with resources and material that would enable it to perfect and enhance its machinery of war.

124. Similarly, we must reaffirm that Security Council resolution 435 (1978) is the only basis for a peaceful settlement, and that the Council should adopt all possible measures to achieve its strict and immediate implementation.

125. The draft resolutions drawn up by the United Nations Council for Namibia [A/36/24, para. 708], respond to the legitimate interests of the Namibian people and its legitimate representative, SWAPO, and therefore deserve the support of our delegation.

126. We salute the members of the Council and its president, Mr. Lusaka, for their devotion and commitment to the cause of the people of Namibia.

127. To the followers of anti-history, those that together with the South African racists have added their names to the annals of ignominy and oppression, we proclaim the certainty that they will be severely judged for their shameful complicity with the *apartheid* régime and the certainty of the inevitable victory of the people of Namibia.

128. Mr. COUMBASSA (Guinea) (*interpretation from French*): At the beginning of this session, Sir, the Guinean delegation, through its Foreign Minister, warmly congratulated you on your election to the presidency of the Assembly [24th meeting]. My Foreign Minister also indicated the great value we attach to the relations of co-operation and friendship that exist between your country, the Republic of Iraq, and ours, the Revolutionary People's Republic of Guinea, and I now reiterate those sentiments.

129. We should like to take this opportunity to welcome the admission of Antigua and Barbuda as the one hundred fifty-seventh Member of the Organization and to assure its representatives of the full co-operation of the delegation of Guinea.

130. The debate on the question of Namibia is taking place at a particularly serious time in view of the stubborn refusal by the Pretoria régime to comply with General Assembly and Security Council resolutions calling for the withdrawal of its illegal administration from Namibia.

131. It is now 15 years since the General Assembly adopted resolution 2145 (XXI), revoking South Africa's Mandate over Namibia and declaring illegal that country's presence in the Territory, which was placed thenceforth under the responsibility of the United Nations. Since that time that responsibility has been assumed, under General Assembly resolution 2248 (S-V), by the United Nations Council for Namibia, which is presided over with competence and dedication by our brother, Mr. Paul Lusaka of Zambia.

132. Fully aware of the interests of the Namibian people, SWAPO consistently showed a constructive attitude throughout the long period of negotiations and co-operated fully in the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

133. As for South Africa, the international community has been greatly disappointed by its defiant attitude throughout the negotiations on the question.

134. The bad faith, arrogance and perfidy of Pretoria are a permanent challenge to the determination of the United Nations to reach a negotiated settlement of the Namibian question through the immediate and unconditional implementation of resolution 435 (1978).

135. The continuing illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa, together with its persistent refusal to recognize the inalienable and imprescriptible right of the Nami-

bian people to independence can only lead the freedom fighters to step up their armed struggle.

136. In the stubborn struggle which they are carrying on with courage and determination to secure their inalienable right to a free and dignified national existence, the Namibian people have the resolute support of the whole of Africa. Pretoria's régime of repression, based on systematic denial of human rights and the rights of peoples, has been repeatedly condemned by the General Assembly, the Security Council and the international community as a crime against mankind.

137. By deliberately blocking the negotiations South Africa's one aim has been to perpetuate its illegal presence in Namibia, which it is using to perpetrate repeated acts of aggression against the territorial integrity and sovereignty of neighbouring African States, particularly the People's Republic of Angola.

138. How can we account for the insolent stubbornness and continued arrogance of the *apartheid* régime of South Africa other than in terms of the political, economic and military support it has been receiving from certain Western Powers? Is the United Nations really incapable of making South Africa and its allies respect the decisions of the Security Council and the General Assembly? Can the United Nations continue to accept the deliberate violation of its decisions by racist South Africa?

139. The Namibian people did not ask to be entrusted to South Africa. It was the League of Nations which, by a simple vote, decided on the fate of our Namibian brothers. Therefore the responsibility for this situation lies with the United Nations, the successor to the League of Nations.

140. In our opinion, the major obstacle to Namibia's accession to independence lies in the continuing plunder of the natural resources of the Territory by South Africa, in collusion with the foreign economic interests of other countries, some of which bear special responsibility in the Organization for the maintenance and protection of international peace and security.

141. How else can we account for the attitude of certain Western countries, members of the contact group, which have done their utmost to protect at all costs the selfish interests of the white racist minority in southern Africa, to the detriment of the freedom and the dignity of the Namibian people?

142. What explanation can be offered for the triple veto by three permanent members of the Security Council against the adoption of resolutions on comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the racist régime of South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter?

143. Africa has not been deceived. It is fully aware of the weight of the economic and strategic interests which stand in the way of the legitimate aspirations of the Namibian people and their inalienable right to independence.

144. However, the abundance of lessons from the history of the liberation struggle of peoples strengthens our belief that neither barbarous acts of aggression nor delaying tactics on the part of certain Powers will succeed in weakening the determination of the Namibian people to recover their independence and affirm their own identity.

145. In this connection, the Secretary for Foreign Affairs of SWAPO has stated:

"The struggle will go on no matter what sacrifices it may mean for us, because we know that in the long run the oppressed masses will triumph. No State terrorism, no police brutality, no attempts at destabilization and no veto will ever succeed in thwarting the achievement of the complete liberation of Namibia and its national independence. We are also convinced that the will and determination of our patriots will never be annihilated by vetoes."

146. The obstinacy of the Pretoria régime leaves the international community no choice but to impose the comprehensive mandatory sanctions provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter.

147. In conclusion, I wish to reaffirm the Revolutionary People's Republic of Guinea upholds its complete solidarity with and support for SWAPO, the only legitimate representative of the people of Namibia, in its just national liberation struggle.

148. Mr. OYONO (United Republic of Cameroon) (*interpretation from French*): Under its resolution ES-8/2, adopted by an overwhelming majority during the eighth emergency special session last September, the General Assembly renewed its request to the Security Council to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the South African régime, pursuant to Chapter VII of the Charter. It did so in view of the continued illegal occupation of that international Territory by the Pretoria racist minority, its bloody oppression of the Namibian people, its acts of aggression against the neighbouring independent States, and the terror, instability and dangerous tension it maintains in the region, thereby seriously threatening international peace and security.

149. In that connection, and while recommending the rapid, unconditional and full implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) the Assembly at its emergency special session requested, in addition, all Member States to sever their diplomatic, consular and trade relations with South Africa.

150. The United Republic of Cameroon, whose position on the question of Namibia is well known and has been repeatedly reaffirmed here and elsewhere, supported those enforcement measures, the purpose of which was to lead South Africa to co-operate with the United Nations in its search for a peaceful settlement of the Namibian question. During that same emergency session, the Western contact group launched appeals for moderation and assured us that it would continue to endeavour to persuade South Africa to agree as soon as possible to the implementation of the United Nations settlement plan endorsed in resolution 435 (1978).

151. Moreover, our Minister for Foreign Affairs expressed our gratification at that development in his statement in the general debate at the beginning of the current session. He said:

"... while we welcome the recent declaration of five members of the Western contact group reaffirming their determination to continue their efforts to reach a prompt and peaceful solution of the Namibian problem, we hope that these initiatives will not in any sense overshadow the role of the United Nations, the sole legal authority in Namibia, or deny the Namibian peo-



ple its inalienable right to the free choice of its national institutions." [16th meeting, para. 337.]

152. What is the situation today? Should we see encouraging progress in the efforts that are under way? Be that as it may, there remains much to be done. It is clear that no decisive breakthrough appears as yet to be in the offing which would enable us to envisage the effective implementation of the United Nations plan within the expected time limits. For stress is now being laid on the need first to amend resolution 435 (1978) so as to provide it with constitutional guarantees for the minorities and for certain economic and geostrategic interests in Namibia. This prerequisite, apart from the fact that it could open the way to other dilatory manoeuvres by South Africa, is not necessary. The Namibian people, represented by SWAPO, its sole authentic representative, has given the international community sufficient assurances of its political maturity and pragmatism to make it impossible for us still to doubt its capacity freely to solve its own problems in keeping with its interests, once it acquires independence.

153. In addition, the history of decolonization has shown that peaceful coexistence between nationals and foreign minorities in the former colonial territories generally derives from a spirit of mutual respect and mutual confidence and solidarity in the same concerns and interests. Formal constitutional guarantees, however solemn they may be, have rarely created such a climate, especially when they have been imposed from outside for the benefit of minorities.

154. However, if those constitutional guarantees are the last price to be paid by Namibia for accession to true independence, then it would be desirable not to reject them *a priori*.

155. Cameroon has always considered the question of Namibia to be a problem of decolonization and illegal occupation. In this context, any proposed solution should be squarely within the context of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV).

156. At this decisive stage in the struggle waged by the brave people of the international Territory, 15 years after the General Assembly terminated South African colonial power over the Territory and created the United Nations Council for Namibia—headed today with great skill and dedication by my friend Mr. Paul Lusaka of Zambia—after so many untiring efforts by the Secretary-General and his Special Representative, Mr. Martti Ahtisaari, to promote the implementation of the settlement plan so patiently drawn up and solemnly approved by all the parties concerned, as well as by the Security Council, we are in duty bound to continue to mobilize public opinion and the international community to increase their pressure on South Africa in order to compel it to co-operate resolutely with the United Nations.

157. Any initiative that departed from this course would launch us on another hazardous adventure with the racist régime of South Africa, whose bad faith and arrogance continue to affect the credibility of the Organization.

158. Thus, we address a pressing appeal to the five members of the contact group and to all those who hold decisive trump cards by reason of the weight of their many interests in South Africa. We appeal to them, aware of their special responsibilities in the search for a negotiated solution to the Namibian question and for the main-

tenance of international peace and security, finally to trigger the process of implementation of resolution 435 (1978) through a persuasive enforcement action *vis-à-vis* the South African régime.

159. In this connection resolution ES-8/2 provides us with the appropriate framework for collective and individual action for the liberation of the Namibian people.

160. As a member of the United Nations Council for Namibia and of the Co-ordinating Committee for the Liberation of Africa of the OAU, Cameroon supports the Namibian people's aspirations to and struggle for self-determination and independence under the aegis of SWAPO and within the context of a united Namibia, including Walvis Bay. It further strongly supports all the measures advocated by the Assembly to speed up implementation of resolution 435 (1978). It rejects any unilateral solution and challenges the puppet authorities which South Africa seeks to impose on the Namibian people. Now more than ever Cameroon will continue to strengthen all the decisions that it took long ago to contribute to the isolation of South Africa, which are: to establish no relations of any kind whatsoever with the racist South African régime; to exclude from Cameroonian territory any ship, boat or aircraft of that country, whether coming from or going to it; and to train refugee Namibian students.

161. In that spirit we support all the conclusions and recommendations contained in the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia, in the drafting of which my delegation took part in the Council. Those decisions, adopted and applied resolutely by our respective States, will have a twofold effect: they will act as a catalyst for the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia and for the dismantling of *apartheid*. Let us hope that the Assembly will remember that.

162. Mr. FONSEKA (Sir Lanka): More than 15 years have passed since the General Assembly, by its resolution 2145 (XXI), terminated the Mandate of South Africa over Namibia, declaring South Africa's presence in the Territory illegal and clearly placing Namibia under the direct responsibility of the United Nations.

163. Since then the question of Namibia has been debated in these forums so frequently and with such little apparent success as to lead some to a feeling of cynicism about the efficacy of the United Nations in dealing with this question. The continuous reiteration by the international community and the repetition of the fact that the only political solution for Namibia is one based on the effective termination of South Africa's illegal occupation, including withdrawal of its armed forces, and on the free and unfettered exercise by all Namibian people of their right to self-determination and independence in accordance with Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) and Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978), have not brought Namibia any closer to independence.

164. Security Council resolution 435 (1978) held out an all-too-brief promise of freedom for Namibia, only for it to be frustrated by South Africa's intransigence and prevarication. The story of the pre-implementation talks earlier this year is too well known to need repetition by me. South Africa continues to drag its feet by talking of strengthening confidence when in fact the only confidence that has been eroded is in the bona fides of the South African régime itself. That régime not only persists in denying the people of Namibia their inalienable right to

self-determination and independence, but continues its resort to ruthless political repression and its violation of all human rights. Its strengthened military presence in Namibia has meant also that South Africa has indulged in repeated acts of aggression against independent African States, thereby not only gravely affecting the peace and security of the southern African region, but also increasing the danger of escalating the conflict far beyond that region.

165. South Africa does not appear to have given up its efforts to bring about a sham independence in Namibia by creating a puppet régime. The United Nations needs to be particularly vigilant to ensure that the only viable and just plan for Namibian independence, that endorsed in Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978), is not sidetracked.

166. The insidious efforts by South Africa to undermine and discredit SWAPO is part of the régime's over-all design to suppress all genuine national sentiment in Namibia. SWAPO, the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people, aware of its own strength in the Territory as well as of the recognition and support it receives from the international community, has expressed readiness to participate in the United Nations plan, in accordance with the Security Council resolutions to which I have referred.

167. The international community, particularly those States which initiated the United Nations plan and which more than any others have the diplomatic and other means to pressure South Africa to live up to its assurances, has a

particular responsibility to implement the plan, without any modification, qualification, dilution, prevarication or delay.

168. Frequent appeals have been made to SWAPO and the freedom fighters in Namibia to forswear the armed struggle, and United Nations resolutions have elicited abstentions on the grounds that support is being given to armed struggle as a means of hastening the inevitable freedom of Namibia. These appeals sound more and more hollow as South Africa gets away with breaking up, on the most specious grounds, the peaceful negotiating process, in which, we are once again told, there are encouraging signs of initially positive reactions. Those who feel thus encouraged must transform those positive reactions into positive action.

169. The very credibility of the United Nations and the peaceful negotiating process it offers are under threat. The question of Namibia will inevitably disappear from the agenda of the General Assembly, but let us all hasten that process.

*The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.*

---

NOTES

<sup>1</sup> *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.*

<sup>2</sup> See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-sixth Year, 2296th to 2300th meetings.*

<sup>3</sup> *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-fifth Session, Supplement No. 24, annex II.*