



**OFFICIAL RECORDS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
NINTH SPECIAL SESSION**

**PLENARY MEETINGS**

Verbatim records of the meetings

***AD HOC* COMMITTEE OF THE  
NINTH SPECIAL SESSION**

Sessional Fascicle

**ANNEXES**

---

24 APRIL – 3 May 1978

**UNITED NATIONS**

New York, 1979

## INTRODUCTORY NOTE

Since the thirty-first session, the *Official Records of the General Assembly* have consisted of records of meetings, sessional fascicles for each of the Main Committees, annexes to the meeting records, supplements, the *List of Delegations* and the *Check List of Documents*. Information on other documents is given in the *Check List* and in the relevant annex fascicles.

\*  
\*   \*   \*

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

---

The *Check List of Documents* for the ninth special session is contained in this volume.

**CONTENTS**

	<i>Page</i>		<i>Page</i>
<b>Note of convocation</b> .....	v	<b>3rd meeting</b>	
		<i>Tuesday, 25 April 1978, at 11.15 a.m.</i>	
<b>Agenda of the ninth special session</b> .....	vi	AGENDA ITEM 7:	
		Question of Namibia ( <i>continued</i> ) .....	37
<b>Check list of documents</b> .....	vii	<b>4th meeting</b>	
		<i>Tuesday, 25 April 1978, at 3.35 p.m.</i>	
		AGENDA ITEM 7:	
		Question of Namibia ( <i>continued</i> ) .....	53
 <i>Part One</i> <b>PLENARY MEETINGS</b>			
<b>1st meeting</b>		<b>5th meeting</b>	
<i>Monday, 24 April 1978, at 11.05 a.m.</i>		<i>Wednesday, 26 April 1978, at 11.05 a.m.</i>	
AGENDA ITEM 1:		ADDRESS BY MR. LEON MEBIAME, PRIME	
Opening of the session by the Chairman of the		MINISTER OF THE GABONESE REPUBLIC ..	69
delegation of Yugoslavia .....	3	AGENDA ITEM 7:	
AGENDA ITEM 2:		Question of Namibia ( <i>continued</i> ) .....	71
Minute of silent prayer or meditation .....	3	<b>6th meeting</b>	
AGENDA ITEM 3:		<i>Wednesday, 26 April 1978, at 3.35 p.m.</i>	
Credentials of representatives to the ninth special		AGENDA ITEM 7:	
session of the General Assembly:		Question of Namibia ( <i>continued</i> ) .....	85
(a) Appointment of the members of the Creden-		<b>7th meeting</b>	
tials Committee .....	3	<i>Thursday, 27 April 1978, at 11.10 a.m.</i>	
AGENDA ITEM 4:		AGENDA ITEM 7:	
Election of the President of the General Assembly		Question of Namibia ( <i>continued</i> ) .....	105
STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT .....	4	<b>8th meeting</b>	
AGENDA ITEM 5:		<i>Thursday, 27 April 1978, at 3.35 p.m.</i>	
Organization of the session .....	5	AGENDA ITEM 7:	
AGENDA ITEM 6:		Question of Namibia ( <i>continued</i> ) .....	121
Adoption of the agenda .....	6	<b>9th meeting</b>	
AGENDA ITEM 7:		<i>Friday, 28 April 1978, at 11 a.m.</i>	
Question of Namibia .....	6	AGENDA ITEM 7:	
<b>2nd meeting</b>		Question of Namibia ( <i>continued</i> ) .....	141
<i>Monday, 24 April 1978, at 3.35 p.m.</i>			
AGENDA ITEM 7:			
Question of Namibia ( <i>continued</i> ) .....	17		
ORGANIZATION OF WORK .....	35		

	<i>Page</i>		<i>Page</i>
<b>10th meeting</b>		AGENDA ITEM 7:	
<i>Friday, 28 April 1978, at 3.30 p.m.</i>		Question of Namibia ( <i>concluded</i> ) . . . . .	237
AGENDA ITEM 7:		Report of the <i>Ad Hoc</i> Committee of the ninth special session . . . . .	237
Question of Namibia ( <i>continued</i> ) . . . . .	151	AGENDA ITEM 2:	
<b>11th meeting</b>		Minute of silent prayer or meditation . . . . .	243
<i>Monday, 1 May 1978, at 11.05 a.m.</i>		CLOSURE OF THE NINTH SPECIAL SESSION . . . . .	243
AGENDA ITEM 7:			
Question of Namibia ( <i>continued</i> ) . . . . .	169		
<b>12th meeting</b>			
<i>Monday, 1 May 1978, at 3.35 p.m.</i>		<b>Part Two</b>	
AGENDA ITEM 7:		<b>AD HOC COMMITTEE OF THE NINTH SPECIAL SESSION</b>	
Question of Namibia ( <i>continued</i> ) . . . . .	183	<b>Sessional Fascicle</b>	
<b>13th meeting</b>		<b>Contents of meetings</b> . . . . .	247
<i>Tuesday, 2 May 1978, at 11.05 a.m.</i>		<b>Corrigendum</b> . . . . .	248
AGENDA ITEM 7:			
Question of Namibia ( <i>continued</i> ) . . . . .	205		
<b>14th meeting</b>			
<i>Tuesday, 2 May 1978, at 3.35 p.m.</i>		<b>Part Three</b>	
AGENDA ITEM 7:		<b>ANNEXES</b>	
Question of Namibia ( <i>continued</i> ) . . . . .	217	Agenda item 3: Credentials of representatives to the ninth special session of the General Assembly:	
<b>15th meeting</b>		( <i>a</i> ) Appointment of the members of the Creden- tials Committee;	
<i>Wednesday, 3 May 1978, at 11.20 a.m.</i>		( <i>b</i> ) Report of the Credentials Committee . . . . .	251
AGENDA ITEM 3:		Agenda item 6: Adoption of the agenda . . . . .	255
Credentials of representatives to the ninth special session of the General Assembly ( <i>concluded</i> ):		Agenda item 7: Question of Namibia . . . . .	257
( <i>b</i> ) Report of the Credentials Committee . . . . .	237		

## NOTE OF CONVOCATION

The Secretary-General of the United Nations presents his compliments to the Permanent Representative of . . . to the United Nations and has the honour to refer to resolution 32/9 H of 4 November 1977 in which the General Assembly decided to hold a special session on the question of Namibia before the thirty-third session on a date to be determined by the Secretary-General in consultation with the United Nations Council for Namibia.

In accordance with the above-mentioned resolution, the Secretary-General consulted the United Nations Council for Namibia which recommended the dates of 24 April to 3 May 1978 for the holding of the special session.

The Secretary-General therefore, in accordance with rule 10 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, has the honour to inform the Permanent Representative that the ninth special session of the Assembly will convene at United Nations Headquarters, New York, on Monday, 24 April 1978, at 10.30 a.m.

Three copies of the provisional agenda, drawn up in accordance with rule 16 of the rules of procedure, are attached (A/S-9/1). Further copies will be distributed through the usual channels.

The Secretary-General wishes to remind the Permanent Representative that the credentials of those representatives who are not already authorized to represent their Governments at all sessions of the General Assembly should be issued in accordance with rule 27 of the rules of procedure.

The Secretary-General would be grateful if the Permanent Representative would kindly bring the above information to the attention of his Government.

28 February 1978

### **AGENDA OF THE NINTH SPECIAL SESSION\***

1. Opening of the session by the Chairman of the delegation of Yugoslavia.
2. Minute of silent prayer or meditation.
3. Credentials of representatives to the ninth special session of the General Assembly:
  - (a) Appointment of the members of the Credentials Committee;
  - (b) Report of the Credentials Committee.
4. Election of the President.
5. Organization of the session.
6. Adoption of the agenda.
7. Question of Namibia.

---

\* The agenda of the ninth special session was adopted by the General Assembly at its 1st plenary meeting, on 24 April 1978. For the relevant documents, see below, "Part Three. Annexes", agenda item 6.

## CHECK LIST OF DOCUMENTS

*Note.* Listed below are all documents pertaining to the ninth special session. An asterisk after the agenda item indicates that the document is published in the corresponding annex fascicle included in this volume. Where there is no asterisk after the agenda item or any mention in the column "Observations and references", the document exists only in mimeographed form.

<i>Document No.</i>	<i>Title or description</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	<i>Observations and references</i>
A/INF/S-9/1	Note by the Secretary-General containing the list of the resolutions and the text of the decisions adopted by the General Assembly during its ninth special session	5	
A/RES/S-9/1 and 2	Resolutions adopted by the General Assembly during its ninth special session		See A/5-9/13
A/S-8/6	Letter dated 20 April 1978 from the Secretary-General to the President of the General Assembly		
A/S-9/1	Provisional agenda of the ninth special session of the General Assembly	6*	
A/S-9/2-S/12631	Letter dated 4 April 1978 from the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia to the Secretary-General transmitting the text of the Lusaka Declaration.	7	Mimeographed. For the text of the Declaration, see A/S-9/4, para. 31
A/S-9/3	Letter dated 4 April 1978 from the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia to the Secretary-General	5	
A/S-9/4	Report of the United Nations Council for Namibia	7	<i>Official Records of the General Assembly, Ninth Special Session, Supplement No. 1</i>
A/S-9/5	Annotated provisional agenda of the ninth special session of the General Assembly	6	
A/S-9/6	Letter dated 13 April 1978 from the Acting Chairman 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 to the Secretary-General	7	
A/S-9/7	Letter dated 21 April 1978 from the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia to the Secretary-General	7	
A/S-9/8	Adoption of a programme of action on disarmament: report of the Secretary-General		This document has been cancelled. The information contained in it has been incorporated in document A/S-10/8
A/S-9/8/Rev.1	Agenda of the ninth special session of the General Assembly	6	See <i>Official Records of the General Assembly, Ninth Special Session, Plenary Meetings, p. viii</i>
A/S-9/9	Letter dated 24 April 1978 from the President of the General Assembly to the Secretary-General		
A/S-9/10	Report of the Credentials Committee	3*	
A/S-9/11	Report of the <i>Ad Hoc</i> Committee of the ninth special session	7*	
A/S-9/12-S/12678	Letter dated 2 May 1978 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of South Africa to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General	7	See <i>Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-third Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1978</i>
A/S-9/13	Resolutions and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its ninth special session (24 April-3 May 1978)		<i>Official Records of the General Assembly, Ninth Special Session, Supplement No. 2</i>

---

<i>Document No.</i>	<i>Title or description</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	<i>Observations and references</i>
A/S-9/AC.1/1	Note by the Chairman of the <i>Ad Hoc</i> Committee of the ninth special session	7	
A/S-9/AC.1/SR.1-5	Summary records of the meetings held by the <i>Ad Hoc</i> Committee of the ninth special session		
A/S-9/PV.1-15	Verbatim records of the plenary meetings held by the General Assembly during its ninth special session		See below part one of this volume



**Part One**

**PLENARY MEETINGS**

**Verbatim records of the meetings,  
held at Headquarters, New York, from 24 April to 3 May 1978**

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

NINTH SPECIAL SESSION

Official Records



**1st  
PLENARY MEETING**

Monday, 24 April 1978,  
at 11.05 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

- Agenda item 1:  
Opening of the session by the Chairman of the delegation of Yugoslavia
- Agenda item 2:  
Minute of silent prayer or meditation
- Agenda item 3:  
Credentials of representatives to the ninth special session of the General Assembly:  
(a) Appointment of the members of the Credentials Committee
- Agenda item 4:  
Election of the President of the General Assembly
- Statement by the President
- Agenda item 5:  
Organization of the session
- Agenda item 6:  
Adoption of the agenda
- Agenda item 7:  
Question of Namibia

*President: Mr. Lazar MOJSOV (Yugoslavia).*

AGENDA ITEM 1

**Opening of the session by the Chairman of the delegation of Yugoslavia**

1. The TEMPORARY PRESIDENT: In accordance with rule 30 of the rules of procedure, I declare open the ninth special session of the General Assembly.

AGENDA ITEM 2

**Minute of silent prayer or meditation**

2. The TEMPORARY PRESIDENT: I invite representatives to stand and observe one minute of silent prayer or meditation.

*The representatives, standing, observed a minute's silence.*

AGENDA ITEM 3

**Credentials of representatives to the ninth special session of the General Assembly:**

(a) Appointment of the members of the Credentials Committee

3. The TEMPORARY PRESIDENT: Rule 28 of the rules of procedure provides that a Credentials Committee shall be

appointed at the beginning of each session and that it shall consist of nine members to be appointed by the General Assembly on the proposal of the President.

4. With a view to expediting the work of the special session and in accordance with precedents, it might be appropriate—as recommended by the United Nations Council for Namibia in document A/S-9/3—if the Credentials Committee were to consist of the same members as those appointed for the thirty-second regular session, namely: Canada, China, Ecuador, Fiji, Madagascar, Nepal, Nigeria, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and United States of America. If there is no objection, I shall consider the Credentials Committee constituted accordingly.

*It was so decided (decision S-9/11).*

5. The TEMPORARY PRESIDENT: In this connexion, may I invite the attention of the members of the General Assembly to a note verbale from the Secretary-General, dated 28 February 1978, in which it was stated that the credentials of those representatives who are not already authorized to represent their Governments at all sessions of the General Assembly should be issued in accordance with rule 27 of the rules of procedure.

**Scale of assessments for the apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations (A/S-8/6)**

6. The TEMPORARY PRESIDENT: Before turning to the next item on our agenda for this morning, I should like, in keeping with the established practice, to invite the attention of the General Assembly to document A/S-8/6, which is still valid.

AGENDA ITEM 4

**Election of the President of the General Assembly**

7. The TEMPORARY PRESIDENT: In connexion with this item I call on the representative of Zambia in her capacity as President of the United Nations Council for Namibia.

8. Miss KONIE (Zambia), President, United Nations Council for Namibia: In my capacity as President of the United Nations Council for Namibia I have the high honour to propose to the General Assembly that Mr. Lazar Mojsov, President of the thirty-second regular session of the General Assembly continue as President of the ninth special session of the General Assembly on Namibia in keeping with the tradition of previous special sessions.

9. The exceptional qualities which Mr. Mojsov brings to the presidency of this special session are indeed known to us all. His outstanding knowledge and experience of United Nations affairs and international politics have been admired and respected by all of us who followed his wise, firm and gentle guidance throughout the thirty-second regular session to its successful conclusion. It is, furthermore, a special privilege for me to propose Mr. Mojsov for the presidency of the ninth special session since the commitment of his country to the cause of the Namibian people has been a source of inspiration and support for all those committed to the complete and immediate withdrawal of South Africa from Namibia in order that the Namibian people may speedily attain self-determination, freedom and national independence in a united Namibia.

10. I am certain that the ninth special session will fulfil its historic role in support of the aspirations of the Namibian people under the distinguished leadership of Mr. Mojsov.

11. The TEMPORARY PRESIDENT: The General Assembly has heard the proposal of the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, Her Excellency Ambassador Gwendoline Konie of Zambia, that the President of the thirty-second regular session serve as President of the General Assembly at its ninth special session. I take it that the proposal is adopted by the Assembly.

*It was so decided (decision S-9/12).*

*Statement by the President*

12. The PRESIDENT: May I, first of all, express my deepest gratitude for the honour representatives have done me by electing me to preside over the ninth special session of the General Assembly. The recognition that they have accorded me I accept with a sense of full responsibility and determination to exert, together with all representatives and with the assistance of the Vice-Presidents of the General Assembly and the Chairmen of the Main Committees, every effort towards conducting effective deliberations and reaching a successful conclusion of the ninth special session of the General Assembly.

13. We have met once again in order to deal with an important and pressing issue. We must undertake resolute and determined action, with a sense of urgency, so as to contribute to the solution of a situation which has for too many years now encumbered over-all international relations. However, before proceeding with the matter at hand, I wish to extend my most cordial greetings to all representatives and to express my satisfaction at our renewed assembly, and to wish all representatives much success in the discharge of their assigned mission.

14. This special session of the General Assembly, which has been convened pursuant to General Assembly resolution 32/9 H, is the ninth special session since the founding of the United Nations. Eight times in the past, the General Assembly found it indispensable to devote itself exclusively to the review of a single problem in the knowledge that the urgency and magnitude of a special problem merited such an approach. In the case of Namibia, the General Assembly is meeting in special session for the second time since terminating, in 1967, South Africa's mandate to administer

the Territory and adopting a series of measures aimed at securing Namibia's independence. Regrettably, after 11 years of debate, study of the problem, and adoption of numerous resolutions by our Organization, Namibia has not yet become independent, simply because South Africa has failed to demonstrate its willingness to terminate its illegal occupation and colonial oppression in Namibia. This special session of the General Assembly should, in view of the pressing need and urgency of the situation, adopt such decisions as will expedite the process of enabling the Namibian people to achieve self-determination, freedom and national independence in a united Namibia within the framework of the already established just basis.

15. The existing situation in Namibia is anything but encouraging. South Africa persists in acting in defiance of all decisions of the United Nations relating to Namibia. It has failed to implement a single provision contained in Security Council resolution 385 (1976), which reasserts the conditions for a just and peaceful settlement through negotiations. It has, moreover, been undertaking measures directly aimed at undermining the future of Namibia as a free and sovereign State.

16. In persisting in its illegal occupation of the Territory, South Africa has been engaged in perpetual aggression against the Namibian people. No substantial changes have occurred in its racist policy of *apartheid* and bantustanization of Namibia either. A reign of terror and intimidation of the Namibian people, and total war against the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), their sole and authentic liberation movement, continue with impunity.

17. The militarization of the Territory, where, according to some sources, the South African colonialists have stationed more than 50,000 soldiers and police, continues. A huge concentration of troops and most sophisticated weapons are used for waging war against the liberation movement of Namibia and launching attacks against the adjacent independent African States. The colonialist forces have organized the dispatching of mercenaries against neighbouring Angola. As a culmination of all this, news is circulating to the effect that South Africa has been making preparations for using certain areas in the Territory—the Kalahari desert—for conducting nuclear explosion tests.

18. All this clearly confirms the intention of South Africa to persist in its aggression against Namibia and the neighbouring African States, seriously jeopardizing, thereby, peace and security in southern Africa and creating a situation having far-reaching implications for international security and peace in general.

19. The exploitation of the natural resources of the Territory—which are the birth-right of the Namibian people—is part and parcel of the daily scene. South Africa, in co-operation with certain transnational corporations, is engaged in a reckless plunder of Namibia's wealth which is, in turn, siphoned out of the country in the form of profits, dividends and interest. African workers, moreover, are paid discriminatory wages while this exploitation goes on. All the decisions of the United Nations aimed at stopping this unscrupulous exploitation, all appeals to some States to refrain from economic dealings with South Africa because of its actions in Namibia, have remained without any result

so far. The plunder of Namibia's natural resources and the high profits gained by foreign economic interests through such ventures constitute the main obstacles standing in the way to Namibia's independence and serve as a vehicle for the perpetuation of colonial occupation.

20. The decision of South Africa to annex Walvis Bay is in direct violation of the fundamental principles set forth in the resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly relating to the integrity of the Territory. Such annexation would seriously undermine the process leading to the independence of Namibia and amount to a great economic loss, since what is involved is an Atlantic port situated deep inside the Territory and, furthermore, a developed industrial centre of Namibia. South Africa's policy of retaining an "enclave" in the Territory sounds so familiar. Such a practice gives rise to new problems and threatens international relations in general.

21. The South African colonialists realize that by resorting to violence and reprisals they cannot break the resistance of the Namibian people and its resolute struggle for freedom and independence. They are also aware of the growing indignation of the international community, which has made their one-time allies change their stance. In the given situation, South Africa nevertheless continues to flout the pertinent decisions of the United Nations on the granting of independence to Namibia. Efforts to establish quasi-independence under the so-called Turnhalle group, to create tribal councils and to organize tribal armies are aimed at excluding the legitimate representative of the Namibian people, SWAPO, from the process of self-determination and independence and at imposing a puppet régime which would ensure the continued influence of South Africa in Namibia and the unhampered exploitation of the natural resources of the country in the future as well.

22. SWAPO has accepted the idea of a peaceful solution of the question of Namibia through free elections to be conducted under the supervision of the United Nations. South Africa has so far neither created conditions that would facilitate the holding of free elections in Namibia nor demonstrated readiness to abide by Security Council resolution 385 (1976). In such circumstances, the political and armed struggle waged by SWAPO is continuing and meeting with the justified support of the international community, since it represents a decisive factor in the struggle for the independence of Namibia. Other more recent but still unsuccessful efforts made towards finding a peaceful solution are welcome to the extent that they satisfy, in the present phase of the struggle, the legitimate aspirations of the Namibian people and its liberation movement.

23. Having in mind these developments and the concerns stated above, as well as the responsibility of the United Nations for the fate of Namibia and the role our Organization has been playing, I believe that we face a complex and responsible task, the solution of which calls for additional efforts from all of us. It will be necessary, at this special session, to examine the over-all situation and, on the basis of our collective assessment, propose concrete measures and actions which the United Nations should undertake in the coming period. It is indispensable that these decisions reflect our support for the genuine independence

of Namibia and for the safeguarding of its national unity and territorial integrity; they should also reflect our opposition to all attempts at imposing a partial solution to the problem contrary to the genuine interests of the Namibian people. The existing resolutions and decisions of the United Nations relating to Namibia and the numerous useful recommendations of the United Nations Council for Namibia provide a sound basis and the only acceptable grounds for the decisions which we shall adopt during this special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

## AGENDA ITEM 5

### Organization of the session

24. The PRESIDENT: On the basis of the practice of previous special sessions, and taking into consideration the recommendation in paragraph 4 of document A/S-9/3, I should like to propose that the Chairmen of the Main Committees who were elected for the thirty-second session should continue in the same posts for the ninth special session, on the understanding that each Chairman of a Main Committee who is absent from this special session will be replaced by another member of his delegation. Furthermore, the Vice-Chairmen of the General Assembly who were elected for the thirty-second session will continue in that capacity during the ninth special session. This would ensure the representative character of the General Committee.

25. If there is no objection, may I take it that the General Assembly decides to approve those proposals?

*It was so decided.*

26. The PRESIDENT: Regarding the Chairmen of the Main Committees, it is my understanding that only the Chairman of the First Committee of the thirty-second session, Mr. Frank Edmund Boaten of Ghana; the Chairman of the Second Committee, Mr. Peter Jankowitsch of Austria; and the Chairman of the Fifth Committee, Mr. Morteza Talieh of Iran, are present at this special session. The following replacements have been communicated to the Secretariat: for the Chairman of the Special Political Committee—Mr. Siegfried Zachmann of the German Democratic Republic; for the Chairman of the Third Committee—Miss Marcela Martinez of Jamaica; for the Chairman of the Fourth Committee—Mr. Taher Al-Hussamy of the Syrian Arab Republic; and for the Chairman of the Sixth Committee—Mr. Alvaro Bonilla of Colombia. If I hear no objections, I take it that the General Assembly approves these nominations.

*It was so decided (decision S-9/13).*

27. The PRESIDENT: The Member States that held the vice-presidencies at the thirty-second session will serve in the same capacity at the ninth special session. They are the following: China, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, France, Gabon, Guatemala, Indonesia, Lesotho, Madagascar, the Netherlands, Peru, Sierra Leone, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of

America. If I hear no objections, I shall consider that the General Assembly accepts this proposal.

*It was so decided (decision S-9/14).*

28. The PRESIDENT: The General Committee for the ninth special session of the General Assembly has now been fully constituted.

#### AGENDA ITEM 6

##### Adoption of the agenda

29. The PRESIDENT: The provisional agenda of the ninth special session of the General Assembly is to be found in document A/S-9/1. The United Nations Council for Namibia has recommended, in paragraph 2 of the annex to document A/S-9/3, a certain number of topics to be examined under item 7 of the provisional agenda. In order to expedite our work, the Assembly may wish to adopt the provisional agenda in plenary meeting without referring it to the General Committee. May I take it that the General Assembly agrees to this procedure?

*It was so decided.*

30. The PRESIDENT: I now ask the Assembly whether there is any objection to the adoption of the provisional agenda as it appears in document A/S-9/1. If there is no objection, I shall declare the agenda adopted.

*The agenda was adopted (decision S-9/21).*

31. The PRESIDENT: Regarding the allocation of agenda item 7, the United Nations Council for Namibia has recommended, in paragraph 5 of the annex to document A/S-9/3, that the special session should establish a committee of the whole, which may constitute open-ended working groups as necessary. In this connexion I should like to make the following proposals: first, that the General Assembly should follow a procedure similar to that followed at the sixth and seventh special sessions; that is, establish an *ad hoc* committee of the ninth special session, which would be a committee of the whole with a chairman, three vice-chairmen and a rapporteur, and accord to its chairman for the duration of the session full rights of membership in the General Committee, including the right to vote, on the understanding that the chairman of the *ad hoc* committee would be elected by the Assembly; secondly, that agenda item 7, entitled "Question of Namibia", should be allocated to the *ad hoc* committee, which would be entrusted with the task of considering the proposals submitted under the item and of reporting to the General Assembly, except that the debate on the item should take place in the plenary Assembly; thirdly, that it should be for the *ad hoc* committee to set up working groups as necessary. May I take it that the General Assembly approves those proposals?

*It was so decided (decision S-9/22).<sup>1</sup>*

32. The PRESIDENT: Concerning the election of the Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, I understand that

informal consultations among delegations and with the chairmen of regional groups have led to a general agreement to elect Miss Gwendoline C. Konie, Permanent Representative of Zambia to the United Nations and President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, as Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee. In the absence of any objection, I declare Miss Konie elected by acclamation Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee of the ninth special session of the General Assembly (decision S-9/15). I congratulate her on behalf of the General Assembly and on my own behalf and wish her well.

33. The election of the other officers of the *Ad Hoc* Committee will take place at its first meeting, which will be held at 10 a.m. tomorrow.<sup>2</sup>

#### AGENDA ITEM 7

##### Question of Namibia

34. The PRESIDENT: The first speaker is the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, Miss Konie of Zambia.

35. Miss KONIE (Zambia), President of the United Nations Council for Namibia: First, I should like to thank the General Assembly for electing me Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee by acclamation.

36. On behalf of the Council for Namibia I wish to congratulate you warmly, Sir, upon your election to the post of President of the ninth special session of the General Assembly. Your election has a very special significance. Yugoslavia belongs to the group of countries appointed to the Council for Namibia on its establishment in 1967.

37. Your many years of association with the United Nations as well as your dedicated and concerned participation in the activities related to the fundamental issues of the Organization will ensure that this second special session of the General Assembly on the question of Namibia will make a decisive contribution to the fulfilment of the solemn commitment of the United Nations in support of the self-determination, freedom and independence of the Namibian people in a united Namibia.

38. As President of the United Nations Council for Namibia I am particularly aware of the profound understanding and whole-hearted commitment of the Government and people of Yugoslavia to the struggle of the Namibian people to fulfil their deep aspirations to liberate their country from the colonialist and racist oppressor.

39. This ninth special session of the General Assembly, convened to reassess the internal and international situation regarding Namibia and the effectiveness of the solemn commitment of the United Nations in support of the self-determination of the Namibian people and of the territorial integrity of Namibia, meets a decade after the General Assembly decided to establish the United Nations Council for Namibia as the expression of the irrevocable decision of the General Assembly to put an end to the

<sup>1</sup> See also the record of the 2nd meeting, para. 206.

<sup>2</sup> See the record of the 1st meeting of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, paras. 2-7.

oppression and colonial exploitation of the Namibian people by the illegal South African administration in the Territory. The General Assembly, in its wisdom, through resolution 2248 (S-V) concretely expressed the solidarity of the international community with the people of Namibia. The expression of this solidarity has had far-reaching effects. Member States of the United Nations recognized the legitimacy of the appeals of a proud and peaceful people against the brutal oppression of colonialist and racist South Africa. The United Nations, bound by its Charter to attempt to solve international conflicts by peaceful means, slowly but surely mobilized all progressive sectors of the international community in support of the legitimate aspirations of the Namibian people. The determined efforts of many in the broad struggle against the forces of colonialism and racism have led to significant victories both inside and outside the United Nations. The mandate given to the Council for Namibia in 1967 established the direction of action by the United Nations to intensify systematically its support for the Namibian people.

40. The efforts of the Namibian people to negotiate with the colonialist and racist administration of South Africa met with no success. In the light of the intransigence and ruthlessness of the Pretoria régime the people of Namibia undertook the armed struggle to fulfil their national aspirations for self-determination, freedom and national independence in a united Namibia, repeating the historical commitment made by many peoples all over the world against all forms of colonialist exploitation and control.

41. Shortly after obtaining the Mandate over the Territory of Namibia, South Africa proceeded to establish oppressive conditions to exploit the Namibian people and deny them their inalienable rights as human beings with legitimate aspirations to self-determination, freedom and national independence. The protests of the people and their leaders led only to increased brutality and oppression. The enforcement since the twenties of exploitative and racist rules and regulations contributed to an intensified effort by the Namibian people to reaffirm their rights and their legitimate aspirations.

42. The extent of South African exploitation of the people and resources of Namibia has been significantly increased through the support which South Africa has received from foreign economic interests which have plundered the natural resources of the Territory and have practised the extremely racist and discriminatory employment policies of *apartheid*. Those foreign economic interests bear a most serious responsibility for the brutality of South African domination in Namibia. Their obsessive greed for the diamonds, copper and uranium of Namibia have certainly contributed to the support of an illegal occupation régime which has brought untold suffering to the people of Namibia.

43. In spite of the increasing oppression, courageous Namibian patriots organized Namibian workers to protest against the exploitative contract labour system and eventually formed SWAPO to promote the cause of national independence in a united Namibia. The firm stand of Namibian patriots against the illegal South African administration led to rules and regulations creating harsh and unusual punishment for any act of defiance against the illegal South African administration.

44. It is well known how South African police have carried out the repression and intimidation of the Namibian people. Police and troops have imprisoned, tortured and killed innocent civilians whose only crime was to assert their integrity. Mankind has witnessed throughout history many instances of human brutality and ruthlessness. However, the systematic practices of *apartheid* and bantustanization rank above all episodes of reckless human brutality in their duration and cruelty. The Pretoria régime has undoubtedly earned the epithet of the abomination of mankind.

45. The number of Namibian patriots who have shed their blood for self-determination and independence for the Namibian people is very large indeed. But it has inspired a growing number of Namibians to fight with all available means to fulfil their legitimate aspirations.

46. The ruthless brutality of the South African régime appears to have no end. Massive transfers of population, indiscriminate detention, torture and assassination are the way of life imposed on the Namibian people. More recently, the creation of tribal armies and the incitement of one sector of the population against another in order to perpetuate its exploitation and colonialist control are attempts to intimidate Namibians and to prepare the ground for the imposition of a puppet régime under which the Namibian people would supposedly be granted independence, which would be a false independence, and thereby continue to serve the hegemonistic ambitions of the Pretoria régime.

47. Since 1967 SWAPO, the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people, has with increasing effectiveness carried out armed attacks against the ruthless oppressor. The people's liberation army of Namibia reflects the unshakable decision of Namibian patriots to struggle by all available means until genuine independence is fully achieved for the Namibian people.

48. South Africa has not only exploited the people and resources of Namibia; it has also used Namibia as a springboard for aggression against neighbouring States with the purpose of consolidating its hegemony through intimidation and brutal armed attacks, in particular against the People's Republic of Angola and the Republic of Zambia. The recklessness of the Pretoria régime has gone to the extent of the Government's engaging in the planning and production of nuclear weapons, for which it has created testing sites in the Kalahari Desert area in Namibia.

49. In spite of the acts of brutal repression by the illegal occupation régime against the Namibian people, South Africa has been unable to prevent the consolidation of support for SWAPO within Namibia and in the international community as a whole.

50. The efforts of SWAPO in the armed struggle against the illegal occupation régime have been fully recognized in the international community. The Organization of African Unity (OAU) has declared SWAPO to be the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people. The General Assembly of the United Nations too has recognized SWAPO as the sole and authentic representative of the people of Namibia. Furthermore, the General Assembly has

granted SWAPO observer status, thus strengthening its ability to participate in the activities of the Organization.

51. The extent of the support of the international community for SWAPO was underlined at the international Conference organized by SWAPO and by a national committee representing various strands of political groupings, trade unions and religious and cultural affiliations in Belgium. That Conference was held in Brussels in May 1972 and was sponsored by the Presidents of several African States and the Prime Minister of Guyana. The Conference adopted a declaration<sup>3</sup> expressing full support for the Namibian people, led by SWAPO, in their struggle for self-determination and national independence.

52. Southern Africa today is no longer the sheltered arena of colonialist and racist minority régimes. During the past decade the collapse of the Portuguese colonial empire and the effectiveness of the liberation struggle of the peoples of southern Africa have created conditions for the complete elimination of colonialism and racism in southern Africa. The Pretoria régime, in its attempts to resist the fulfilment of the aspirations of the peoples of southern Africa to self-determination, freedom and national independence, is continuously increasing the threat to international peace and security.

53. The manoeuvres of the Pretoria régime against the legitimate aspirations of the peoples of southern Africa will not prevail. In Namibia changes which occurred during the past decade are concrete evidence that the will of the people is irreversible. Colonialist exploitation and control are the expression of military and political objectives no longer tolerated by the indigenous people, who enjoy the full support of all progressive forces of mankind.

54. The General Assembly has continuously demanded the withdrawal of the administration and troops of the illegal South African occupation régime in Namibia. The Security Council, in conformity with the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of 21 June 1971,<sup>4</sup> has reaffirmed in resolution 385 (1976) that the presence of South Africa in Namibia is illegal, and has demanded its withdrawal from the Territory. In that resolution the Security Council formulated the conditions for a peaceful settlement of the question of Namibia. All efforts of the international community must be geared to obtaining the complete withdrawal of the South African administration and military forces from the Territory, with the implementation of the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council in support of self-determination and national independence for the Namibian people in a united Namibia.

55. During the past decade the Council for Namibia has endeavoured to fulfil its mandate to obtain the withdrawal of the illegal administration of South Africa by all means at its disposal. As a result, the uninformed and apathetic attitude in large sectors of the international community has

been replaced by a much deeper understanding of the situation in Namibia and by a strong commitment to the withdrawal of the illegal South African administration with its brutal policies of *apartheid* and homelands, which the Pretoria régime has systematically applied in the Territory, which remains the responsibility of the United Nations until independence.

56. The Council has formulated and implemented a vigorous policy of dissemination of information on Namibia to mobilize the international community for a sustained and effective rejection of the illegal presence of the South African administration in the Territory. Through its missions of consultation the Council has brought home to governmental authorities of Member States the exploitative character of South African occupation of Namibia and the urgency of measures to obtain the complete withdrawal of the South African administration and troops from the Territory. The Council has drawn the attention of Member States to the need to put an end to any activity of South Africa through which it pretends to represent the interests of the people of the Territory. The Council has therefore endeavoured to represent Namibia in international organizations and conferences, thus ensuring the protection of the interests of the people of Namibia in the formulation and development of all forms of international co-operation.

57. During this crucial decade the Council has consolidated its co-operation with SWAPO to intensify its assistance to Namibian patriots everywhere. The creation of the United Nations Fund for Namibia, the establishment of the United Nations Institute for Namibia and the creation of the Nationhood Programme, as well as the assignment of an indicative planning figure for Namibia in the United Nations Development Programme, attest to the vigorous and sustained action of the Council for Namibia in support of the Namibian people and their sole and authentic liberation movement, SWAPO.

58. The efforts of the United Nations to mobilize support for the cause of the Namibian people during the last decade led to the convening of two particularly successful conferences. The International Conference of Experts for the Support of Victims of Colonialism and *Apartheid* in southern Africa, held at Oslo, Norway, from 9 to 14 April 1973, defined a programme of action<sup>5</sup> which inspired many new initiatives in support of the people of Namibia and their liberation struggle. More recently, in December 1976, the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General [*resolution 31/145*], in co-operation with 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 Council for Namibia, to organize the International Conference in Support of the Peoples of Zimbabwe and Namibia. This Conference, held at Maputo, Mozambique, approved a declaration and programme of action on Namibia and Zimbabwe<sup>6</sup> which has also contributed to enhance the efforts of the international community for the liberation struggle in southern Africa against the illegal

<sup>3</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-seventh session, Supplement No. 24*, vol. II, appendix II.

<sup>4</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>5</sup> See A/9061, para. 49.

<sup>6</sup> A/32/109/Rev.1-S/12344/Rev.1, annex V. For the printed text, see *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-second Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1977*.

occupation of Namibia by South Africa and against the racist minority régime in southern Africa.

59. We have arrived now at a stage of the liberation struggle for southern Africa in which the peoples of the region are fully committed to putting an end to colonialism and racism in all their forms. The people of Namibia, under the leadership of SWAPO, their sole and authentic liberation movement, demand with a single voice the immediate withdrawal of the illegal occupation régime of South Africa. By their personal sacrifices they have proved their conviction and their determination to carry out the liberation struggle until independence. This special session of the General Assembly thus has an immense responsibility to fulfil. It must determine in the most effective manner the conditions and steps for the immediate independence of Namibia in realization of its solemn commitment to the people of Namibia.

60. Fully aware of the grave political responsibilities it must shoulder, the Council for Namibia has since January of this year endeavoured to carry out consultations and discussions which would enable it to assist the General Assembly in the discharge of its solemn commitment to the Namibian people. Missions of consultation were sent to several African States in order to ascertain the concerns and priorities of friendly Governments in their efforts to support the liberation struggle of the Namibian people. The results of the initiatives of the Council for Namibia are expressed in the report it has submitted to the ninth special session [A/S-9/4] related to its extraordinary plenary meetings at Lusaka and in particular in the 1978 Lusaka Declaration of the Council, adopted at Lusaka on 23 March 1978 [*ibid.*, para. 31].

61. In the 1978 Lusaka Declaration the Council for Namibia expressed its central concerns in assisting the Namibian people to attain self-determination, freedom and national independence in a united Namibia. The Council has stressed its commitment to ending the illegal South African occupation in Namibia through its complete and unconditional withdrawal to enable the Namibian people, under the leadership of SWAPO, to exercise freely its right to self-determination and independence. The Council firmly supports SWAPO, the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people, and it has the firm conviction that, in conformity with the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, the United Nations must endeavour to ensure the transfer of power in Namibia to SWAPO, the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people. The Council for Namibia is therefore committed to ensuring the territorial integrity of Namibia against any attempts to dismember the Territory through the illegal annexation of Walvis Bay by South Africa. The Council strongly and unequivocally reaffirms that Walvis Bay is not a question of territorial claims; it is an inviolable and non-negotiable part of Namibia.

62. The Council for Namibia has given careful and exhaustive consideration to the issues before this special session. Therefore it has decided to submit to the representatives of Member States of the United Nations a working paper [A/S-9/7] containing a well-considered draft declaration and programme of action in support of the liberation of Namibia for discussion and adoption by the General Assembly.

63. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the Chairman 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, His Excellency Mr. Salim A. Salim, of the United Republic of Tanzania.

64. Mr. SALIM (United Republic of Tanzania), Chairman, Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples: Allow me at the outset to say how gratified I am to see you, Sir, presiding over the deliberations of this special session of the General Assembly. Through my close association with you over the past several years, both personally and in my capacity as the Chairman of the Special Committee, I am particularly aware of your outstanding ability and competence, your acknowledged integrity and, above all, your personal commitment and dedication to the cause of the people who are still languishing under colonial and alien rule.

65. Your election to the presidency of the General Assembly at this extremely important session is indeed a most fitting tribute to the Government and people of the country you so ably represent, Yugoslavia, whose outstanding contributions in the field of decolonization I am sure require no elaboration in this forum. The positive role played by Yugoslavia as an active member of both the Special Committee and the United Nations Council for Namibia is a matter of record. I am fully confident that you will once again discharge your heavy responsibilities with your demonstrated skill and competence.

66. The decision of the international community to devote a special session of the General Assembly to the question of Namibia may be said to be truly timely and appropriate for two main reasons. First, it clearly demonstrates at this critical time in the history of Namibia the importance that the international community attaches to the question. Secondly, it underscores our determination to find a solution to a problem which, in addition to constituting a major obstacle to the pursuit of normal international relations, is seriously affecting both the moral and the juridical authority of the United Nations.

67. As we once again examine the situation obtaining in Namibia, we must in the first instance take into account the fact that, in addition to being a colonial issue, the problem of Namibia is that of the illegal occupation of an international Territory, in open defiance of the authority of the Security Council and in contravention of numerous decisions adopted by the General Assembly. Thus, as we search for a solution, we are not only attempting to assist a colonial people in its struggle to regain its freedom, we are also demonstrating to the South African authorities that the United Nations is fully and irrevocably determined to enforce its authority over the Territory which they have illegally occupied.

68. The voluminous documentation available on the question of Namibia makes it unnecessary to delve at length at this stage into the particulars of the question. However, certain basic and known facts do bear repetition and should indeed be borne in mind in elaborating whatever initiatives



or measures may emerge from our deliberations. One of the basic elements is, as I have just stated, that Namibia is a United Nations Territory which South Africa is illegally occupying by force of arms. South Africa's response to the decisions of the United Nations in regard to its illegal occupation has always been one of utter defiance and contempt. Instead of withdrawing from the Territory, it has systematically consolidated its position to prevent the Namibian people from achieving genuine independence. Irrefutable evidence exists that, even as it is negotiating, the Pretoria régime is continuing its military build-up in the Territory and escalating its repression of the Namibian people. There is evidence also that, by instigating a terror campaign in the Territory, by holding its illegal trials, by harassing, intimidating and otherwise repressing the people of Namibia, and in particular the members of SWAPO, South Africa plans to use the resulting climate of violence as a pretext for maintaining its armed forces in the Territory and for promoting ethnic strife so as to advance further its policies of bantustanization. The international community must therefore be constantly alert to any possible action by which the Pretoria régime might seek further to entrench its illegal occupation of the Territory through a so-called internal settlement.

69. Also to be borne in mind is the fact that, in order to perpetuate its illegal domination, South Africa has never hesitated in the past to use the international Territory of Namibia as a base for its repeated acts of aggression against neighbouring States, in particular against the People's Republic of Angola and the Republic of Zambia. The world community should be mindful therefore that the explosive situation obtaining in the Territory as a result of South Africa's illegal occupation, the war being waged by that country against the Namibians and those continuing acts of aggression against independent African States clearly constitute a most serious threat to international peace and security. It is therefore self-evident that the time is long overdue for all appropriate measures to be taken to end this situation, including the full application of the measures provided for under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter.

70. The special session also provides the international community with a unique opportunity to mobilize our collective efforts in support of the struggle currently raging in Namibia. That responsibility is all the more compelling, to enable the people of Namibia, under the leadership of their national liberation movement—SWAPO—to carry their struggle to a successful conclusion. At the same time, it is important that we, the international community, continue to support SWAPO unequivocally in its efforts to achieve national independence in Namibia as a whole, including Walvis Bay. Not only must South Africa's move to annex Walvis Bay be condemned for what it is—that is, a clear violation of United Nations resolutions and in particular Security Council resolution 385 (1976)—but also more importantly the international community must act in a united and decisive manner to confound such manoeuvres by the illegal occupying forces. We must, therefore, all act to preserve the unity and territorial integrity of Namibia.

71. Those and other equally important considerations were duly taken into account by the Special Committee during its recent consideration of the question of Namibia.

As members are aware, the Special Committee concluded its study of the question by adopting a consensus text—which is now before the General Assembly in document A/S-9/6—in which it set out its views and recommendations as regards the implementation of a declaration with respect to the Territory. I commend that text to the serious attention of the members of the Assembly.

72. As the United Nations body entrusted with the task of ensuring the full and speedy implementation of the Declaration, the Special Committee will naturally continue its efforts to mobilize world public opinion by all possible means and to muster international support for and assistance to the people of Namibia in their struggle for liberation. In this connexion, I should like, on behalf of the Special Committee, to pay a tribute to the important and effective role played by the United Nations Council for Namibia, which, as the legal Administering Authority for the Territory until its independence and the policy-making organ of the United Nations in respect of Namibia, has been working tirelessly to discharge effectively the mandate entrusted to it and to enable the Namibian people to exercise its right to self-determination and independence.

73. I wish to pay a particular tribute to the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, Ambassador Gwendoline Konie of Zambia, for her dynamic efforts in pursuit of our common objective in Namibia. Her unanimous election this morning by the Assembly as Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee augurs well for the deliberations of our session.

74. In conclusion, I should like to stress once again that the liberation of Namibia will not be achieved merely by appealing to the South African Government; nor will that Government be induced to change its policies by the application of half-hearted measures. We, the international community, have both the means and the capacity to solve the problems posed to us by the recalcitrant authorities in Pretoria. All that is asked of us is that we summon the will to address ourselves to the problem squarely, set aside petty interests and short-term gains and persevere on the only course open to us—that of unqualified support for a people which is merely asking for what all of us here consider our birthright. In this context, it is all the more appropriate that we call upon all those States and financial, economic and other interests which have directly or indirectly sustained South Africa's defiance of the international community to desist from their collaboration with that régime.

75. Let this session be an action-oriented one. Let it be a fitting culmination of the collective efforts of the international community in the struggle for the liberation of Namibia. The Special Committee is confident that this special session will live up to the expectations raised by the various major international Conferences that have taken place in the last two years, including the Dakar International Conference on Namibia and Human Rights, the Maputo International Conference in Support of the Peoples of Zimbabwe and Namibia, the World Conference for Action against *Apartheid*, held at Lagos, and the recently concluded extraordinary meetings of the United Nations Council for Namibia, held at Lusaka.

76. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the President of the South West Africa People's Organization, Mr. Sam Nujoma.

77. Mr. NUJOMA (South West Africa People's Organization): It is indeed a great honour and privilege for me to address this Assembly once again within seven months on behalf of the oppressed people of Namibia, and indeed on behalf of SWAPO, this time on the occasion of the ninth special session of the General Assembly on Namibia.

78. Sir, I am especially pleased to address the Assembly under your presidency. Needless to say, your qualifications and accomplishments accumulated and demonstrated over the years in the service of your country and the United Nations system are concrete evidence that you should preside over this particular session. It is these considerations, and, no doubt, much more, which assure our delegation that you will with the usual skill and wisdom steer the deliberations of the session to a successful conclusion.

79. Mr. President, I should have failed in my duty if I did not, while I am talking about you and your country, point out the fact that I was in your great country exactly two weeks ago today. I met President Tito, Comrades Milos Minić and Martin Getinić, respectively Foreign Minister and Acting President of the Socialist Alliance of Yugoslav Workers. During this last trip, as always in the past, SWAPO and the embattled masses of Namibia have been assured of continued and increased support and concrete assistance by President Tito, the Socialist Federal Republic and the Socialist Alliance of Yugoslavia. On this basis, I have no doubt in my mind that your country and you, Mr. President, will aspire to invigorate and inspire the rest of the socialist and non-aligned countries, and indeed the entire progressive world, to increase and intensify their much appreciated support of and assistance to our Movement so that we, in turn, can further intensify and prosecute the armed liberation struggle to the final goal of the liberation and genuine national independence of Namibia.

80. It is fitting and proper to recall at this juncture that this Assembly met from 21 April to 13 June 1967 in a fifth special session on the very same question of Namibia. That special session began its plenary meetings exactly on this very date, 24 April, 11 years ago. I hope there is something positive in this happy coincidence.

81. Today, we are meeting once again in yet another special session to reaffirm, on the one hand, the continued direct responsibility of the United Nations for Namibia, through the instrumentality of the United Nations Council for Namibia, which was charged by the special session in 1967 with administrative and legislative authority until independence. On the other hand, we have to examine in detail the whole range of issues concerning the struggle of the oppressed Namibians, under the leadership of SWAPO, their sole and authentic representative, with a view to providing relevant answers to the pressing needs of this struggle and, further, to devise effective measures to end the illegal, colonial military occupation of Namibia by the racist rulers of *apartheid* South Africa.

82. The termination of South Africa's Mandate over Namibia by the General Assembly on 27 October 1966 by

114 votes to 2, with 3 abstentions, [*resolution 2145 (XXI)*] was a milestone in the long and arduous history of the question of Namibia in the United Nations. The decision to terminate the Mandate and the subsequent International Court of Justice opinion of 1971,<sup>4</sup> which reaffirmed and gave juridical validity to it, have elevated the problem of Namibia to the prominent status of a unique decolonization question in United Nations history. The importance of this special undertaking must not be compromised or lost as long as Namibia is not totally liberated or not under the full control of the Namibians themselves.

83. We are meeting at a time when there is quite a lot of talk and activity about the desirability of a negotiated settlement rather than a military solution to the colonial conflict in our country. I wish to comment briefly on this in respect of Namibia. In this context, it is worth while to recall once again the words of wisdom and good will used by many a representative in this chamber in 1966 and in 1967 during those debates on independence for Namibia. I intend to show that the United Nations and the entire people of Namibia have always favoured a serious effort to effect a negotiated settlement in Namibia. But South Africa has never accepted this. It has been and still is racist South Africa and its imperialist collaborators and partners which have obstructed all avenues and efforts to that end. When progressive countries were proposing effective measures to evict South Africa from Namibia, those States made reactionary proposals calling for further studies and volunteered empty promises in defence of South Africa and their own interests in Namibia. All of a sudden it is now being suggested by some of the same recalcitrant States that the oppressed people of Namibia and the United Nations, and not they, themselves, are to be blamed for the lack of a peaceful settlement in Namibia.

84. This august Assembly knows full well about the many missions and initiatives undertaken in the past by various organs of this Organization and by certain friendly countries on their own to reason with and persuade the ruling clique in Pretoria to come to terms with the international community for a solution through the ballot box rather than through the bullet, but to no avail.

85. Let me cite just a few examples from the decisions adopted by the General Assembly that were later reaffirmed by the Security Council. Having terminated the Mandate on the grounds that South Africa had failed to fulfil the sacred trust in respect of Namibia, the Assembly decided by resolution 2145 (XXI) that South Africa had no right to continue to administer the Territory and thenceforth Namibia became the direct responsibility of the United Nations. To concretize that historic decision, the Assembly then established at that time [*resolution 2248 (S-V)*] the United Nations Council for Namibia in 1967, which would take over the administration and replace South African authority with a United Nations presence in Namibia.

86. Furthermore, the Council would also, in consultation with the Namibians, establish a Constituent Assembly to draft an independence constitution. This would be followed by national elections held on the basis of universal adult suffrage. Upon the formation of a government, Namibia would become an independent sovereign State. The As-

sembly also warned that any action by South Africa to impede the Council's work would be considered as constituting a flagrant defiance of the authority of the United Nations, and that in such an event action by the Security Council would be called for under Chapter VII of the Charter.

87. It is a matter of public record that in the last 11 years South Africa has done nothing meaningful to co-operate with the Council or with the United Nations in general on the question of Namibia. The régime has, over the years, become more vicious and repressive and has militarized the entire country to the detriment of our people. Today that régime is an international outcast, both for its policies and practices in Namibia and for the colonial system of *apartheid* in South Africa itself. In practice, South Africa has been excluded for ever from this most representative Assembly. However, thanks to the vetoes of its Western allies in the Security Council, South Africa still is a Member of this Organization.

88. It is very important, in our view, that as we search for effective measures—militarily, politically and diplomatically—so the historical perspective of the evolution of the question of Namibia in the United Nations should not be lost. In this context, the special responsibility assumed by this Organization over Namibia until its independence must never be compromised; neither should it be allowed to be circumvented. It is not only the inalienable right of the oppressed Namibians to self-determination and independence that is at stake. The very purposes and principles that justify the existence of the United Nations itself are inextricably linked to the question of the independence of Namibia, which has remained on the agenda of the Assembly since 1946.

89. During the years since 1966, much has happened in Namibia and in the world. Colonial repression and oppression of the people of Namibia and the ruthless depletion of the country's natural resources have continued unabated. Many lives have been lost and much property destroyed, and our people are languishing under a régime of brutal military and police terror. The territorial integrity and unity of our country and people have been usurped and destroyed. South Africa and its collaborators from certain major Western Powers have carried out acts of aggression in Namibia that now constitute a serious threat to the peace and security of the world. The Security Council, instead of being an effective ally of the Assembly for ensuring protection of victims of colonial injustice, has been used by the Western permanent members to obstruct progress through the repeated exercise of vetoes and has consequently been rendered ineffective.

90. All this has taken place with a negative effect on our struggle. But there is also the other side, the positive side, of developments on the world scene. Let us pause and think how many countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America have rid themselves of the evils of imperialism, colonialism and racist reaction since 1966.

91. SWAPO and the people of Namibia applaud the heroic struggle and final victory of the peoples of Indo-China; and on our own continent, Africa. We rejoice in the recent victories of the peoples of Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique,

Angola, and Sao Tome and Principe. These countries have now become full Members of this Organization and other international bodies. It is these positive revolutionary developments which inspire and motivate us to emulate their fine examples.

92. We in Namibia, in the rest of southern Africa in particular and in Africa in general are confident that our own efforts will also be crowned with similar victories sooner rather than later. We are confident because we are witnesses to the fact that the tensions between the progressive forces and those of imperialism and reaction in the international arena have shifted the balance of power in our favour. We also see in this the ever worsening economic crisis in the capitalist world.

93. We note with satisfaction the ever broadening base of co-operation among the nations of the third world, the non-aligned movement and the socialist countries in all spheres of human endeavour. As natural and ideological allies of that group of countries, which together represent more than two thirds of the human race and possess the largest reservoir of raw materials and an extensive world market, we are convinced that the days of the world hegemony of Western imperialism and colonialism are numbered.

94. This is the character of the world situation today, as we see it. In our region, southern Africa, the confrontation between our forces of national liberation, which are waging an armed struggle, and the minority racist colonialists and their supporters, has reached a decisive and critical phase signalling a certain change of the *status quo* there.

95. In 1966, the racist military régime of South Africa and its Western supporters were intoxicated with an arrogance of power. They felt no need to talk to the oppressed masses in Namibia about a negotiated settlement. True to type, they once again misread and miscalculated the dynamics of the colonial conflict. Consequently, they made a misjudgement concerning the inevitable victory of the armed liberation struggle in southern Africa until it all suddenly happened in the former colonies of Portugal in Africa. Now they are desperately trying to undermine the armed liberation struggle being waged by the People's Liberation Army of Namibia (PLAN). But this they will certainly not achieve, for we in SWAPO are forever convinced that it is only the intensified armed liberation struggle waged by the Namibian people, under the leadership of SWAPO, which will create the necessary conditions for the realization of our right to self-determination, genuine national independence and social liberation for our country. We will therefore not allow ourselves to be deflected from this correct course. I must assure the Assembly at this special session that SWAPO and the embattled masses of Namibia are most grateful to the overwhelming number of Member States of this Organization which, in support of this determination, reaffirmed the legitimacy of the armed struggle being waged by SWAPO and committed themselves to support us.

96. It was South Africa which started violence and is still maintaining a state of war in Namibia. Ours is a war of resistance. We regard our own war of liberation as just and, therefore, deserving support from all the peoples the world over that love justice and peace.

97. Vorster's long-range problem in Namibia is how to get out, when to do so and whom to leave behind in charge of a neo-colonial, puppet régime that he wishes to create there. At the same time, he is really for the moment not prepared to abandon Namibia for strategic, economic and political reasons. This is the dilemma and it is being suggested that SWAPO and the victims of South Africa's police state in Namibia must be sympathetic, understanding and sensitive to this colonial aggressor's predicament. SWAPO declares once again here that the cardinal issue is for Vorster and his racist henchmen to get out of Namibia forthwith so that **the oppressed people of the country can assume the State power.** This is the same position that the United Nations, the OAU and the rest of the world community have been insisting on for many years.

98. We will never allow a situation to arise in which our attention will be drawn away from what is actually taking place on the ground in Namibia as a result of South Africa's cruel repression and violent maimings and killings of our innocent civilian population. The press statements and all the other propaganda devices of the Pretoria régime which portray Namibia as a peaceful and happy place are false and must be exposed, denounced and rejected. They are a vain effort to hide the sufferings of our people and the bloody violence caused by that régime; they are a sinister scheme to hoodwink world opinion.

99. Today in Namibia there is a dangerous situation of widespread violence officially organized and instigated expressly against SWAPO by the agents of the régime as represented by the Turnhalle tribal gathering.

100. Colonial power is illegitimate foreign domination, which in Namibia, as elsewhere in the world, has been imposed on the people by the use of brutal force. Throughout, violence has been relied upon by the successive colonial régimes in Namibia as a singular means of control and callously used to instigate ethnic strife and create animosities among our people in order to keep them divided, thereby perpetuating colonial rule and exploitation.

101. Today there is a new wave of official violence against our people by the occupation régime itself, through the use of tribal and reactionary elements associated with the South African-sponsored Turnhalle group or the so-called Democratic Turnhalle Alliance (DTA).

102. I should now like to cite examples of this rekindled massive violence against SWAPO members and supporters since 28 February 1978 in Windhoek and later in other parts of the country. On that day two SWAPO comrades, Angula Henock and Isak Max, were brutally killed by a group of hired tribal thugs in Windhoek. No arrests have been made because the police sided openly with the tribal elements and, to add insult to injury, used tear gas against those who wished to assist the victims. More than 14 persons were injured, some of whom later died. Despite the fact that no arrest was made, one racist brigadier, Verster, the local so-called Chief Police Commissioner, announced that SWAPO was to blame for the violence. The SWAPO leadership inside Namibia restrained our followers not to retaliate in the face of this naked provocation.

103. On Wednesday, 1 March 1978, five SWAPO members, namely, Michael Mvula, Michael Frans, Andreas Johannes, Henock Shimwafeni and Levi Jerobeam, were shot and admitted to hospital. Again, no arrest was made; instead the police reportedly said: "It was a quiet and uneventful day". The hospital authorities initially denied admitting any casualties. However, following inside information which we received from one of the nurses, SWAPO challenged both the police and the hospital authorities. We inquired as to when the five comrades in ward 2B had been shot and admitted to the hospital. It was only then that a ridiculous police statement was made to the effect that an unknown and unidentified person had shot into the residence of these comrades and seriously injured the victims, two of whom later died. The police were neither interested in nor heeded the call by SWAPO officials to prevent the violent situation, as long as the victims were SWAPO supporters.

104. On Saturday, 4 March, Shafooli Shaeamange was stoned and stabbed and had his throat cut. His friend, David Kulo, was also stabbed but managed to escape. Murder squads associated with certain Turnhalle tribal elements were recruited, financed and ferried to Windhoek and other urban centres from remote regions, such as Aminuis, Okakarara, Otjinene and Ohopoho, and put in charge of virtually the entire section of Katutura township. They maintained there a reign of terror and continued to carry out indiscriminate attacks and killings of SWAPO members. Still no arrests were made. On the other hand, police disarmed, dispersed or arrested only SWAPO members or those suspected of being SWAPO members, ignoring the Turnhalle instigators. These conspicuous and clearly partial actions of the fascist police infuriated our people and caused much tension.

105. On Sunday afternoon, 5 March, a large group of tribalists belonging to the so-called National Unity Democratic Organization (NUDO) of the Turnhalle tribal group launched an organized attack on the inhabitants of single workers' quarters in Katutura township around Windhoek. A fierce fight ensued in which five people died. While this fight was in full swing, the police were "patrolling" only the residential section of the victims. The police used tear-gas or otherwise arrested innocent people and not those who had started the fight. One of the dead was a bodyguard of a certain tribal chief who was once prominent in the Turnhalle affair. The police quickly arrested the so-called suspected SWAPO murderers. But they could not fool the people. People were asking: "Why an arrest only when a NUDO-DTA element has been killed? What about the other murders?" These questions still remain unanswered.

106. On Monday, 6 March, after heavy fighting, tension ran very high in Katutura. More than 90 per cent of the workers stayed away from work.

107. Meanwhile, the so-called police chief and the so-called neutral Administrator-General, Steyn, were publicly blaming everything on SWAPO. Our demands for a judicial commission of inquiry were ignored by this official, Steyn, of the illegal régime because, as he said: "It was clear that SWAPO with its violent policies was responsible for the murders". He has refused to return the hired thugs to the

regions of the country whence they were recruited, for, according to him, there was no longer influx control except, presumably, for SWAPO members.

108. It was in this atmosphere of officially instigated and organized reactionary violence which he approved and encouraged that puppet Kapuuo was killed. Nobody has been arrested, tried or convicted. But the racist police, who themselves may probably be responsible for the puppet's death, claimed that SWAPO is responsible. Actually, Kapuuo was the victim of circumstances of which he was wittingly a part without having the slightest understanding of their political repercussions. In any case, SWAPO had nothing to do with his death.

109. Following the demise of Kapuuo, thousands of South African fascist security police and paramilitary units have been deployed throughout Namibia under the guise of "maintaining peace". True to type, these agents of South Africa's colonial system embarked upon a well-calculated strategy to sow death and destruction, mistrust, hatred and suspicion among the Namibian people. Their first step was to distribute automatic rifles, machine guns and pistols among the tribal armies, Turnhalle quislings and other South African paid agents. Secondly, the police positioned themselves at strategic points within Windhoek and Katutura townships. At the same time, para-military police units were ordered to "comb" the surrounding areas, patrol highways and search Namibians suspected of being SWAPO members. Consequently, South African combat troops were put on maximum alert throughout Namibia and given orders to shoot and kill any suspected person.

110. The climax of this generalized reign of terror and officially organized and instigated violence, as well as continuous intimidation of the oppressed Namibians, especially the members of SWAPO, was the arbitrary, sweeping dictatorial powers imposed in Namibia on 18 April 1978 by the illegal occupation régime, empowering its local racist official Steyn, the so-called Administrator-General, to detain indefinitely anyone he deems "to be a threat to the Territory's security". Detainees will not be able to challenge his decision.

111. The whereabouts and conditions of detention of those arrested will be at the discretion of the so-called Administrator-General. However, these so-called emergency measures are actually politically inspired and aimed at SWAPO and our followers. It is a diabolic stratagem to suppress the legitimate demands of our people for liberation and genuine national independence. It is further proof of the régime's commitment to an internal settlement under the pretext of fighting so-called terrorism by SWAPO. These new measures have now reinforced the already existing notorious Terrorism Act and other repressive laws.

112. The recent victims of the continuing terror and violence are the following members of SWAPO, who have been either killed or detained: Axel Johannes, SWAPO member of Central Committee and Administrative Secretary in Windhoek, detained on 4 April; Jeremiah Asino, Festus Thomas, Thomas Asino—all SWAPO functionaries, arrested on 16 April; David Shapaka, Ana Inoko, Johannes Amathila, David Shiimi and David Amathila—all SWAPO members, arrested in northern Namibia. David Hausiku,

SWAPO Regional Chairman, was arrested, together with Pastor Malakia Muremi, at Runtu in Okavango District. In Rehoboth District, Frans Paulus, Attie Beukes and Paulus Denier were detained.

113. Besides these arrests, various other acts of terror and intimidation are taking place in Namibia. These include: the forceful closure of the Lutheran-run Paulinum Seminary at Otjimbingwe on 8 April; the forceful eviction of the worshippers at the Saint John's Apostolic Church, on 16 April in Windhoek; and the savage beating of nurses at Okakarara Hospital in Waterberg East District, resulting in the death of two SWAPO members on 10 April.

114. All in all, hundreds of Namibian patriots have been arrested in the wake of this new violence. Dozens of them have been killed or maimed. Coupled with this are well-documented cases of official torture of our people.

115. SWAPO has always pointed out that the so-called Administrator-General, Steyn, is a political appointee of the racist South African régime. He is a passionate believer in the philosophy of white supremacy and a defender of *apartheid* colonialism. He is definitely an agent of the system, who is implementing the repressive policies and laws in Namibia as directed from Pretoria. He is therefore an interested party to the colonial conflict in Namibia.

116. Of late he has shown his true colours: against the legitimate interests, aspirations and fundamental demands of the oppressed Namibian people for genuine national independence. The new dictatorial measures which he imposed and is now implementing in Namibia clearly show that he is there to entrench and perpetuate South Africa's colonial hold on Namibia. He had the audacity to claim as he was imposing these measures that he "felt sure that if a United Nations representative had been in Windhoek he would have agreed with the steps taken". How could that be? For these measures and indeed the entire South African military occupation of Namibia are abominable and in fact illegal and thus could not be associated with any United Nations official.

117. We have gathered irrefutable evidence through our own sources inside Namibia and from the combatants in the People's Liberation Army of Namibia of extensive enemy military build-up and activities in Namibia. For example, the régime has embarked on a reinforcement of its already huge army in Namibia. Concurrently, it is deploying new types of heavy and sophisticated armaments. This scheme involves the shipment into Namibia of large numbers of tanks, combat aircraft and artillery pieces and large quantities of ammunition. To facilitate this ever-expanding military build-up in Namibia, new bases, barracks and military airfields are being built in strategic areas in the country for offensive purposes against SWAPO and the Namibian revolution.

118. The objective of this military build-up on the part of South Africa is political and strategic. The political objective of this military build-up is to frustrate and suppress the aspirations and demands of the Namibian people for immediate independence. It is an attempt—a vain attempt to break the morale of the Namibian people and to destroy SWAPO.

119. The strategic aspect of this show of force, which entails hegemonic ambitions by the racist régime, is to undermine the stability, peace and territorial integrity of the neighbouring independent African States. It has continuously used Namibia as a spring-board to commit wanton aggression against the People's Republic of Angola and the Republic of Zambia.

120. As part of its military designs, racist South Africa also continues to train, finance and equip Angolan counter-revolutionary elements of the *União Nacional para a Independência Total de Angola* and the *Frente Nacional para a Libertação de Angola* from bases in Namibia. Those elements then infiltrate the People's Republic of Angola to carry out subversive activities. Moreover, the occupation régime has created tribal armies which it is training and arming as part of its bantustan neo-colonial strategy in Namibia. Meanwhile the illegal régime has intensified its preparations for the imposition of the internal settlement through its puppets of Turnhalle.

121. The South African colonial régime has been able to maintain its hold over Namibia by and large because of its military, economic, political and strategic ties with the major Western Powers.

122. I have gone to great lengths to describe the violence and repression suffered daily by my people at the hands of the South African racists and their imperialist allies in Namibia. This naked aggression against our people, the continued defiance of the authority of the United Nations over Namibia, the constant acts of provocation and the use of force against independent African countries in the region clearly constitute a threat to the peace and security of the world.

123. I submit that the task before the Assembly at this special session is to examine critically the current situation in Namibia upon which I have just elaborated. SWAPO, the people of Namibia and indeed all who are progressive and peace-loving are watching its deliberations. This session is expected to result in concrete measures which will expedite the effective implementation of the resolutions and decisions of the United Nations on Namibia, thereby compelling South Africa to withdraw forthwith. It is within this framework that all efforts to assist the United Nations to fulfil its responsibilities must be carried out. The implementation of Security Council resolution 385 (1976) must also be viewed within this context.

124. Earlier I mentioned missions and initiatives undertaken within the United Nations and by some other countries in order to find a basis for a peaceful and negotiated settlement for Namibia. In retrospect it may be said that those efforts did not succeed in one sense because of South Africa's continued intransigence. But in another sense the lack of success may have been due to the fact that certain fundamental principles consistent with the United Nations Charter and the resolutions of the United Nations on Namibia were not taken seriously into consideration.

125. Some of those fundamental principles are: first, the inalienable right of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence; secondly, the inviolability of the territorial integrity of Namibia and the national unity of our people; thirdly, that the legitimate interests of the

Namibian people must never be equated with colonial interests; fourthly, that the administrative responsibility of the United Nations over Namibia through the United Nations Council for Namibia must not be compromised or circumvented; fifthly, the legitimate right of the Namibian people to use all methods of resistance against foreign military occupation, including the armed liberation struggle; and sixthly, the sovereign right of the Namibian people to control the natural resources of the country. It is SWAPO's firm belief that it is only by scrupulous adherence by all of us, individually and collectively, to these basic principles that an amicable solution in accordance with the purposes of this Organization can be achieved in Namibia.

126. With regard to the initiative of the five Western Governments which have been exploring for a year now with SWAPO and South Africa a basis for the implementation of resolution 385 (1976) in its entirety, I wish to inform this Assembly that SWAPO will respond to the latest proposals of the five in due course.

127. Before concluding, I should like to state that SWAPO, having participated actively in the drawing up of the Declaration adopted by the United Nations Council for Namibia in Lusaka recently and a declaration for consideration by the special session, supports and endorses those documents.

128. We are confident that this Assembly will adopt at the end of its deliberations a progressive political declaration and a practical programme of action in order to assist the struggling people of Namibia, under the leadership of SWAPO, to accelerate the process of liberation.

129. I should like to seize this opportunity to thank all those Governments, international and non-governmental organizations, liberation support groups and individuals that have greatly strengthened, and contributed materially, politically and diplomatically to, our resolve to ensure the success of our national liberation cause.

130. May I also extend special thanks to the Secretary-General, Mr. Kurt Waldheim, for his tireless efforts to ensure the implementation of the United Nations resolutions on Namibia.

131. In the same vein, I should like to pay a special tribute to Miss Konie of Zambia for her courageous and dynamic leadership of the United Nations Council for Namibia. I should like to assure the Council and its Commissioner once again, through her, of SWAPO's appreciation of their continued co-operation with SWAPO and support for our struggle.

132. In conclusion, I should like to reaffirm that so long as racist South Africa continues to entrench and perpetuate its colonial military occupation, and so long as the plundering and exploitation of our natural and human resources continue, for so long will SWAPO persist in the intensification of the armed struggle. We are confident that our victory in this is certain. I therefore appeal, on behalf of the oppressed people of Namibia and, indeed, on behalf of SWAPO, to the world community to increase and intensify material, political, diplomatic and moral support to SWAPO.

*The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.*

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

NINTH SPECIAL SESSION

Official Records



**2nd  
PLENARY MEETING**

Monday, 24 April 1978,  
at 3.35 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Agenda item 7:  
Question of Namibia (*continued*)

Organization of work

**President: Mr. Lazar MOJSOV (Yugoslavia).**

AGENDA ITEM 7

Question of Namibia (*continued*)

1. Mr. KAISER (Bangladesh): I should at the outset like to express our deep appreciation for the keynote statements we heard this morning from Miss Konie, President of the United Nations Council for Namibia; Mr. Salim, Chairman 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; and Mr. Sam Nujoma, President of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO). They have outlined [*1st meeting*] the dimensions and set the tone for the task now facing this Assembly.

2. President Ziaur Rahman of the People's Republic of Bangladesh and the people and Government of Bangladesh consider the convening of the ninth special session of the Assembly on the question of Namibia to be an event of crucial significance, one that carries tremendous potential for enhancing either international peace or peril. This session fulfils the imperative need for an essential stock-taking, reassessment, consolidation and reaffirmation of the directions to be pursued in the resolution of this outstanding problem. The recent past has witnessed a gathering momentum in the search for a viable solution towards an independent sovereign Namibia, a process that we believe is as inevitable as the tide of history and one that cannot be stopped or stayed until injustice is redressed and right triumphs. The basic question that remains is how expeditiously this end can be pursued and at what cost, so that the people of this Territory can pursue their destiny without further division and bloodshed. Namibia remains an acid test for the United Nations, charged as it is with the unique responsibility of exercising its authority as the international trustee of the people, the resources and Territory of this region.

3. In addressing ourselves to this question, President Ziaur Rahman and the people of Bangladesh have emphatically reaffirmed what we consider to be irrefutable and fundamental premises governing the transition to ultimate independence in Namibia.

4. First and foremost, that South Africa's continued occupation and presence in Namibia is illegal and one that constitutes aggression against the people of this Territory and the United Nations itself. Namibia is an international Territory under the direct responsibility of the United Nations, which is the legal Administering Authority over this region, acting through the Council for Namibia. The continued illegal occupation by South Africa is a threat to international peace and security.

5. Secondly, that independence in Namibia can and must be achieved without concession to the principles embodied in the resolutions of the United Nations, particularly Security Council resolution 385 (1976) in its entirety.

6. Thirdly, that the United Nations recognizes the special position of SWAPO as the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people and supports its commitment to end the illegal South African occupation by all means at its disposal, including its armed liberation struggle.

7. Finally, that no initiative or solution of the Namibian question can be recognized or resolved outside the framework of the United Nations or without cognizance and support of the Namibian people under the leadership of SWAPO.

8. As we turn now to consider in depth the determination of the conditions and steps that would ensure an orderly and immediate transition to genuine independence in Namibia we must of necessity take stock of the objective realities of the region. While negotiations currently being carried out by the five Western European members of the Security Council with the main parties concerned carry with them expectations of some progress towards a negotiated agreement and are welcomed by Bangladesh, they must not obscure the actual conditions obtaining in Namibia which could have a direct, even adverse, bearing on the outcome.

9. First, the Territory continues to be subject to a grave political and military situation arising out of the illegal occupation of the racist *apartheid* régime of South Africa. Over the past few months South Africa has systematically intensified its military build-up through shipments of lethal weaponry, including tanks. Some 50,000 South African troops recruited through national conscription continue to police this Territory and bolster its repression. Meanwhile, evidence of South Africa's ill-concealed efforts to develop its nuclear-weapon potential have added a dangerous new dimension to the situation.

10. Secondly, the past history of this Territory has been replete with instances of all the ills that characterize classical colonialism, with the added brutality inherent in

the repressive régime of *apartheid*. There is little evidence that there has been or any expectation that there will be any lessening in the manifestation of this heinous policy. On the contrary, it appears that the process of harassment and intimidation has been intensified, particularly through the use of local mercenaries from tribal armies and of *agents provocateurs*, the escalation of arbitrary mass arrests, torture, detention and imprisonment.

11. Thirdly, the logical extension of this policy has been an organized and systematic fragmentation of the Territory along ethnic and racial lines, exemplified by the system of bantustanization.

12. Fourthly, this system has been maintained and extended through repressive legislative actions, the extent of which has been extensively and annually recorded by the Special Committee against *Apartheid*. Thousands of Namibians engaged in their legitimate struggle for self-determination lie incarcerated in gaols within South Africa and Namibia, condemned as terrorists.

13. Fifthly, South Africa has extended its militant activities outside Namibia, committing aggression on neighbouring African territories with all the inherent dangers to peace and security.

14. Finally, South Africa in the face of internal resistance and external condemnation turned to subterfuge in propagating a so-called internal settlement to give the semblance of legality to a puppet régime of its own choosing and to perpetuate its illegal occupation and exclusion of the genuine leadership of the Namibian people.

15. It is only with a clear-cut conception of these prevailing objective realities that this Assembly can move forward to consider the future content of any constitutional settlement leading towards genuine independence for Namibia.

16. Bangladesh believes that the cardinal element towards orderly independence is explicit in the commitment of all Member States to genuine, free and democratic elections in Namibia. It is within this basic umbrella that the integral elements of a meaningful settlement assume a direct focus.

17. First, genuine elections would require, as Security Council resolution 385 (1976) clearly specified, that they be held on the basis of one national political entity and not on the basis of tribal or ethnic representation—the subterfuge that South Africa sought to perpetuate through the Turnhalle Convention. Connected questions imperilling the concept of genuine elections lay in the attempt to corrupt the process through such issues as proportionate or constituency voting or the possibility of dividing Namibia into different electoral areas and bicameral chambers in a future parliament. The spectre of fragmentation through the bantustanization process lies very near the surface of proposals that South Africa seeks to impose.

18. Secondly, the most critical element towards meaningful progress lies in the implementation of free and democratic elections. The cardinal preconditions emphasized in Security Council resolution 385 (1976) are complete South African withdrawal, particularly of its armed

forces, the release of political prisoners, the repeal of all repressive and discriminatory legislation in Namibia and the dismantling of the *apartheid* system. It is obvious that elections can be neither free nor democratic in an environment where the mechanics of repression are institutionalized through legislation and brutally imposed by a policing force steeped in the psychology of racism and well equipped with the means of bribery and intimidation. Nor does freedom have content when the legitimate leaders of the Namibian people, the representatives of SWAPO, remain under surveillance or physically excluded from campaigning.

19. It follows therefore that the third essential element in the process is an obvious one: supervision and control of the transition to independence must be vested in the United Nations and guaranteed by all major Powers and, above all, by the international community.

20. Fourthly, given the prevailing atmosphere of violent prejudice, distrust and intimidation in an armed environment, it is only logical that SWAPO would be reluctant to surrender its armed struggle and demobilize, for fear that South Africa would resile from the promise of free elections and take punitive action—an event that could in all likelihood take place. The only viable alternative towards ensuring cessation of hostilities would lie in the first instance in effecting the withdrawal of all South African troops prior to the official start of electioneering, and in demobilizing and dismantling all indigenous Namibians forces, units and structures and simultaneously policing these actions and an effective cease-fire through a United Nations force in the region.

21. Fifthly, the United Nations Special Representative in the region would be specifically charged with the responsibility of taking steps to ensure a peaceful environment and an electoral process free from interference from any quarter whatsoever.

22. Finally, an imperative and cardinal element for any solution of this problem is the preservation of the territorial unity and integrity of Namibia. There can be no compromise regarding the status of Walvis Bay, which is an indistinguishable part of South West Africa's economic, cultural and political life. South Africa's attempts to retain control over the area and annex it by proclamation deserve the strongest possible condemnation. The General Assembly, in resolution 32/9 D of 4 November 1977 declared that the decision of South Africa to annex Walvis Bay was an act of colonial expansion in violation of the purposes and principles of the Charter and that such annexation was null and void. It reaffirmed that Walvis Bay was an integral part of Namibia, with which it was inextricably linked by geographical, historical, economic, cultural and ethnic bonds.

23. A solution short of these imperatives and directed towards excluding SWAPO, fragmenting the Territory or compartmentalizing the electorate on racial lines in an environment of intimidation would make a mockery of moves towards a negotiated settlement and genuine independence for Namibia.

24. The possibilities facing the international community with regard to a solution are therefore crystal clear—one is



that of a peaceful negotiated settlement under the direct auspices of the United Nations and the other is recourse to armed struggle with its dire implications for peace and security in the region and Africa as a whole. Bangladesh is convinced of the inevitability of the ultimate achievement of independence in Namibia. It is the cost in terms of human lives and material damage and the grave threat to international peace that is the fundamental issue. We strongly advocate the peaceful alternative, but we are equally committed to supporting SWAPO's liberation struggle by all means, including armed struggle. Bangladesh has noted and commends SWAPO's willingness to reach a negotiated settlement and the far-reaching and substantive concessions it has made, including its acceptance of the proposal that some 1,500 South African troops should remain in Namibia during the pre-election period.

25. It is now up to the international community to take decisive action to conclude this long-delayed process of transition to ultimate independence. Bangladesh fully endorses the recommendation of the United Nations Council for Namibia to the General Assembly contained in the 1978 Lusaka Declaration that it is time for the Security Council to resume its consideration of the issue and take the necessary steps to terminate forthwith South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia, bring to an end its continued aggression against the people of this Territory and the United Nations and ensure the complete and unconditional withdrawal of South Africa from the Territory [see A/S-9/4, para. 31, subpara. 36]. In the face of South Africa's recalcitrance, we believe that among measures of particular import are the imposition of mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter and the payment of compensation for damage to and exploitation of the Territory.

26. Bangladesh has been a member of the Council for Namibia since its admission to membership in the United Nations. It goes without saying that we are party to and fully endorse the recommendations submitted by the Council and particularly the Declaration adopted at the extraordinary meetings of the Council at Lusaka in March this year. Bangladesh has always accorded particular priority to the more positive or nation-building measures that would accompany and facilitate the emergence of an independent Namibia. We believe that this task has assumed particular significance and is an integral complement to the political negotiations leading up to genuine independence for Namibia. Thus, in the tasks facing the Assembly at this special session, particularly in the compilation of its final documents, a crucial element will be the drawing up of an integrated, progressive and graduated programme of action directed towards developing the human potential of that Territory so as to enable the people of Namibia to assume the manifold administrative and economic responsibilities involved in building a truly viable State. An essential prerequisite is to increase assistance in the context of the already established Nationhood Programme [General Assembly resolution 31/153], the Institute for Namibia at Lusaka and the Fund for Namibia.

27. I should like to state in conclusion that the people and the Government of President Ziaur Rahman of Bangladesh are irrevocably committed to the cause of the Namibian people. Our support is not only founded on our constitu-

tional commitment "to support oppressed peoples throughout the world waging a just struggle against imperialism, colonialism and racism", but also deeply rooted in our conviction that the process of decolonization is inevitable and that the struggle for liberty and freedom is inexorable and bound to triumph. For the people of the world who have emerged from the shadow of subjugation, Namibia has a special position in the global struggle against racial discrimination. It is here that we can strike a first and perhaps decisive blow in dismantling the abhorrent edifice of *apartheid*.

28. Mr. GARBA (Nigeria): My delegation is happy to participate in the deliberations of the ninth special session of the United Nations General Assembly on the question of Namibia. We are equally gratified to see you, Mr. President, directing the affairs of this special session in continuation of your brilliant and erudite performance during the thirty-second session of the General Assembly last year.

29. Yugoslavia and Nigeria share identical views on current issues in the international firmament. Besides steadfastly upholding the principles of the United Nations Charter and working assiduously in furtherance of its purposes and objectives, Yugoslavia and Nigeria have been in the vanguard of the international crusade against inequality, exploitation, dehumanization and all forms of colonialism.

30. Within this same Assembly and elsewhere, we have vigorously pursued and relentlessly fought for international acceptance of the basic universality of human dignity. We have always worked from the standpoint that our own individual freedom and national honour will remain meaningless as long as others, regardless of their race and colour, remain under any form of domination and as long as their basic freedoms and their inalienable rights to determine their future are abridged. Our two positions on issues of individual freedom, liberty and human dignity have been consistent, strong, positive and forthright.

31. In the rapidly unfolding political developments in southern Africa, Sir, we in Nigeria have been impressed by the enormous contribution your esteemed Government has made towards the cause of liberation in the world. You were compelled in your recent history by the ravages of fascism to fight for your own liberation only some three decades ago. That unprecedented and valiant struggle, led by President Tito himself, should be an inspiration to all freedom-fighters from wherever they operate. The Partisans in Yugoslavia proved that the indomitable will of the people will prevail. These are great lessons for Africa.

32. My delegation has examined the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia [A/S-9/4] embracing the activities of the Council in furtherance of the legitimate aspirations of the Namibian people since the thirty-second session of the General Assembly. I have also seen the recent Lusaka Declaration which, among other things, reaffirmed that Namibia remains the direct responsibility of the United Nations and that the exercise of internal and external administrative authority over Namibia also remains the exclusive responsibility of the United Nations Council for Namibia acting in sacred trust on behalf of the people in the Territory.

33. The Declaration also contains the commitment of the Council to end the illegal occupation of Namibia by the racist régime in Pretoria by ensuring its complete and unconditional withdrawal to enable the Namibian people, under the leadership of SWAPO, to exercise freely its right to self-determination and independence. But equally significant is the reaffirmation of the armed liberation struggle, currently pursued vigorously by SWAPO, as a means of securing the eventual independence of the Territory.

34. Today there is concerted international effort sponsored by a select group within the United Nations to seek peaceful transition to majority rule and genuine independence in Namibia. We have no doubt that this initiative has a direct bearing on the current military pressure mounted by SWAPO. To that extent, we must also see SWAPO's efforts as complementary to United Nations measures to free Namibia.

35. We cannot at this stage ignore the fact that negotiations have been taking place between the Western contact group of the Security Council and SWAPO. The proposals for a settlement of the Namibian question have been published as document S/12636 of the Security Council for general distribution.

36. I think we can say, with all modesty, that the African Members of this august body and of the Security Council have co-operated fully since the thirty-second session in all initiatives taken outside the United Nations to achieve a peaceful transition to majority rule and independence in Namibia.

37. The African Group, acting in due deference to the delicate negotiations being conducted early in the year between SWAPO and the racist administration, had at first vacillated on fixing a date for this special session. Last January, during Nigeria's presidency of the Security Council, we did not only agree to postpone a discussion on Namibia but also made substantial concessions to the Council's Western contact group of five by not going beyond submitting a number of draft resolutions in the Council and waiving our option to press for a vote on them.

38. In the ensuing negotiations arranged under the auspices of the five countries, I can say, without necessarily going into the substance of the matter, that SWAPO did make concessions that even went beyond what was required of it under Security Council resolution 385 (1976). This was SWAPO's best demonstration of its intention to resolve the Namibian conflict peacefully. We are yet to know of any corresponding concessions on the part of the racist occupation force.

39. In fact, it was the racist Foreign Minister, Mr. Botha, who walked out of the proximity talks, and yet the impression was being created that SWAPO, which stayed on patiently in New York and co-operated fully in the negotiations, was the recalcitrant party. This impression was consciously peddled around as recently as April to discredit the SWAPO leadership.

40. It is not my intention to go over the beaten track of the Namibian question which is very clear to Member States

of the United Nations. I intend, however, to analyse the situation in order to identify the obstacles to progress. In this connexion, the decisions of the Security Council are quite explicit.

41. Among the new elements in the Namibian situation, in the view of my delegation, is first the annexation of Walvis Bay. The annexation carried out by Pretoria is in contravention of any acceptable international norms and moral proprieties. It exposes South Africa's future diabolical plan to use the bay as its last rearguard launching pad to continue its policies of aggression against an independent Namibia and neighbouring sovereign African States, as is currently being done from the Caprivi Strip on the Angolan border. Walvis Bay is Namibia's umbilical cord and to sever it from the rest of the Territory will adversely affect the economic viability of an independent Namibia.

42. My delegation is unimpressed by the spurious arguments advanced to justify the annexation, and condemns without any reservation such an act. We will certainly not condone any violation of the territorial integrity of any African State, and therefore demand forthwith an unconditional revocation of such wanton annexation. We consequently hope that the final declaration that will flow from the special session will reiterate the General Assembly's indignation on this sensitive issue and reaffirm that the bay remains an integral part of Namibia, with which it is linked by ethnic, historical and cultural bonds.

43. The second new element is a military one. On the withdrawal of all South African troops from Namibia envisaged in Security Council resolution 385 (1976), SWAPO, according to information reaching us, has conceded that some South African troops remain during the transitional period. South Africa's Prime Minister, John Vorster for his part, reflected his contempt for this concession by SWAPO when, as recently as 13 April, while addressing the racist Parliament in Pretoria, he said:

"I wish to state that unless and until it is absolutely clear that there is no more violence and no more killings, South Africa cannot reduce its security forces, let alone withdraw them."

Vorster is reported to have over 50,000 South African troops in Namibia. He also ignored the fact that violence is a built-in factor in the bantustanization of Namibia. This we have warned against over the years.

44. Further, South Africa continues to mass troops along the border with Namibia. We also have information to the effect that Britain's Marconi Company is at present engaged in installing a network of monitoring stations throughout Namibia, linking the Territory to South Africa for so-called counter-insurgency operations.

45. Increasingly there are reports of the ominous development of atomic weapons in the Territory carried out with a rather lopsided arrogance to taunt the whole world, with the Western Powers taking only desultory steps, if any, to halt this. That is not all. The racist Administration has begun to build and equip tribal armies in order to foster ethnic strife and prepare the ground for a civil war.

46. The General Assembly at this special session should reiterate its demand that South Africa withdraw all its forces from the Territory in compliance with relevant United Nations resolutions. The General Assembly should demand that it dismantle all its monitoring installations, and call for an end to all forms of collaboration with the racists in the nuclear field.

47. A third element is the close link between the process of the consolidation of South Africa's occupation force with the creation of conditions for imposing a puppet régime in the Territory. Those puppets are to be drawn from the discredited Turnhalle group. To attain its objective, South Africa has tried all kinds of manoeuvres. The new element is the clandestine revival of the so-called multiracial group, now crystallized in the Democratic Turnhalle Alliance.

48. The hidden motives of the occupying Power are scarcely difficult to unravel. On the one hand the escalating process of militarization is calculated to prepare the ground for a bloody confrontation with SWAPO, the national vanguard of the people's liberation struggle, and blunt that people's yearnings for true freedom and independence. Closely linked with this is the promotion of the so-called Democratic Turnhalle Alliance, which is geared towards providing the political platform for an internal settlement. This would perpetuate white minority control and ensure Pretoria's influence and dominance in a post-independence Namibia.

49. A fourth element is the escalating use of terror tactics by the notorious racist para-military force among innocent civilians, the rising incidence of mass arrests, torture, detention and incarceration of SWAPO members, and the unending chain of illegal and fraudulent trials of Namibian patriots in racist courts. These are part of a carefully orchestrated plot aimed at softening the people's resistance to racist oppression and victimization.

50. Last week's declaration of emergency by the so-called Administrator-General, who immediately assumed dictatorial powers, including those permitting detention without trial, is no more than an attempt to confer an aura of legality on an odiously illegal situation created by the occupying force. This leaves some doubts about confidence in any future Administrator-General if the Five's settlement plans are accepted, in the absence of a clearer role for the United Nations.

51. The fifth element is the lessening of the heat on South Africa. We have, in the process of focusing on the issues of Namibia and Zimbabwe, eased international pressure on South Africa. The racist régime of South Africa is at the heart and core of the problems in southern Africa. Therefore, in any initiative or in talks for the peaceful resolution of these problems, South Africa must not be given the opportunity to negotiate from a position of strength. Nor must a situation be created in which, as attempts are made to resolve one problem, South Africa is allowed to consolidate its position in other areas. This is the present scenario in southern Africa.

52. In South Africa itself we have noticed the progressive consolidation of bantustanization as attempts are being

made to resolve the Namibian question. Blacks are still being herded into those tracts of unproductive land that are incapable of sustaining life. Inevitably and increasingly they have little choice but to minister to the needs of their white oppressors at sub-datum wage levels in areas that are progressively becoming white preserves.

53. In parallel to this development, we have noticed increasing direct and indirect investment by multinational corporations in South Africa. Lately, multinational corporations have made attempts to minimize "petty *apartheid*", without addressing themselves to the core of the problem; segregated canteens, toilets and benches are but products of *apartheid*. Those corporations have refused to address themselves to full trade-union rights, for this is the antithesis of profitability based on the exploitation of labour.

54. We have seen Ian Smith, with the support of South Africa, consolidate the internal settlement arrangement in Southern Rhodesia. When pressure through sanctions should have been brought to bear on South Africa over Rhodesia and Namibia, we witnessed the equivocation of some Western Powers on the Security Council. One excuse after another was advanced as to why such sanctions should not be applied. The result of such lack of timely action is what we have today in Salisbury and may be confronted with tomorrow in Namibia.

55. The sixth element is that of the activities of multinational corporations in Namibia continuing albeit at a reduced level. This is due to the combined factors of economic stagnation and political uncertainty in the Territory. Those multinational corporations are by and large concerned in the mining and fishing industries through affiliates or subsidiaries of companies based in the United Kingdom, the United States, Canada and France.

56. The incentives for their investments remain the twin pillars of cheap black labour, guaranteed by the repressive *apartheid* system exported to Namibia by South Africa, and its liberal investment policies, whereby United Nations resolutions and decisions continue to be ignored, particularly as regards the payment of royalties and taxes to that illegal administration. The stark reality is that the black man continues to be exploited in the land of his birth in order to promote the well-being of the whites.

57. Obviously half-hearted measures hurriedly contrived by some Western Governments for the regulation of the activities of their multinational corporations in the area have so far failed; nor have they acted as a deterrent to the collaboration of those multinational corporations with the Vorster and Smith régimes, because of the absence of sanctions.

58. The inadequacy of the guidelines of the European Economic Community and other voluntary guidelines is recognized by the international community. Accordingly, there is need for an extension of home-country jurisdiction to regulate the activities of the affiliates or subsidiaries of their multinational corporations based in southern Africa. This is distinctly possible in respect of Namibia under the United States Trading with the Enemy Act.

59. As regards Namibia, the payment of royalties and taxes to the Vorster régime should be prohibited by all home countries of multinational corporations in the area as an illegal act in the pursuit of international commercial transactions. This is already provided for in Decree No. 1 of the Council for Namibia,<sup>1</sup> and must be implemented.

60. We must now sound a note of warning that our patience is fast becoming exhausted with regard to the West's double standards in its use of the carrot and the stick when dealing with South Africa. It is now glaringly evident that there is increasing preference for the carrot rather than the stick. The General Assembly can no longer afford to permit the continuation of South Africa's defiance of its authority and resolutions, and we demand that the Assembly now act fast and firmly to put an end to the racist charade in Namibia and elsewhere in southern Africa.

61. How, then, can the continuing political impasse created by South Africa's defiance of the world community be resolved in Namibia? In the view of my delegation, we are faced with three options. The continuing crisis can be resolved by peaceful negotiations. The second option is armed liberation struggle, which is currently being vigorously pursued by SWAPO. I must add, however, that SWAPO deserves enormous credit for its consistency in leaving the options open for a peaceful solution to the conflict in spite of South Africa's continuing policies of repression and brutality against its supporters. There is still a third option—that of mounting international pressure to compel South Africa to withdraw from the Territory.

62. In the view of my delegation the Western countries must realize that if their initiative on the first option is to have a reasonable chance of success it must be closely linked with the third option—that of political and economic pressure on the racists.

63. If today the Western initiative paints a depressing picture of a type of motion without progress, this can easily be explained by their hesitancy to apply necessary pressure on their racist allies to abide by the resolutions of this august body. The West must step up the momentum of pressure on Pretoria if their efforts are to attain any level of credibility.

64. The General Assembly at this special session should, in the view of my delegation, proceed to spell out in clear and unambiguous terms the broad framework within which a genuine and internationally acceptable settlement in Namibia is feasible. The racists and their backers must be bluntly told that any transitional arrangements intended to lead Namibia to full independence must be carried out within the broad framework of the United Nations, which remains the legal and administrative authority over the Territory. Another test of international acceptability is that such arrangements must recognize the state of war and must include SWAPO, which for years has borne the brunt of the liberation struggle.

65. If today we do support any initiative which will bring about a peaceful solution of the current political stalemate

in Namibia, it is because we are conscious of the overriding consideration that a bloody racial confrontation should be avoided in the Territory. We are equally concerned with the need to put an end to the current hardship on the Namibian people in a manner that will permit the country's leaders to devote their energies to the problems of national reconstruction after independence following decades of naked exploitation under a callous and oppressive administration.

66. The General Assembly must bear in mind at all times that the United Nations has a special responsibility whenever it considers all issues related to Namibia. To that extent, at least, the United Nations has a moral obligation, if not an abiding duty, to ensure that South Africa is stopped in its present disastrous course and is compelled to halt its genocidal campaign in the Territory.

67. We must also look ahead and prepare the Territory for independence. My delegation therefore calls on Member States to step up their assistance to the United Nations Institute for Namibia with a view to preparing and equipping more and more Namibians with the basic skills to consolidate the Territory's sovereignty in the early months of independence. That is not all. The General Assembly also has a moral responsibility to mount all diplomatic and political pressures necessary to bring about an early withdrawal of the racist administration in accordance with its resolutions and those of the Security Council. Should South Africa persist in its intransigence or seek to install a puppet government in pursuit of a so-called internal settlement, this Assembly should request the Security Council to take early action, and in any event not later than the beginning of the thirty-third session of the General Assembly, including the imposition of comprehensive and mandatory economic sanctions, against the racist régime in Pretoria under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter.

68. In the event of such a development my delegation hopes that South Africa's Western backers will not subordinate the noble ideals of human rights, individual liberties and self-determination, the cause of which has been espoused in the Western world for generations, to short-term economic interests and ephemeral gains.

69. For our part, we will continue to give moral, diplomatic and material support to SWAPO in its relentless struggle until every inch of its God-given country is liberated from the occupation force. Nigeria also reserves the right to take whatever steps will in our considered judgement help to accelerate the withdrawal of the racists from the Territory.

70. We will never be diverted from this objective, and we will continue to support all measures that will promote the interests of Namibia and Namibians in all international forums until such time as Pretoria considers it politically and economically inexpedient to persist in its policies of occupation.

71. Mr. WOLDE-GIORGIS (Ethiopia): Mr. President, allow me at the outset to extend to you on behalf of the Ethiopian delegation our warmest congratulations on your election as President of the General Assembly at this ninth special session. My delegation considers your election to this important post a fitting tribute paid by the General

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-ninth session, Supplement No. 24A*, para. 84.

Assembly to you personally and to the highly constructive role your great country Yugoslavia plays in the United Nations and the non-aligned movement. We are convinced that you will guide our present deliberations with the same high distinction that characterized your efficient stewardship of the enormous work of the thirty-second regular session of the General Assembly, as well as that of the eighth special session.

72. The ninth special session of the General Assembly, devoted to consideration of the question of Namibia, takes place during a very unique period in the history of southern Africa. The confrontation between the progressive forces, on the one hand, and the forces of colonialism, racism and imperialism, on the other, has entered a decisive stage. The single most important change that is currently taking place inside Namibia is the sharpening of the confrontation between the struggling people of Namibia under the leadership of SWAPO and the colonial racist régime of Pretoria, which has so arrogantly continued to occupy Namibia illegally. It is this momentum that the United Nations and indeed all those who are the genuine friends of Africa must make it their duty to encourage and promote at the present special session.

73. To state that the year 1960 constituted an important landmark in the history of international action for the emancipation of the Namibian people from the oppressive rule of South Africa is, I believe, but to state the obvious.

74. The historic Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples was adopted in 1960 [*General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV)*]. It was also in the same year that Ethiopia and Liberia jointly initiated legal action against South Africa at the International Court of Justice in connexion with its administration of what was then known as South West Africa.

75. It will be recalled that in their application to the Court the sister African States sought the Court's decision on whether the mandate system of the defunct League of Nations in respect of the Territory of South West Africa had expired with the demise of the League or had actually been transferred to the United Nations as the successor organization.

*Mr. Anwar Sani (Indonesia), Vice-President, took the Chair.*

76. As can be readily discerned, the primary objective of the applicants was to compel South Africa to place South West Africa under the United Nations Trusteeship System and thus make it accountable to the international community under Article 73 *e* of the Charter. Alternatively, the applicants also had as their primary objective to compel South Africa to withdraw from the Territory under its administration, so that administrative authority might revert to the United Nations, depending on the Court's findings.

77. After taking an unduly long time on a relatively simple case, the Court, however, cynically evaded its responsibilities. Instead of giving judgement on the central issues raised, it dismissed the application on the technical ground

that Ethiopia and Liberia did not have sufficient "interest" in South West Africa.<sup>2</sup>

78. Following that unflattering record of the International Court of Justice, the General Assembly, by its resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966, decided to terminate South Africa's Mandate over the Territory and assume direct responsibility for South West Africa—now Namibia.

79. The question of Namibia has been on the agenda of the General Assembly for over 32 years. In 1966, after 20 years of futility, the United Nations declared South Africa's occupation of Namibia illegal and placed the Territory under the Organization's direct responsibility. The following year at a special session, by resolution 2248 (S-V), the General Assembly created the United Nations Council for Namibia as the legal Administering Authority until the Territory should attain full and complete independence in its entirety.

80. Over the past decades the International Court of Justice, the General Assembly and the Security Council have issued scores of recommendations, decisions and resolutions. Year after year, resolutions are repeated to such a degree that the repeated demands made by the overwhelming majority of the international community have often been described as "merely rhetorical". In a few instances the Security Council, the highest organ of the United Nations, has been unable to reach a decision owing to the veto power in the hands of the allies of the racist Pretoria régime. But in many more instances where decisions have been arrived at, our Organization has been incapable of implementing its own decisions and resolutions. At the same time, however, the repeated demands for the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of South Africa from Namibia made by the States Members of this august body also prove that the international community is in agreement regarding the illegal nature of South Africa's occupation of Namibia and the legitimacy of the struggle by its people under the authentic leadership of SWAPO for their freedom, dignity and independence.

81. The persistent demands of the United Nations over the years are paralleled only by racist Pretoria's equally persistent and adamant refusal to heed the appeals made by both the international community and the Namibian people with its legitimate aspirations, as well as by the ever-escalating brutal repression. The aggressive policies of the South African occupation régime in Namibia have further spread into unprovoked acts of aggression against and military incursions into the independent countries of Zambia, Angola, Mozambique and Botswana. The continued illegal occupation is enhanced by the increasingly monstrous repressive forces and the exploitation and plundering of the natural resources of the Territory by South Africa and its economic partners. The objectives of the South African military build-up are not only the consolidation of the illegal occupation but also the undermining of the stability, peace and territorial integrity of the neighbouring independent African States, particularly those of Zambia and Angola.

<sup>2</sup> See *South West Africa, Second Phase, Judgment, I.C.J. Reports 1966*, p. 6.

82. The Lusaka Declaration adopted by the Council for Namibia clearly states that:

“Irrefutable evidence from inside Namibia shows that South Africa has, over the last few months, embarked on a reinforcement of its already huge army in Namibia in preparation for a major confrontation with the liberation forces led by SWAPO. South Africa’s activities involve a huge military build-up within Namibia, including the shipment into Namibia of large numbers of tanks and large quantities of ammunition, the construction of army barracks and the development of atomic weapons. The immediate objective of this military build-up is to consolidate the occupation régime’s position, to carry out its hegemonistic ambitions in this region, to prevent the oppressed Namibian people from achieving genuine national independence and to create conditions for imposing a puppet régime in Namibia drawn from the Turnhalle group. This military build-up is coupled with officially instigated and organized widespread violence against SWAPO by South Africa’s collaborators in Namibia. The Pretoria régime is provoking ethnic strife and hostilities within Namibia to consolidate the process of bantustanization of Namibia.” [A/S-9/4, para. 31, sub-para. 11]

83. More recently, crucial information about South Africa’s feverish preparations for a nuclear test has been in circulation. The signals are clear. The means sustaining *apartheid*, colonialism and international imperialism have by far surpassed their objectives, and what is now put in clear and present danger is international peace and security.

84. Those irresponsible and contemptuous acts of the racist Pretoria régime have two primary objectives. South Africa’s occupation forces which are now estimated in excess of 50,000 are, first and foremost, instruments of the ruthless and systematic oppression and repression of the Namibian people. Similarly, they also carry out constant forays into the neighbouring independent African States, particularly Angola, with the object of destabilizing and eventually overthrowing the progressive Governments in the region and replacing them by imperialist quislings. There can be little doubt that, by its success in establishing reactionary and imperialist-supported Governments in the region, South Africa aspires to isolate Namibia and thereby perpetuate its illegal armed occupation of the Territory.

85. As a member 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, the Ethiopian delegation is already on record as stressing that South Africa’s single source of strength in its intransigence is the support it receives from Western Powers, which invariably come up with one set of diversionary tactics after another to thwart decisive action by the international community and to make the region increasingly safe for *apartheid*. Those are the very imperialist Powers which, through their enormous investments, trade, military co-operation, sales of weapons and technical assistance, have brought the fascists of Pretoria to the alarming threshold of nuclear capability. Those are also the very same imperialist Powers which, in various international forums, act unabashedly as the spokesmen of racist Pretoria in the name of a so-called negotiated settlement.

86. As confirmed by them, it is true that they have special interests and, hence, special relations with South Africa; but those relations are, unfortunately, based on the shared objectives of the continued plunder and exploitation of the resources of southern Africa and the degradation of its people. Moreover, those special relations stem from the shared guilt not only for the extension of *apartheid* to Namibia but also for the prolongation of the fascist rule over the people of the Territory. The ultimate goal of the so-called Western plan is to bestow recognition on South Africa, carve out Walvis Bay and wrest more concessions from SWAPO, contrary to United Nations decisions and the legitimate aspirations of the Namibian people.

87. We reject the Western plan, not simply because of the identity of its authorship, but rather because far from bringing peace it is a scheme engineered to undermine and destroy the victories and achievements that have been gained over the long years of bitter struggle against colonial oppression and exploitation. It is clear that the Western Five are not ready to use to the full extent the influence and leverage they have in South Africa to ensure the implementation of Security Council resolution 385 (1976) in its entirety. That resolution lays down the fundamental guidelines for the withdrawal of South African troops, independence for the country, respect for the territorial integrity of Namibia, including the inalienable area of Walvis Bay, and elections to be held under strict United Nations control.

88. Contrary to the guidelines laid down by resolution 385 (1976)—and, indeed, by all other relevant resolutions of the Organization—the Western plan stipulates the perpetuation of the illegal occupation of Namibia and its legalization by means of various schemes and by the installation of a puppet régime. To embellish that scheme with a modicum of legitimacy, the United Nations will be brought in as observer of the so-called elections to be staged in the Territory without the prior withdrawal of Pretoria’s repressive machinery. Those are the stages to be followed in the process of conciliation with *apartheid* and colonialism.

89. With each passing day, the liberation fighters are rising more resolved to win their freedom, human dignity and national independence, more determined to make every sacrifice for the intensification of the armed struggle. This they do because they fully realize that progressive and peace-loving forces of the world are solidly with them and because they know too well that there can be no conciliation with *apartheid* and colonialism.

90. The Western plan for an internationally acceptable negotiated solution to the Namibian question has, above all, as its central objective the dismemberment of Namibia by carving out Walvis Bay for a later negotiation “between an independent Namibian State and South Africa”. This sinister scheme is an incontestable manifestation of their collusion with the colonialists of Pretoria and their evil intention to impose in Namibia a so-called internal settlement to foster civil war and to destabilize the whole region. Walvis Bay is an integral part of Namibia with which it is inextricably linked by geographical, historical, cultural, economic and ethnic bonds. In other words, there can be no independent Namibian State without Walvis Bay, and this is certainly not an issue for equivocation.

91. Compromising the territorial integrity of Namibia and, even worse, the existence of military bases of racist South Africa in Walvis Bay is a threat not only to the security of Namibia but also to the entire southern African region. South Africa's spurious claim to Walvis Bay is clearly aimed at nothing but the deprivation of Namibia of its main port and vital economic avenue and the maintenance of a strategic military base in that part of Africa.

92. If objectives are not to be lost, if goals are to be matched with determination, and if this ninth special session of the General Assembly devoted to the question of Namibia is to mark a radical departure from our three-decade history of rhetoric, defiance and futility, Member States of the United Nations must take into account two essential developments.

93. First, the struggle of the Namibian people for their freedom, independence and inalienable right to self-determination has entered a decisive stage. The second essential development is that, parallel to the intensification of the struggle in southern Africa, recent years are witnessing fundamental restructuring of the entire system of international relations on new democratic and progressive bases. The commitment and determination of progressive and peace-loving countries and peoples have accomplished a great measure of success in countering the colonial and imperialist aggression, thereby relaxing international tension, and in forging the climate necessary to unravel pressing international problems.

94. No task is more urgent and more deserving than the eradication of racism and colonialism in southern Africa. To expunge these last hotbeds of colonialism and racism and to avert the imminent danger they constitute to international peace and security, the international community, particularly free Africa, must accelerate the provision of all the means necessary for the prosecution of the liberation struggle by the people of Namibia under the sole and authentic leadership of SWAPO.

95. This Assembly also has the unique responsibility to urge the Security Council to take all the necessary measures, including comprehensive sanctions provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations. These measures, together with the unequivocal enhancement of the central role of the United Nations, and particularly the unimpeded discharge of the responsibilities entrusted to the Council for Namibia as the legal Administering Authority for the Territory, must be accepted as the objective corner-stone for the speedy achievement of the genuine independence of a united Namibia in accordance with the legitimate interests and aspirations of the peoples of Africa.

96. Mr. ULLSTEN (Sweden): First of all, I should like most warmly to congratulate Mr. Mojsov and his colleagues on the Bureau on their election. We are looking forward to working, at this special General Assembly session also, under his able leadership.

97. I should like too to congratulate most warmly, through you, Sir, my old friend Miss Konie, President of the United Nations Council for Namibia and former Ambassador of Zambia to my country, on her election as Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee of the Whole and wish her well in her important task.

98. In 1960 the General Assembly adopted one of the most important documents in its history: the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples [resolution 1514 (XV)]. That Declaration reiterated and elaborated some basic principles of the Charter which have played a fundamental role for the work of this Organization, for the behaviour of its Members and for the shaping of our modern world. The Declaration confirmed once and for all the right of all peoples under colonial rule to determine their own destiny and to establish their own independent nations.

99. However, the process of liberation from colonialism, racism and oppression has not yet come to an end. The majority of the peoples in Namibia, Rhodesia and South Africa still have to struggle for freedom and human dignity. It is understandable that in their despair these oppressed peoples have seen no alternative but to resort to armed struggle to achieve liberation, freedom and democratic rights.

100. The conditions under which the struggle for freedom in these three areas is carried out may vary, but the root of the problem is basically the same: those who for generations have dominated and ruled refuse to share their power and privileges with the majority of the people. In southern Africa this key element is, more than anywhere else, organically linked to the many hideous aspects of racial discrimination.

101. The white régime in South Africa, through its ruthless dedication to *apartheid*, its huge military power and its economic wealth, remains a crucial obstacle to the liberation process in southern Africa as a whole. The régime in Pretoria tries to use Namibia and Rhodesia as a wall behind which the privileges of the few can be preserved at the expense of the rights of the many. The outcome of the struggle in one of these areas is likely not only to have an impact on the final settlement in the other, but also to influence the future development in South Africa itself.

102. The United Nations has a unique and direct responsibility for Namibia. The problem has in essence been the same ever since the inception of the United Nations: how to deal with South Africa's refusal to abide by the decisions of the United Nations and to leave Namibia; how to bring an end to the illegal occupation of the Territory; how to achieve a peaceful transition to self-determination and independence.

103. This ninth special session of the General Assembly will be an important occasion to reaffirm that responsibility. It is the occasion to focus on the actions to be taken to ensure the transition to a free and independent Namibia. It is the occasion both to hasten the process of independence in the Territory and to discuss the needs of the Namibian people in their preparations to build their future independent nation.

104. The point of departure for our deliberations should be unambiguous. Only the Namibians themselves have the right to decide about their future. Until the independence of the Territory has been achieved, its administration should be the responsibility of the United Nations.

105. In resolution 385 (1976) the Security Council has laid down the principles that must govern the political process leading to an independent Namibia in which the Namibians can determine their destiny. It is with the full force of the legal and moral authority of the international community that the Security Council has clearly established in this resolution what South Africa has to do.

106. These demands must be viewed in the context of South Africa's past and present behaviour in Namibia, which clearly reveals how totally opposite and detrimental South Africa's interests are to those of the Namibian people.

107. South Africa is illegally occupying and administering Namibia, using its huge military power to sustain its domination of the Territory in clear defiance of repeated demands by the United Nations.

108. South Africa has used its great economic power to exploit Namibia and its natural resources to the detriment of present and future generations of the Namibian people.

109. South Africa has steadily made efforts to fragmentize the Territory into homelands similar in all but name to the South African bantustans, thereby attempting to destroy the bonds of unity and national identity among the population.

110. South Africa tries to disrupt the territorial integrity of Namibia by detaching Walvis Bay from the Territory.

111. South Africa has made all kinds of efforts to deprive SWAPO of its role as the leading national political organization and has consistently tried to force its own illusory solutions and its own choice of political leaders on the people of Namibia.

112. South Africa has insisted on describing those who fight for basic political rights in their own native country as "terrorists". Requests for elementary human rights are looked upon and treated as criminal acts.

113. Any judgement of South Africa's objectives in Namibia and of its role in a negotiation process about the future of the Territory must obviously take this illegal and immoral behaviour into due account.

114. The aspirations of the Namibian people are contrary to these objectives and in full harmony with the principles of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. SWAPO and the people of Namibia have fought a long and arduous struggle to be able to form an independent nation of their own, to be able to decide their own destiny and to build a free Namibian nation. In their efforts to reach that goal, the Namibian people and SWAPO have the continued whole-hearted support of my Government and of the Swedish people.

115. During the past year, the five Western countries in the Security Council have made efforts to achieve a negotiated settlement. Various plans have been elaborated and proposed by the five. Discussions between them and South Africa and SWAPO have dealt with the whole range of problems posed by a transition to an independent

Namibia. It is our impression that those participating in these talks have come closer to a solution.

116. SWAPO, for its part, has shown flexibility. Now the time has come to increase the international pressure on South Africa. For the South African leaders the time has come to accept, once and for all, that they have to leave Namibia. This is basically not a matter of modalities; it is a matter of political will, a question of yes or no. If Pretoria's answer is "no", it means that South Africa prolongs the process towards the independence of Namibia. It means more suffering for the Namibian people. South Africa may be able to delay the ultimate solution, but it cannot halt the ultimate process towards an independent Namibia.

117. It is important that every possibility that the initiative of the five Western Powers may still offer should be fully explored. For the moment, we cannot see that there is any peaceful alternative. The Swedish Government supports these efforts at finding a peaceful and internationally acceptable solution in Namibia. We have done so in the hope that these negotiations could be a useful way to achieve independence at the earliest possible date in accordance with Security Council resolution 385 (1976). This view was also expressed by the Nordic Foreign Ministers at their meeting at Oslo this year. The Foreign Ministers also reiterated the willingness of the Nordic countries, within the framework of the United Nations, to make their services available for the promotion of a peaceful transition to independence and majority rule. They also emphasized that the participation of SWAPO would be decisive for the implementation of a peaceful transition to majority rule.

118. A strong United Nations presence in Namibia would be of decisive importance in facilitating a peaceful and orderly transition through free and democratic elections. All political movements in Namibia must be guaranteed political expression and participation. Political prisoners must be released from South African prisons and those in exile must be given permission to return and to participate freely in the political campaigning. Sufficient time should be given to this process. The United Nations must be involved in all stages of the transition period and in the election process. There is no other way to ensure that procedures are correct and that no doubt can be cast on the election results.

119. Should the negotiations fail to give results that conform with the principles contained in resolution 385 (1976), the Security Council must consider appropriate measures to be taken under the Charter.

120. In the context of the situation prevailing in South Africa itself, the Security Council took an important step in this direction when it passed its resolution on a mandatory arms embargo. This resolution will also have a bearing on the situation in Namibia in view of the heavy South African military build-up there. This makes it even more important to secure the full implementation of that resolution.

121. But the Security Council will also have to examine in what respects the arms embargo can be complemented with other measures that are of relevance to the situation in Namibia. It would seem, for instance, that measures taken



with a view to achieving the cessation of further foreign investments in South Africa would also have the effect of increasing the pressure on South Africa to abandon its present posture on Namibia.

122. In spite of numerous promises concerning moral and material support to the victims of *apartheid*, the international community has so far largely failed to live up to its verbal expressions of solidarity with the Namibian people. The inadequacy of humanitarian assistance to SWAPO is not in harmony with the words of the United Nations resolutions over the past decade. The time has come to set right this situation. Today, thousands of Namibian refugees in Angola and Zambia are in desperate need of our immediate help. They also need our assistance to prepare themselves for the future in their native country.

123. To build a politically and economically independent Namibia will not be an easy task. Following the long occupation by South Africa, Namibia will accede to independence as a nation deprived of national cadres, technical know-how and an adequate infrastructure. It is a country where productive resources are monopolized by foreign capital.

124. The transition to independence and the consolidation of achieved self-determination will need considerable and generous international support given on flexible terms and on a long-term basis. Against this background, my Government strongly welcomes the comprehensive plan of action for assistance to Namibia as launched in the Nationhood Programme. This programme can provide the necessary over-all framework and co-ordination of assistance to Namibia. The Namibian people, through SWAPO or the Council for Namibia in consultation with concerned groups inside the country, must participate directly in preparing projects. The aims of the Programme should be to achieve genuine political and economic independence and to meet the basic needs of the Namibian people.

125. Concurrently with the negotiations on a peaceful settlement in Namibia, South Africa is perpetuating its control over that country and creating conditions favourable to the imposition of a tribal settlement. The Nationhood Programme has to keep this in mind and consider support for activities inside Namibia carried out by groups favouring national unity in Namibia. These are the groups which today suffer under South African discriminatory policy.

126. In order to arrive at a consolidated programme of assistance to Namibia a central funding arrangement is needed. I take it that this special session of the General Assembly will discuss how to generate funds for the Nationhood Programme as well as for the humanitarian work carried out by SWAPO in Angola and Zambia and its social programme in Namibia. Sweden, for its part, has set aside resources to meet the increased needs in southern Africa in general and Namibia in particular. We shall be prepared to respond positively to the needs under the Nationhood Programme.

127. This is one field where all of us can act immediately within the United Nations and/or within bilateral programmes to prepare the Namibian people for the moment

when it will have the administrative and political responsibility for its country.

128. It is our hope that the long and hard struggle for self-determination and independence will soon be over. It is our hope that this long struggle, concurrently with increased pressure by the international community, will at last result in the abolition of the illegal role of South Africa in Namibia. It is our hope that this General Assembly will witness pledges from all countries to give their full and generous support to preparing the Namibian people for that moment and assisting it after independence is reached.

129. Finally, at this crucial stage it is essential that this special session effectively contribute to these goals.

130. Mr. RASOLONDRALIBE (Madagascar) (*interpretation from French*): At the outset, I wish to congratulate Ambassador Mojsov on his election as President of this special session of the General Assembly. On behalf of the delegation of Madagascar I should like to express our satisfaction that he is presiding over the work of a special session devoted to the question of Namibia.

131. When Great Britain decided to hand over to South Africa the exercise of the League of Nations Mandate over Namibia—instead of exercising that Mandate itself—the Pretoria authorities certainly must have thought that the Territory had been offered to them as a gift and that they could draw from it all the profits they wished to draw, with no question of any obligations on their part or of any *quid pro quo* for the people of Namibia. The Namibians could not have more rights or receive more consideration than the indigenous people of South Africa, and therefore—in conformity with the logic of the racist régime—they were subjected from the very outset to the same laws of *apartheid* and the same system of exploitation as their brothers in South Africa.

132. If their condition did not arouse any particular reaction on the part of the members of the League of Nations, it was because the ethos of the time took very little account of the rights and well-being of the peoples which the Christian West intended to subject to its civilizing mission.

133. The South African racists did not believe that the Second World War provided any reason at all for their control over Namibia to be called into question. The United Nations was to realize this very quickly, when South Africa, a founding Member of the Organization, refused to conclude a trusteeship agreement in relation to Namibia, in conformity with the Charter. Blocking in that way any concrete action by the Organization, South Africa went so far as to claim the right to change unilaterally the international legal status of Namibia.

134. The annexationist ambitions of Pretoria and its intention to deprive the Namibian people of their right to self-determination and independence were so obvious that the General Assembly [*resolution 338 (IV)*] asked the International Court of Justice to pronounce on the question. Thus, it was established from 1950 that South Africa,

acting alone, was not competent to change the international status of Namibia.<sup>3</sup>

135. That first point having been established, the position of the Organization subsequently underwent a change. It embraced the idea that the best way to respect the spirit of the Charter was not, as had been believed at one time, to seek the conclusion of a trusteeship agreement that in fact would serve only to regularize and legitimize the legal links between South Africa and Namibia. The racist régime itself had in any case refused to do this.

136. The General Assembly thought that it should rather work towards enabling the Territory to become a free and independent State and that the Assembly should do what the Mandatory Power had failed to do. Drawing the appropriate conclusion from South Africa's refusal to comply with the Charter, the Assembly resolved that the non-execution of the obligations in question constituted a breach and a violation that justified the termination of the Mandate and hence the breaking of the legal links between South Africa and Namibia [*resolution 2145 (XXI)*]. That decision by the General Assembly was confirmed both by the Security Council [*resolution 245 (1968)*] and by the International Court of Justice. When—with poetic justice—South Africa complained that the United Nations had acted unilaterally by terminating the Mandate, it was told by the International Court of Justice that the consent of the wrongdoer cannot be required for a termination.<sup>4</sup> The advisory opinion of the Court stated also that the Charter had established a relationship between all Members of the United Nations and each Mandatory Power and that one of the principles governing that relationship was that a party which disowned or did not fulfil its obligations could not be recognized as retaining the rights which it claimed to derive from the relationship.<sup>5</sup>

137. It was in those circumstances that a new legal order was established in Namibia. Its presence having been declared illegal, South Africa was put under notice to end this situation and to withdraw from the country. Member States were under the obligation not to establish conventional relations with South Africa in any case where South Africa claimed to be acting on behalf of Namibia or in a matter concerning Namibia. The United Nations assumed direct responsibility for the administration of the Territory, pending its accession to independence.

138. At the risk of tiring the Assembly, we wished briefly to recall those facts, because South Africa and its allies in the imperialist camp want to call this legal order into question, wholly or partially—a legal order which, it must be stressed, is the outcome of a conscious and deliberate process on which there was a consensus of all the Member States.

139. The Turnhalle Conference reminds us that South Africa has not given up its attempts to change unilaterally,

<sup>3</sup> See *International Status of South West Africa, Advisory Opinion, I.C.J. Reports 1950*, p. 128.

<sup>4</sup> See *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*, para. 101.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 90-91.

without the consent of the United Nations, the international status of Namibia. Recently we have learned from the press that South Africa intends to organize before the end of this year so-called elections in conditions marked, as we know, by a total absence of freedom of expression, of assembly and of the press, when the apparatus of repression and intimidation will be able to function without restraint, when the nationalist leaders and the members of SWAPO will be excluded from the consultation and will remain either in prison or in exile. We are sure that the Organization will be true to itself and will not permit the racist régime in this way to establish a Government of its choice which will decide the fate of the people of Namibia.

140. And what are we to say of those among us who, in spite of the opinion of the International Court of Justice, do not have the slightest juridical qualms in considering South Africa as an interested party and, probably, even a party with a stake in the negotiations on the future of Namibia. It is left out of account that in dealings of this kind the status of the South Africans is rather that of an outside party and certainly not that of a party with any standing in the case. Such an aberration is, to say the least, surprising on the part of Governments which are normally so quick to claim that law has primacy over political considerations, particularly when law is backed by an actual verdict in the case, and in this particular case everyone is aware that the International Court of Justice took action.

141. Questionable as it is in principle, such an attitude confuses in practice two fundamental elements of the Namibian problem. The first is that of the illegal presence of South Africa, an act of force falling within the definition of aggression, of defiance of the authority of the Organization, which the Organization should rebuff by the application, in their fullest rigour, of the specific measures provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter. The second is that of the exercise by the Namibian people of its right to self-determination, which concerns only that people and presupposes that the first part of the problem shall have been solved.

142. To attempt to solve these two problems in a single operation without bringing to either the specific solution it calls for, seems to us illusory in practice—incorrect in law, because it recognizes the power of the South Africans to intervene in Namibian affairs, and dangerous politically because it is bound to end by limiting, restricting and, indeed, crippling the very right of Namibia to independence.

143. If the United Nations is prevented from taking concrete measures designed to have its authority accepted by the South Africans, if it cannot function normally and apply its policy, that does not mean that the nationalists of SWAPO are therefore obliged to make the necessary political concessions to obtain the unblocking of the situation, the unblocking of our institutions. We have no right to ask them to mortgage the territorial integrity of their country, particularly with regard to Walvis Bay, so that a so-called compromise solution can become acceptable to the South Africans. To rid ourselves of a problem which has hitherto proved insoluble, we cannot ask the Namibians to subject to the authority of South African administrators, who are *ipso facto* hostile, the act of

self-determination whereby they must pronounce on the future of their country. Since the Western members of the Security Council want to make of the United Nations an instrument of their imperialist policy, we cannot ask the Namibians to allow themselves to be controlled by the discretion of the South African police with regard to their freedom to participate in propaganda and information operations.

144. Briefly, it seems to us to be unjust to ask the Namibians to pay for the ineffectiveness of the United Nations, to ask them to accept the principle of popular consultation without being assured that such a consultation will take place under the effective authority of the United Nations, at a time when South African troops and police will actually still be on the territory, when the departure of these forces from Namibia remains hypothetical because no one knows when it will take place, on whose orders and pursuant to what act.

145. Let us be careful not to ask too much of our friends from SWAPO, because as concessions succeed each other they might be led right up to the point where they simply and purely renounce their legitimate and inalienable rights. For vulnerable countries such as ours, this is a frightening prospect. Indeed, we have everything to lose if within the United Nations itself, which is the very symbol of the rule of law in international relations, the rights of peoples, such as those of the Namibians, are considered by some as bargaining counters.

146. Since, under the leadership of SWAPO, their authentic and sole representative, the Namibian nationalists have brought the liberation struggle to the very borders of South Africa, we can now see among the Western Powers a renewal of interest in peace in southern Africa—an interest which was lacking when we denounced, as we have for so long, the injustices, imprisonments, deportations and massacres to which, unfortunately, the peoples of the area have had to become accustomed; an interest which was lacking when we so repeatedly drew attention to the deliberate and unprovoked acts of aggression committed by the illegal régime against neighbouring independent African countries.

147. Curiously, the countries which have associated their name with the plan for the settlement of the Namibian problem seem to believe that the determination of the SWAPO militants to fight to the end for the liberation of their country is a greater danger to international peace than the use of Namibian soil for purposes of preparing for and carrying out nuclear tests by South Africa. This liberation struggle, equipped as it is with primitive arms, is in the eyes of these countries more dangerous to peace than the complete militarization of Namibia and its transformation into a vast arsenal the size of which is incommensurate with the resources available to SWAPO.

148. For our part the search for—or rather maintenance of—peace in southern Africa is not synonymous with an enterprise destined to prevent the advance of any particular ideology, because, in the final analysis, in this particular case the independence of the Namibians will go hand in hand with their right to adopt the ideology of their choice. The question is to allow them the possibility to do this. We cannot envisage this peace in terms of preserving the

present state of prosperity of the South African economy in disregard of the interests of those who are so brutally exploited by the members of the racist minority and their imperialist allies.

149. It must be recalled that the Namibians did not take up arms cheerfully. To make peace with them does not consist in disarming them, in inviting them to leave their knives in the cloakroom in order to enter into nebulous negotiations. It is not a matter of depriving them of what they have gained in the struggle, of frustrating them of victory when it is in sight.

150. The establishing of peace in southern Africa turns on the triumph of the rights of these peoples to independence, freedom, justice and social progress. If we want to remain faithful to the purposes and principles of this Organization, which has never sanctioned actions or proposals implying compromise, reservations or restrictions on these rights, if we want to defend the integrity of these rights and have them prevail over all other contingent considerations, then, in all logic, we must denounce manoeuvres in which the future of the Namibian people is today at stake.

151. We must denounce efforts that tend to sabotage the decision taken by the Namibian people to free themselves by their own means, efforts which are not in keeping with the need to do away with the causes which led that people to take up arms, but seek, rather, to call a halt to the struggle without guaranteeing that South Africa will subscribe to the idea of a truly independent and sovereign Namibia.

152. We must denounce efforts of those who, deliberately closing their eyes to the illegal position of South Africa, would restore to it the rights of which the United Nations and the International Court of Justice have already deprived it. It is an out-and-out scandal that, in virtue of its acceptance, SWAPO—and we know its feeble capacity to resist pressure—is supposed to assume the sole responsibility for such a change.

153. Instead of enabling the Security Council to exhaust the ways and means provided for in Chapter VII, thus performing the role which properly belongs to it in the liberation of Namibia, the very people who have increased the impotence of the United Nations and undermined its authority, seek today to create confusion in our ranks by attempting to have us join in their peculiar way of regarding peace in southern Africa from the wrong end of the telescope. That is something which also should be denounced. The peace is not threatened by the liberation struggle of the peoples. It is threatened because the illegal racist minority régimes cling to power, determined to make use of the considerable resources at their disposal to oppose the legitimate aspirations of the oppressed majority. It is threatened because capitalist and international imperialist circles are more interested in maintaining and consolidating their position than in preparing for the advent in southern Africa of a new era of freedom and dignity for the victims of *apartheid* and discrimination of all kinds.

154. The United Nations Council for Namibia—whose efforts we should like to commend—has submitted for the approval of our Assembly a draft declaration and a

programme of international action. The messages which emerge from these documents are clear. The United Nations remains attached to the realization of the inalienable national rights of the Namibian people to independence, freedom and social progress. As the depositary of legality in southern Africa the United Nations once again calls for the unconditional withdrawal of the South African administration and repeats that any solution of the problem of Namibia must be arrived at under its aegis, in conformity with the purposes and principles of the Charter. The General Assembly is in favour of stepping up the pressure on South Africa and calls upon the Security Council to adopt appropriate sanctions, namely economic sanctions, an oil embargo and an arms embargo. These are recommendations with which my delegation willingly associates itself.

155. In reaffirming our unreserved support for SWAPO, the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people, I should like to say by way of conclusion that my Government fully supports the draft declaration when it expresses the conviction that the intensification of the armed liberation struggle continues to be the decisive factor in efforts being made to bring about the self-determination, freedom and national independence of a united Namibia.

156. Mr. TÜRKMEN (Turkey): I should like to say at the outset that my delegation is very happy to see Mr. Lazar Mojsov presiding over the General Assembly at its ninth special session devoted to the question of Namibia. Remembering vividly how much his wisdom and diplomatic skills helped to promote constructive conclusions during the thirty-second session, we are fully confident that our deliberations will, under his guidance, contribute substantially and effectively to the accession of Namibia to independence.

157. The developments which have taken place since last year have confirmed the soundness of the decision of the General Assembly to hold a special session on the question of Namibia before the thirty-third session. In the light of the events unfolding in Namibia itself, with their crucial implications for the liberation struggle of the Namibian people; of the recent evolution in other parts of southern Africa; and of the present status of initiatives undertaken to achieve a settlement within the framework of Security Council resolution 385 (1976), it is indeed urgent for the General Assembly to assess all these developments and to work out guidelines as well as a programme of action for future efforts.

158. In Namibia this period has been marked by a serious deterioration of the situation. South Africa has embarked on a reinforcement of its armed forces in Namibia with the obvious aim of consolidating its political power, of creating conditions conducive to a bogus independence and of establishing a puppet régime. Brutal action against the Namibian people, such as arbitrary detention, torture and assassination and violence against SWAPO, is being vigorously pursued. Ethnic strife is being abetted to consolidate the process of bantustanization. South Africa still continues to exploit and plunder the natural resources of the Territory. Its aggressive attacks against neighbouring front-line countries have not stopped. Furthermore, the annexation of Walvis Bay is nothing but a violation of the territorial integrity of Namibia.

159. While these developments are taking place in Namibia, the initiative undertaken by the five Western members of the Security Council to bring about a transition to independence during 1978 within a framework acceptable to the people of Namibia has not yet, to our knowledge, achieved significant progress. Inasmuch as this initiative is designed to provide an agreed basis for the implementation of Security Council resolution 385 (1976) under effective United Nations responsibility and supervision, it does represent, in our view, a valuable contribution to the search for a solution enabling the Namibian people to attain independence without delay. SWAPO, through its President, has also stated that it is prepared, in principle, to find a negotiated settlement in Namibia. This constructive approach by SWAPO is borne out by the conciliatory attitude it adopted during the talks in New York last February. In the Lusaka Declaration, the United Nations Council for Namibia commended SWAPO for its willingness to reach a negotiated settlement. But, unfortunately, it is equally clear to us that South Africa has remained intransigent in the talks and we are concerned about the possibility that Pretoria may try to manipulate the negotiating process with a view to reviving its inadmissible scheme of an internal solution leading to a fraudulent decolonization. What has happened recently in Rhodesia can only increase our fears in this respect.

160. As a Territory under the direct responsibility of the United Nations, Namibia constitutes a very special challenge to the international community. Our task at this session is not only to reaffirm the principles already enunciated by the General Assembly and the Security Council, but also to determine the conditions which will ensure the genuine independence of Namibia and safeguard its territorial integrity.

161. The groundwork for the General Assembly has been thoroughly prepared, we believe, by the United Nations Council for Namibia which, under the able presidency of Miss Konie of Zambia, held at Lusaka a series of extraordinary meetings in late March which culminated in the adoption of an important Declaration. Earlier, countries having special significance for the liberation struggle in southern Africa were visited by missions on behalf of the United Nations Council for Namibia. Turkey, as a member of the Council for Namibia, was privileged to take part in one of those missions.

162. We firmly uphold the view that the United Nations Council for Namibia, which has direct responsibility for administering Namibia until independence, is also the main policy-making body in support of the aspirations of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence. In this capacity, the Council for Namibia should be called upon to play an active and primordial role in the preparation and implementation of arrangements designed to ensure the accession of Namibia to independence.

163. It is the firm belief of my delegation that any genuine attempt to resolve the question of Namibia by negotiation should not in any way undermine the position of SWAPO; nor should it diminish the role of the United Nations Council for Namibia in this regard. The Security Council should take the views of the Council for Namibia fully into account in devising measures and steps on the

basis of resolution 385 (1976). It seems almost certain at this stage that South Africa will not consent to a settlement compatible with the principles adopted by the Security Council and that any delay in the implementation of resolution 385 (1976) will probably be seized upon as an opportunity to prevent genuine change in Namibia and to undermine the achievements of SWAPO by attempting to impose a puppet régime. It falls to the Security Council to avert this danger by applying strong and effective measures. We would support a call by the General Assembly to this effect.

164. Turkey fully endorses the principles and objectives of the Lusaka Declaration. In particular, we consider that South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia constitutes an act of aggression against the Namibian people and against the United Nations. We recognize SWAPO as the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people. We reject any so-called internal settlement in Namibia and urge effective measures to prevent the imposition of such a settlement becoming a fait accompli. We believe that the territorial integrity of Namibia should be reaffirmed, and we unequivocally condemn the illegal annexation of Walvis Bay by South Africa.

165. We are convinced that a peaceful settlement can only be reached under the conditions spelled out in Security Council resolution 385 (1976) which calls, among other things, for free and unfettered exercise by the Namibian people of their right to self-determination and independence within a united Namibia.

166. The convening of this special session on Namibia coincides with crucial developments concerning not only Namibia but southern Africa in general. What is happening in Namibia will influence in no small measure the situation in Rhodesia and the racial policies in South Africa itself. The international community cannot but recognize that a truly independent Namibia would not only mean that the legitimate aspirations of the Namibian people were fulfilled but also serve the interests of peace in southern Africa. In charting our course of action we should be guided by the awareness that any undue delay in reaching a settlement in Namibia can only engulf southern Africa in a prolonged, bitter and cruel conflict. The Namibian people has fought perhaps longer than any other people for self-determination and independence. The United Nations has been involved in this question for more than 30 years. The international community is unanimous in demanding immediate independence for Namibia. It is high time for concrete and sustained action.

167. Mr. FONSEKA (Sri Lanka): May I congratulate Mr. Lazar Mojsov on the resumption of his duties, this time as President of the General Assembly at its ninth special session. He amply demonstrated a wealth of experience in international affairs and great competence in and familiarity with the work and procedures of the United Nations during his presidency of the thirty-second regular session and no less during the eighth special session, which we have just concluded. All this and his election today indicate the esteem in which his country, Yugoslavia, is held—a country with which we have the most cordial relations, both bilaterally and through the non-aligned movement. My delegation is confident that under his presidency this

special session on the question of Namibia will be guided to a fruitful conclusion. I trust that, since he is absent, my sentiments will be conveyed to Mr. Mojsov.

168. I should like to convey to you, Mr. President, and the Foreign Ministers present here the sincere regret of my Foreign Minister, Mr. A. C. S. Hameed, at his inability to participate personally in the special session owing to a number of other important commitments both at home and abroad. I should like, however, to place before you the text of a message from my President, His Excellency Mr. J. R. Jayawardene, President of the Republic of Sri Lanka and current Chairman of the Non-Aligned Conference. This message reads as follows:

“I have pleasure in sending this message to the special session of the United Nations General Assembly convened in New York to discuss the question of Namibia. The special session takes place at a critical period when racist elements in the whole of southern Africa are seeking to entrench themselves against the noble aspirations and ambitions of the people of southern Africa. It was only two years ago that at the Colombo summit the non-aligned Heads of State or Government reaffirmed their support for the legitimate struggle of the Namibian people under the leadership of SWAPO, their national liberation movement, and called upon the world community to render every form of assistance to them in their struggle for independence.

“Sri Lanka has consistently held that the occupation by South Africa of Namibia is illegal and untenable and that Namibia is the direct responsibility of the United Nations. No arrangement for the future of Namibia can have any validity unless any determination or decision is based on the freely expressed views of the people of Namibia within the framework of a single undivided political entity.

“The non-aligned countries have been unanimous in their strong condemnation of the racist régime of South Africa for its illegal occupation of Namibia and the system of *apartheid* foisted on the Namibian people. The special session of the United Nations General Assembly on Namibia must take action for the abolition of this inhuman system of *apartheid* and all its practices, the release of all political prisoners and the return of political exiles and refugees to enable the people of Namibia, under the auspices of the United Nations, to determine their future in a free and unfettered environment.

“I wish the special session all success”.

169. May I say that at this time when our Organization is so deeply involved in a number of issues, all of them of immediate and deep concern for the security and well-being of Member States, we might well be asked why we have been called together for yet another special session on the question of Namibia. In all probability we should be told that the question of Namibia has been on the agenda of the United Nations General Assembly for as long as we can remember and will reappear on the agenda of the thirty-third session. The reasoning accordingly would be that there is hardly a situation here which demands our assembling again to revive and debate an issue of no apparent urgency.

170. May I recall that the special session is being held in pursuance of General Assembly resolution 32/9 of 4 November 1977. That resolution contains eight sections dealing with different aspects of the question of Namibia, the last of which calls for this special session. It was the leader of my delegation, in his capacity as representative of the current Chairman of the Non-Aligned Group, who introduced the resolution in its eight parts on behalf of the Non-Aligned Group. The last part of resolution 32/9 calls on us to keep the situation in Namibia under continuous review, and we meet today to place before the General Assembly an appraisal of what has happened since the last session of the General Assembly and to decide on the action we must take if we are to advance the cause of Namibian independence.

171. The Foreign Minister of Nigeria, who has addressed the Assembly, as well as the President of the Council for Namibia, the Chairman of the Special Committee and Mr. Sam Nujoma, representative of SWAPO, have given the Assembly what I might describe as the most recent and informed appraisal of the situation in Namibia. We ourselves shall be followed by several other representatives who will give their own estimates of developments in the Territory and urge action we must take. My delegation does not propose to repeat all those views.

172. As the representative of the current Chairman of the Non-Aligned Group, I should like to recall the resolution on Namibia adopted unanimously by the States participating in the Non-Aligned Summit Conference in Colombo. Briefly, that resolution condemned the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa, reaffirmed that SWAPO is the authentic national liberation movement of the Namibian people, denounced the so-called constitutional talks arranged by the racist régime in South Africa, which ignore SWAPO with a view to achieving an internal settlement, and called upon the Security Council to live up to its resolution 385 (1976). The approach in that resolution, which is based on previous resolutions of the General Assembly, has also been that of the United Nations Council for Namibia, whose report and Declaration adopted at Lusaka set out what the General Assembly should accomplish at this special session.

173. May I take this occasion to record our appreciation of the work of the United Nations Council for Namibia and its President and their untiring efforts to advance the cause of Namibia's independence. The Council for Namibia has been set up by the General Assembly as the internal and external administrative authority for Namibia until independence. It remains both the symbol and the instrument of the United Nations having direct responsibility for Namibia.

174. The occasion of the special session on Namibia is an appropriate one on which to recall the Maputo Declaration of May 1977,<sup>6</sup> which, after setting out the existing situation, outlines a programme of action for the liberation of both Namibia and Zimbabwe. We support that Declaration and ask that it be the basis of any declaration and

programme of action emanating from this session. May I add that that Declaration had the unanimous support of the 92 States Members of the United Nations that assembled at Maputo for that Conference.

*Mr. Mojsov (Yugoslavia) returned to the Chair.*

175. My remarks would be incomplete without a reference to the work and efforts 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. Its members have toiled ceaselessly over the years and given their labours for the advancement of Namibia's independence.

176. We meet at a time when serious attempts are being made to dismember the Territory of Namibia. We must therefore take the opportunity provided by this special session to reaffirm that Namibia remains one Territory and that there should be no encouragement or recognition of any attempt to install the bantustans which the illegal administering Power has already imposed on the African people inside the boundaries of South Africa. Aware, as we are, that there is only one organization which truly represents all the people of Namibia, we must reaffirm and strengthen the position of SWAPO as the only organization responsible for the genuine national liberation and independence of the Namibian people. The General Assembly has itself accorded that recognition to SWAPO, and we would ask those States that have not done so to recognize SWAPO in this capacity.

177. In my earlier remarks I asked whether we were in a situation of urgency requiring us to meet now in special session. That question was by no means rhetorical, because recent events do point to more than an ordinary degree of urgency. We are all aware of recent events in the course of which South Africa has embarked on measures which are all too familiar to those following the scene in southern Africa. The policy of bantustanization pursued to sustain the evil doctrine of *apartheid* has been imposed within South Africa itself. That it is unworkable and doomed to failure was brought vividly into focus just the other day when one bantustan, the Transkei, unceremoniously broke off relations with the Pretoria that had fathered it and the country that had the unique distinction of being the only one that had recognized it, thereby reducing the comedy to a farce. Seeing that propagation of the bantustan concept has no hope in Namibia, the approach now is via the device given new respectability in southern Africa known as the "internal settlement". An attempt was made to achieve this in Namibia by a dubious combination of one minority African ethnic group with the political leadership of the next largest ethnic element, which is, as expected, made up of the descendants of white settlers. Together they have called themselves the Democratic Turnhalle Alliance, which is led by Dirk Mudge, who has been described as a liberal white, with Chief Kapuuo, a tribal chief, to give the alliance a veneer of authenticity. This Turnhalle Alliance was an obvious device to which Pretoria could pass on the mantle of authority if and when it vacated its illegal occupation. Chief Kapuuo was talked of as a possible first President of independent Namibia. That alliance did not have any support from the majority of the black people of Namibia, whose true representative is SWAPO. The Turnhalle Alli-

<sup>6</sup> A/32/109/Rev.1-5/12344/Rev.1, annex V. For the printed text, see *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-second Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1977*.

ance and the constitutional talks were no more than a counterpoint to SWAPO and an all too familiar formula in colonial territories striving for independence. While political assassination is not a phenomenon which we condone, the fate that overtook Chief Kapuuo has a familiar ring. Political stratagems devised in desperation must regrettably come to desperate ends.

178. I have just referred to the new approach known as the internal settlement. When my delegation introduced the eight draft resolutions on Namibia at the thirty-second session of the General Assembly<sup>7</sup> we made a reference to the initiative taken by the five Western members of the Security Council to arrive at a negotiated settlement. That initiative has now been submitted as a formal proposal in a paper of the Security Council,<sup>8</sup> issued just two weeks ago. It is described as providing an effective basis for the implementation of Security Council resolution 385 (1976) of January 1976, and if implemented would enable a government of Namibia to assume authority in 1978 and draw up and adopt a constitution for an independent and sovereign Namibia.

179. Meanwhile, an Administrator-General appointed by South Africa has already begun to introduce certain reforms, including the abandoning of all the external manifestations of *apartheid* exported from racist South Africa to Namibia. We hope that those cosmetic changes will not be regarded as evidence of a change of heart and reasons for delaying two conditions under which the Namibian people could exercise the determination of their future. Nor can we overlook other evidence that has been placed before us by the Council for Namibia that the South African Government has reinforced its military establishment which has hitherto been the mainstay of its illegal authority.

180. It would be premature for my delegation to offer comments, critical or otherwise, on the proposal that was placed before the Security Council barely two weeks ago. It includes a role for the United Nations Special Representative, elections under United Nations supervision, the release of political prisoners, the return of Namibian refugees, the phased withdrawal of South African forces, a role for SWAPO and participation by its personnel in the political process. The proposal also includes the establishment of a United Nations transition assistance group and the cessation of hostile acts by all parties. We did also note that the proposal entrusts the existing police force with the maintenance of law and order in Namibia during the transition period. As I stated earlier, it would be premature for us to comment on this proposal. Its validity will be subject to acceptance by SWAPO, which we have always said remains the genuine representative of the people of Namibia.

181. I might add here that we have yet to learn Pretoria's reaction to this proposal. All we do know is that South Africa has sought clarification of the proposal. Clarification it may seek; but let us hope that clarification is not a subterfuge to enable South Africa to retain its control either administratively or through political front men.

<sup>7</sup> Approved as resolutions 32/9, A-H.

<sup>8</sup> S/12636.

Nevertheless, what we should like to stress here is that this proposal should not be regarded as the commencement of another process of an "internal settlement" which has already complicated the situation in Zimbabwe and seemingly given a new lease on life to the illegal régime of Ian Smith. Should it so evolve in Namibia because South Africa so wills, the General Assembly can have no alternative but to reject another such "internal settlement".

182. I have referred in these remarks to Pretoria's reaction to the proposal of the five Western Powers. It is no secret that the South African Government has made it known that in any settlement for Namibian independence the vital port of Walvis Bay will not be included or will be regarded as a separate entity requiring separate treatment. I need hardly repeat here that we regard Walvis Bay as an integral part of Namibia and that any plan or device to detach it is unacceptable and would only jeopardize any proposal for a Namibian settlement.

183. We await the outcome of this special session with more than ordinary interest and, may I say, with some anxiety. The United Nations has been obliged to acquiesce in South Africa's defiance over an unduly extended period. It has by no means been a willing acquiescence; it has been more a condition of helpless resignation in the face of the unwillingness of those who could act declining to do so because their vital economic interests in both South Africa and Namibia are at stake. Or, if a more palatable reason was needed, then that peaceful solutions must be found and that international peace and security were not in jeopardy. The Western proposal is now before the Security Council.

184. I shall conclude by asking whether, in the event of South Africa's rejecting this proposal, the Security Council will be allowed to enforce the relevant provisions of our Charter. We remain hopeful that before this session completes its work we shall have something in the way of an answer.

185. Mr. ULRICHSEN (Denmark): I am speaking in my capacity of Permanent Representative of the country which at present exercises the presidency of the European Community.

186. The nine member countries of the European Community have on many occasions presented their views on the question of Namibia, notably during the debates on this important issue at the regular sessions of the General Assembly. The occasion of the ninth special session of the General Assembly devoted especially to the question of Namibia provides an opportunity to do so again—this time with a sense of special urgency, as developments with regard to the question of Namibia have now reached a crucial stage. The Nine therefore sincerely hope that the special session will contribute to a settlement of the Namibian problem, in accordance with Security Council resolution 385 (1976), which will be acceptable to all the parties and attract full international support. In the view of the Nine that resolution which was adopted unanimously by the Security Council, provides the fundamental principles for an internationally acceptable solution leading to self-determination and independence for Namibia. Only through a settlement based on the above-mentioned resolution will it be possible to achieve a peaceful transition to independence for the Territory.

187. It may be worth recalling the essential elements of that historic resolution. Implementation of its provisions would guarantee that free and fair elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations would be held in the whole of Namibia as one political entity which would enable the people of Namibia freely to determine their own future. The United Nations would establish the necessary machinery within Namibia for the supervision of such elections and would guarantee conditions that would allow the Namibian people to organize politically for the purpose of the elections. South Africa's illegal presence would be ended, and a democratically elected Government would lead Namibia to independence with the assistance of the United Nations. Furthermore, South Africa would be required to release all Namibian political prisoners and to accord to all Namibians currently in exile for political reasons full facilities for returning to their country without risking arrest, detention, imprisonment or intimidation. South Africa would also be obliged to comply fully with the provisions of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and to abolish the application of all racially discriminatory and politically repressive laws and practices.

188. The nine member countries of the European Community believe that the fulfilment of those fundamental requirements would provide the best and most comprehensive solution of the Namibian problem. We have always shared the grave concern of the international community at South Africa's continued illegal occupation of Namibia and have therefore on numerous occasions demanded that South Africa should withdraw from Namibia at an early date and that all racially discriminatory and repressive laws and practices in Namibia should be abolished.

189. In the months following the adoption of resolution 385 (1976) we were particularly concerned at reports that the establishment of some form of internal self-government based on the recommendations of the Turnhalle Conference was imminent. The installation of such a government based on ethnic factors and excluding one of the major political forces in the Territory, SWAPO, would have been unacceptable to the Nine and to the entire international community and would inevitably have led to increasing tension. For this reason, in their démarche to the South African Government in February 1977, the Nine made it clear that they fully supported the position of the United Nations that free elections be held in Namibia under United Nations supervision and control. We took the occasion to reaffirm our basic requirements for a settlement of the Namibian problem which had to be met to bring Namibia to early self-determination and independence: South Africa should withdraw from Namibia at an early date in order to enable the Namibian people to exercise their right of self-determination and independence in a fully democratic election process.

190. All major political groups in Namibia, including, notably, SWAPO, should be free to engage in the political activities preceding the elections, and all political prisoners should be released and exiles permitted to return. Our Governments therefore welcomed the decision by the South African authorities to abandon their intention to implement the Turnhalle Constitution.

191. In early 1977 the five Western members of the Security Council initiated efforts, which our nine Govern-

ments welcomed, to find an internationally acceptable solution in accordance with resolution 385 (1976). During the past year the five countries have conducted intensive negotiations with the various parties involved, with a view to encouraging agreement on the early transfer of authority in Namibia to a freely elected, independent government. The Nine have noted with appreciation the positive role played by the front-line States and other African Governments in the course of those negotiations. As a result of considerable progress made in narrowing the gap between the positions of the parties concerned, the five countries recently transmitted to the parties and to the Security Council their proposal for a peaceful settlement of the Namibian situation in accordance with resolution 385 (1976).

192. The Nine have studied the proposal carefully and believe that it represents the best opportunity for a peaceful transfer of power in Namibia designed to bring about an early transition to independence within a framework acceptable to the people of Namibia and to the international community. The proposal addresses itself to all elements of resolution 385 (1976), and provides for the holding of genuinely free elections for the whole of Namibia as one political entity. It also guarantees a substantial United Nations involvement during the transitional period. The Nine therefore find that the proposal provides an effective means of implementing resolution 385 (1976) while at the same time taking appropriate account of the interests of all parties involved. We do not see any peaceful alternative to the plan.

193. At the recent meeting in Copenhagen of the European Council the nine participating Heads of State or Government issued the following declaration on Namibia:

“The European Council has taken note of the proposal for a settlement in Namibia prepared by the five Powers. The Council supports the action of the Five and considers the proposal to be a fair and reasonable settlement. It hopes that all the parties involved will feel able to accept this important opportunity for a negotiated peaceful solution in accordance with Security Council resolution 385 (1976).”

194. The parties have not yet given their final reaction to the Five's proposal. This might be the last opportunity for achieving a peaceful, democratic and internationally acceptable settlement in Namibia. Political decisions are now urgently required. Moreover, success in Namibia could well have favourable repercussions elsewhere in southern Africa. It is therefore with a very acute sense of urgency and awareness of both the risks and the opportunities inherent in the present situation that the Nine express the sincere hope that all parties concerned will accept the proposal as the best means of accelerating Namibia's speedy and peaceful transition to independence.

195. Mr. HARRY (Australia): In the years to come, when students of history look back over the struggle of the people of Namibia for independence, the year 1978 will, I believe, stand out as one of the most significant periods.

196. In March we adopted the Declaration of Lusaka. That document was the product of a series of plenary



meetings that the Council for Namibia held in Lusaka under the dynamic chairmanship of the representative of Zambia, and is, in essence, a reaffirmation of the need for genuine freedom and independence for Namibia.

197. Earlier this month, the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, under the deft chairmanship of Ambassador Salim Salim of the United Republic of Tanzania, adopted a consensus statement on Namibia [see A/S-9/6, annex] which, similarly, demands justice for Namibians.

198. Now we are gathered here for an even more significant event: a special session in which the General Assembly is devoting exclusive attention to Namibia. Our conclusions and the courses of action we recommend can have a most important influence on the future of Namibia.

199. I do not propose to repeat in any detail the general position of the Australian Government on the question of Namibia. Our policy is clear: we reject any claim by South Africa to Namibia; we condemn its illegal occupation of the Territory, and we call upon South Africa to accede to the unequivocal view of the international community that it should allow genuine self-determination to be exercised in Namibia. We have made our stand on this issue clear, both in the Council for Namibia and in the Special Committee.

200. Our task here is to assess realistically the situation as it faces us today, to assess the options before us and to consider what course of action we should take. For we are standing at the crossroads: if we proceed in one direction, peace and freedom for the Namibian people can, we believe, be attained; if we proceed in the other, although independence will in the end be achieved, it will come at a great cost.

201. When Australia participated in the adoption of the Lusaka Declaration and the consensus statement of the Special Committee on Namibia, we reiterated our view that the search for a peaceful settlement should not be abandoned in favour of an attempt to reach a solution exclusively by force of arms. In our view such a course of action could only lead to a Namibia wasted by war, a Namibia no doubt eventually independent, but at the greatest cost in human and material terms, and with its independence embittered and crippled by the hates and destruction engendered by the conflict.

202. A realistic and practical proposal is within our grasp to bring about peace and justice in Namibia. This is contained in Security Council document S/12636 circulated on 10 April 1978. The five Western members of the Security Council have been engaged in an extensive series of negotiations with South Africa, on the one hand, and SWAPO, on the other. These negotiations have culminated in the circulation by those five countries of a set of proposals designed to bring about independence for Namibia in accordance with Security Council resolution 385 (1976) of 30 January 1976. During the Special Committee's most recent consideration of the question of Namibia, my delegation examined in some detail various aspects of these proposals of the Five. The authors of the proposals will no doubt do the same at this special session. The proposals offer us at this time the best chance for a

peaceful solution. If reason and good sense prevail, a solution acceptable not only to the Namibian people but also to the international community can be achieved. We urge South Africa to grasp this opportunity.

203. Since 1966, when the General Assembly terminated South Africa's Mandate over South West Africa, which covered most of Namibia, South Africa has defied the international community. There have been many actions by the international community designed to bring about the withdrawal of South Africa from Namibia. I shall recall only one or two here. The advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice in 1971 held that

“the continued presence of South Africa in Namibia being illegal, South Africa is under obligation to withdraw its administration from Namibia immediately and thus put an end to its occupation of the Territory”.<sup>9</sup>

Significant steps have since been taken by the Security Council, the most important being the adoption of Security Council resolution 385 (1976) of 30 January 1976. Australia believes that this resolution remains the most authoritative guide for action. The Australian Government emphasizes particularly the need for genuinely free elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations. Free elections in which all Namibians participate can alone decide the future of Namibia on a sound and stable basis. Any action designed to circumvent this, such as the installation of the sort of government that would have resulted from the Turnhalle talks, cannot constitute genuine decolonization.

204. The proposal of the Western members of the Security Council that I mentioned earlier is entirely in conformity with Security Council resolution 385 (1976). We hope that it will become the basis for a process accepted by all parties for it offers a chance for the attainment of the fundamental human rights so long denied to the people of Namibia.

205. I have said that we are at the crossroads. Good sense suggests that now as never before we have an option that can lead to peace, freedom and justice for the Namibian people. Humanity surely demands that we pursue this option to its conclusion.

#### *Organization of work*

206. The PRESIDENT: This morning, in establishing an *Ad Hoc* Committee of the ninth special session, the General Assembly decided that the Committee would have three vice-chairmen. Following consultations with a number of delegations, I propose now that there should be an additional Vice-Chairman for the *Ad Hoc* Committee, on the understanding that he could serve as Chairman of the working group that might be established by the Committee. I take it that the Assembly agrees to that proposal.

*It was so decided (decision S-9/22).*

*The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.*

<sup>9</sup> See *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*, para. 133.



CONTENTS

Agenda item 7:  
Question of Namibia (*continued*)

*President: Mr. Lazar MOJSOV (Yugoslavia).*

AGENDA ITEM 7

Question of Namibia (*continued*)

1. The PRESIDENT: Before calling on the first speaker, I should like to propose that the list of speakers be closed this afternoon at 5 o'clock. If there is no objection, I shall take it that the General Assembly decides to approve that proposal.

*It was so decided.*

2. Mr. ILLUECA (Panama) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. President, the General Assembly is meeting in special session under your worthy guidance to make effective the inalienable right of the people of Namibia to their political independence and territorial integrity. The action the General Assembly must take to achieve that goal should be supported, in the opinion of the delegation of Panama, by the three basic pillars of the system elaborated in conformity with the Charter to permit the exercise of the right of peoples to self-determination, namely, the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, contained in resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960; the Declaration on the Permanent Sovereignty of Peoples and Nations over their Natural Wealth and Resources, contained in resolution 1803 (XVII) of 14 December 1962; and the Declaration on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order, contained in resolution 3201 (S-VI) of 1 May 1974.

3. In those historic declarations, the General Assembly proclaimed, on the one hand, that "All peoples have the right to self-determination" and that:

"The subjection of peoples to alien subjugation, domination and exploitation constitutes a denial of fundamental human rights, is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations and is an impediment to the promotion of world peace and co-operation".

On the other hand, the General Assembly declared that:

"Violation of the rights of peoples and nations to sovereignty over their natural wealth and resources is contrary to the spirit and principles of the Charter of the

United Nations and hinders the development of international co-operation and the maintenance of peace".

And, finally, the General Assembly proclaimed as a fundamental principle of the new international order

"The right of all States, territories and peoples under foreign occupation, alien and colonial domination or *apartheid* to restitution and full compensation for the exploitation and depletion of, and damages to, the natural resources and all other resources of those States, territories and peoples".

4. It is within that legal and political framework that the question of Namibia should be solved, with full respect for the resolutions and decisions of the United Nations and for the advisory opinion of 21 June 1971 delivered by the International Court of Justice.<sup>1</sup> All those documents state that South Africa must withdraw its illegal administration from Namibia and hand over power to the Namibian people with the assistance of the United Nations. The United Nations Council for Namibia has made noble efforts in that direction, and my delegation extends heartfelt congratulations to its Chairman, Ambassador Gwendoline Konie of Zambia, and to the members of the Council on the splendid work they have done, as reflected in the Council's latest reports [A/S-9/4].

5. It is clear that in order to achieve this supreme goal the General Assembly, if it is to uphold its prestige and authority in the face of the outrageous conduct of the South African Government, must not remain a passive bystander any longer but must adopt concrete and categorical measures to solve the question as a whole.

6. It should be recalled in this connexion that the General Assembly, in resolution 31/153 of 20 December 1976, decided to launch a comprehensive assistance programme within the United Nations system, covering both the present period of struggle for independence and the initial years of independence of Namibia, with the active and dynamic participation of the specialized agencies and other organizations and bodies within the United Nations system. That provision, which is in keeping with the direct responsibility for Namibia that the United Nations has assumed, was confirmed by the General Assembly in its resolution 32/9 A, in which it called upon the United Nations Council for Namibia, as the legal Administering Authority for the Territory, to continue and intensify, in consultation with the South West Africa People's Organi-

<sup>1</sup> See *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.

zation (SWAPO), the direction and co-ordination of the Nationhood Programme for Namibia.

7. The Government of Panama is convinced that today more than ever it is essential that a United Nations programme ensuring the immediate and genuine independence of Namibia must be carried out to the full. In that connexion my country, which participated, as Vice-Chairman, in Latin America's representation at the International Conference in Support of the Peoples of Zimbabwe and Namibia and which participated actively in the Working Group that drafted the Maputo Declaration in Support of the Peoples of Zimbabwe and Namibia and Programme of Action for the Liberation of Zimbabwe and Namibia, has noted as a definitely positive sign the fact that the United Nations Council for Namibia in its 1978 Lusaka Declaration reached the conclusion that the implementation of the Maputo Programme of Action must be one of the central objectives of this special session of the General Assembly [*Ibid.*, para. 31, subpara. 35 (d)].

8. Therefore, on instructions from my Government, I solemnly declare that the Republic of Panama recognizes SWAPO as the sole authentic representative of the people of Namibia, and that we will lend our unreserved co-operation to the efforts to strengthen SWAPO as the leader of the Namibian people's struggle for genuine liberation and independence. That support, as the Head of Government of my country, General Omar Torrijos, stated at the Summit Conference of Non-Aligned Countries held in Colombo in August 1976, will not be confined to measures that do not imply the use of armed force. As General Torrijos said to our African brothers, on the day when the United Nations orders armed action to liberate Namibia, Panamanian armed forces will participate in that mission of liberation.

9. With that background, it is entirely appropriate to make clear at this early stage of the debate that the General Assembly, because of its own earlier decisions, cannot accept any political arrangement or merely cosmetic formula that will not lead this year—1978—to the genuine self-determination and independence of the Namibian nation and that is not based on the territorial integrity and unity of Namibia, in conformity with United Nations resolutions and decisions. Among those resolutions a pre-eminent place is held by Security Council resolution 385 (1976), adopted unanimously on 30 January 1976, with no change at all in the draft resolution that had been presented by Benin, Guyana, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Pakistan, Panama, Romania, Sweden and the United Republic of Tanzania.

10. As a sponsor of the draft resolution which became resolution 385 (1976) the delegation of Panama has a keen interest in ensuring that the resolution is not flouted but, on the contrary—as required by respect for the dignity of the United Nations—is strictly complied with, that there is full implementation of each and every one of the decisions set out in the operative part of the resolution, covering as they do, in a clear and specific way, the general abominable situation that South Africa has illegally created in the international Territory of Namibia.

11. Resolution 385 (1976), referred to in paragraph 9 of the consensus adopted by the Special Committee on the

Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, reached very clear conclusions:

(a) The occupation of the Territory of Namibia by South Africa is illegal and, hence, must be condemned;

(b) The application by South Africa of racially discriminatory and repressive laws and practices in Namibia is illegal and arbitrary and, hence, must be condemned;

(c) The South African military build-up in Namibia and the use of the Territory as a base for attacks on neighbouring countries—I am referring in particular to Angola and Zambia—is a violation of international law since they involve the militarization of Namibia by the South African illegal occupation régime;

(d) The policy of bantustans and so-called homelands is aimed at violating the national unity and territorial integrity of Namibia, and therefore the Security Council demands that South Africa put an end to that policy forthwith;

(e) The resolution records the failure by South Africa to comply with previous decisions by the Security Council on the question of Namibia;

(f) The resolution brings out South Africa's intentions to evade the clear demand of the United Nations for the holding of free elections in Namibia, under United Nations supervision and control;

(g) It declares that it is imperative that free elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations be held for the whole of Namibia as one political entity;

(h) The resolution declares that an adequate period of time before the holding of these elections must be fixed by the Security Council, to enable the United Nations to establish the necessary machinery within Namibia to supervise and control the elections, as well as to enable the people of Namibia to organize politically for the purpose of the elections;

(i) The resolution demands that South Africa accept the foregoing provisions and undertake to comply with the resolutions and decisions of the United Nations and with the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of 21 June 1971;

(j) It reiterates the demand that South Africa take the necessary steps to effect the withdrawal of its illegal administration maintained in Namibia and transfer power to the people of Namibia with the assistance of the United Nations;

(k) The resolution demands that South Africa, pending the transfer of power, should (i) comply fully in spirit and in practice with the provisions of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights; (ii) release all Namibian political prisoners, including all those imprisoned or detained in connexion with offences under so-called internal security laws; (iii) abolish the application in Namibia of all racially discriminatory and politically repressive laws and practices;

and (iv) accord unconditionally to all Namibians currently in exile for political reasons full facilities for return to their country without risk of arrest, detention, intimidation or imprisonment.

12. South Africa has not failed to follow up on the events which led to the adoption by the Security Council of resolution 385 (1976); on the contrary, all the cruel violations listed in that resolution have been intensified and refined, with all the bitterness and suffering that that has entailed for the Namibian people. It would therefore be illusory and ludicrous for the General Assembly, in the face of this deplorable situation, to resign itself and merely adopt one more resolution repeating earlier decisions of the United Nations at a time when the peoples of the entire world are anxiously awaiting drastic, vigorous and effective action to put an end to the criminal occupation and ferocious exploitation of Namibia by South Africa.

13. Nor in our opinion, would any other kind of resolution be acceptable to the international community that certain Member States might put forward to allow the Government of South Africa to gain time and give it an opportunity to bring about a negotiated settlement adapted to its intransigence and serving its selfish colonial interests.

14. The General Assembly is faced with a burning issue which is more than a threat to international peace and security because it has actually already disrupted peace, for that is what has happened now that a colonial war is being waged by South Africa in the international Territory of Namibia, in open defiance of the people of Namibia and its legitimate representative, SWAPO.

15. In its resolution 385 (1976) the Security Council decided to meet at a later date in order to ascertain whether South Africa had abided by the provisions of certain resolutions and, in case of its non-compliance, to consider appropriate action to be taken in accordance with the United Nations Charter.

16. In paragraph 32 of its resolution 32/9 D the General Assembly urged the Security Council to consider, with regard to the question of Namibia, the application of sanctions against South Africa in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter. The Special Committee, in its consensus of 13 April this year [see A/S-9/6, annex], for its part also recommended that the Security Council consider the adoption of all appropriate action under the Charter, including other measures provided for in Chapter VII, with a view to ensuring the speedy compliance by the Government of South Africa with the decisions of the Security Council.

17. The delegation of Panama is fully in agreement with and supports the central objectives of the Lusaka Declaration of 1978 which should be borne in mind by the present special session of the General Assembly. My delegation also unreservedly supports the recommendation which the United Nations Council for Namibia made to the General Assembly in that Declaration to the effect that the Security Council should be urged to take the necessary action to put an immediate end to the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa, to terminate its aggression against the Namibian people and the United Nations and to ensure

the complete and unconditional withdrawal of South Africa from the Territory [see A/S-9/4, para. 31, subpara. 36].

18. Since the open disrespect, the defiant obstinacy and the clear refusal of the Government of South Africa to comply with the decisions of the United Nations have created explosive conditions in southern Africa, my delegation believes that the Assembly, with the authority conferred upon it in paragraph 2 of Article 11 of the Charter, should as a matter of urgency request the Security Council, in exercise of the powers conferred to it under Chapter VII of the Charter, to impose economic sanctions on South Africa, in addition to the arms embargo, and also proceed to order an oil embargo against South Africa.

19. My delegation furthermore supports the recommendation made by the United Nations Council for Namibia in its highly significant report to the effect that, "in the event of the Security Council's inability to adopt concrete measures, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations to compel South Africa to end its illegal occupation by withdrawing from the Territory, the General Assembly, cognizant that this is a unique instance in which the United Nations has assumed direct responsibility for Namibia, should urgently consider necessary action in this regard." [ibid., subpara. 37.]

20. Economic sanctions and an oil embargo would, in our opinion, constitute the most effective means to ensure compliance with the decisions already adopted by the Security Council, because, as is well known, South Africa depends entirely on imported oil. Everyone is keenly aware of the fact that South Africa is encountering problems with its balance of payments, and for the past few years its imports have substantially exceeded its exports. Its current account deficit was \$2,400 million in 1975. *The New York Times* in its international economic study of 5 February 1978 stated that the South African economy was in dire straits. It indicated that, after four decades of growth, the country was mired in an economic slow-down which could pose a serious threat if the Government did not change its racist policy. The same source reported that there were more than 1 million unemployed out of a total labour force of some 6 million workers. A Member of Parliament, Mr. Harry Schwarz, termed the situation "an economic time bomb". Appeals have been made for the Government to spend less on defence and more on projects which might create employment.

21. The same newspaper mentioned that, in the South African manufacturing industry, building and trade, last year was the worst on record. The automobile industry suffered a decrease in the production of passenger cars of 16 per cent, the lowest production recorded in a decade. Commercial bankruptcies have exceeded a figure of 2,000, thereby setting another record. Profits from almost all economic activities were down. The country, whose economy is largely based on foreign investments and loans in order to sustain the high growth rate of the post-war period, has been suffering a shortage of capital since the middle of 1976, when the uprisings in Soweto and other African communities shattered the confidence of overseas bankers and investors. In the first nine months of 1977 \$1,100 million in short-term deposits left the country at the rate of more than \$100 million a month. The Minister

for Economic Affairs, Mr. J. C. Heunis, declared that the country would have to fill the vacuum created by the flight of capital by increasing savings or by simply settling for a lower standard of living.

22. It should be added that, in the report of the Secretary-General entitled "Activities of transnational corporations in southern Africa and the extent of their collaboration with the illegal régimes in the area"<sup>2</sup> it is stated that in the past few years, a number of transnational corporations have, as a result of growing international and national pressure, left Namibia and others have not carried out their investment plans in the area. Some companies controlled by the United States, which were participating in consortia for oil exploration, withdrew after learning of the opinion of the International Court of Justice. The same report refers to the fact that the Government of the United States has since 1970 discouraged American investments in Namibia. The Overseas Private Investment Corporation has stopped guaranteeing investments of United States companies in Namibia and will no longer protect such investments made after 1966.

23. It should also be pointed out, however, that Namibia ranks seventeenth in the world in the production of minerals and that 90 per cent of its mining output is the result of the work of two transnational corporations—one South African and the other from the United States. In the same report of the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations we note that the most significant recent event in the mining sector in Namibia is the effort being made to develop uranium on a major scale at the Rossing Mine, in which English, South African and French companies are participating with financing from United States banks, which are the principal source of funds for the Rossing uranium project.

24. It is clear that the General Assembly will have to cope with a difficult situation now in view of the seriousness of the events involved, which were referred to yesterday both by certain heads of delegations and by the leader of SWAPO, Mr. Sam Nujoma, who, with his customary force as a statesman, left the door open for constructive—and not delaying—proposals of an important nature which might be forthcoming from Western mediators. This is a matter which has been awaiting a settlement for more than 30 years as a result of the outrageous and brazen attitude of South Africa, and of course the United Nations must come forward clearly and bluntly with a resolution in support of the ideals, purposes and principles on which the Organization is based.

25. It is undeniable that the United Nations has responsibility over Namibia. All these circumstances indicate that from the moment the United Nations was established the mandate of the Union of South Africa came to an end and that, from that time, there was an unlawful occupation of Namibia as determined by the International Court of Justice,<sup>3</sup> and, with that unlawful occupation, instead of a respectful attitude on the part of South Africa, a defiant attitude, openly counter to the will of the international

community, and a clear defiance of the resolutions and decisions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, as well as of the Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice, which I have already mentioned. In addition to this illegal, unlawful and immoral attitude, which deserves condemnation from every point of view, we feel that South Africa has become an element of unrest, disruption of the peace, invitation to conflict, and violation of human rights and of the most elementary principles of the dignity of the peoples of southern Africa, and now is dedicated to criminally destroying the national unity of those peoples and the territorial integrity of Namibia, and intensifying its repression by committing shameless crimes against the people and acts of genocide which are comparable only to those that were perpetrated by the Nazi régime during the Second World War. Perhaps it is a curious coincidence that the political party which is in power in Pretoria was one of the most determined, loyal and vehement supporters of the Hitler régime, which had caused so much harm to mankind. It has been truly said: "Those who run with wolves learn to howl." That is to say, what should be an attitude of repentance on the part of South Africa, a desire to make amends, is transformed into open defiance of the international organization. That has created many serious problems for the United Nations and disrupted peace in a manner which must not be allowed to continue. We cannot continue to tolerate that attitude, regardless of the pretext.

26. With the militarization of Namibia by South Africa the colonial war has been cruelly intensified against the people of Namibia and SWAPO. Armed force has been used against the civilian population; the most sophisticated means of torture have been used; intimidation has been practised; a reign of terror has been imposed in order to maintain power against the will of the people. But that criminal conduct is not limited to Namibia. South Africa has continued to attack, harass and violate the rights of its neighbours, particularly Zambia and Angola, thereby disrupting peace in the entire area.

27. To justify the deliberate and premeditated crimes of the South African Government, Mr. Vorster has tried to divert world public opinion from the colonial problem of Namibia and has sought political allies elsewhere by stimulating once again the cold war and ideological antagonisms. He has tried to fish in troubled waters and to delude the unwary. However, the problem of decolonization in Africa, just as that in Asia, Latin America and elsewhere, will brook no delay for the exercise of the right of self-determination cannot be made subject to ideological conflicts, be they real or imaginary. Nor can we make decolonization and self-determination dependent upon any unilateral claims to the maritime routes of the world. That time belongs to the past. Mr. Vorster, with an absurd display of emotion, has said that the South African air and naval forces are responsible for keeping open the waterways of the Indian Ocean and the South Atlantic. He wishes in that way to involve Western Powers and have them assist in keeping open the Cape route, thereby creating further antagonism among the peoples of Asia and other non-aligned peoples. It was reaffirmed at the Summit Conference at Colombo that the Indian Ocean should be a zone of peace where there would be no rivalry among the major Powers.

<sup>2</sup> E/C.10/26.

<sup>3</sup> See *International Status of South-West Africa, Advisory Opinion, I.C.J. Reports 1950*, p. 128.

28. The right of self-determination and the process of decolonization must not be stopped in Africa or anywhere else in the world by the claims of one Power in its desire to control the territory of other peoples or nations on the pretext of protecting its national security. Such claims are no longer relevant in today's interspatial and nuclear world of advanced technology. We insist that the Cape route and access to the Indian Ocean cannot be an excuse for South Africa to seize Walvis Bay or to prevent the liberation of Namibia.

29. The non-aligned countries cannot agree to allow Mr. Vorster even to masquerade in the role of an apostle of an ideological war which he is trying to promote for the benefit of his own unavowed interests. From time to time we hear about ideological aggression and the need to defend oneself against this type of attack, the results of which have their impact not on the bodies but on the minds of human beings. But we ask whether there can be ideological aggression on the part of those who promote respect for the principles of equal rights and the exercise of the self-determination of peoples as a way of promoting among nations relations of friendship which would only serve to create a favourable climate for international peace. Quite the contrary—and I am saying this in conclusion—we believe that there can be genuine international co-operation under the Charter only when development and respect for self-determination are promoted, only when there is respect for fundamental human rights and freedoms for all, without any distinction as to race, sex, language, religion or political ideology.

30. Mr. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): Comrade President, permit me first of all to congratulate you on your unanimous election to the important post of President of the General Assembly at its special session. We have no doubt that your distinguished diplomatic qualities, knowledge and experience, which were demonstrated in your skilful and effective leadership of the work of the thirty-second session of the General Assembly, will enable you to conduct most successfully the proceedings of this important session too. On behalf of the Soviet delegation, I should like to assure you and the representatives of Member States of the United Nations present here that the Soviet delegation will strive to make this a constructive session which will produce useful decisions designed to ensure for the people of Namibia their long-awaited independence.

31. We welcome here in this hall many leading personalities from African countries—and not only from Africa—who have come here to take part in the work of this session. This is something which lends the forthcoming debate particular significance inasmuch as it stresses the fact that the attention of the African peoples is now focused on the decisions to be taken by the General Assembly in order to accelerate the process of the liberation of Namibia.

32. The liberation of Namibia from colonial and racist occupation is a task which brooks no further delay. On the performance of this task depends to a large extent the fate of international peace and security not only in southern Africa but also beyond the confines of that continent. The elimination in Namibia of one of the last strongholds of

colonialism will be an important step towards the final elimination of the shameful system of colonialism and imperialism which until only recently covered a considerable proportion of the entire globe.

33. Sixty years ago the Great October Socialist Revolution laid the foundations for a radical transformation of the world, aroused the colonial peoples to struggle and lit their path to freedom and independence. Since that time the forces of the national liberation movement have gone from strength to strength and have undermined the foundations of colonial domination. An important milestone along this road was the adoption in this very hall in 1960, on the initiative of the Soviet Union and other States, of the historic Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples [*resolution 1514 (XV)*], which became the concrete political programme of the struggle of the oppressed peoples for their liberation. Today about 100 young States which were formerly colonial possessions are in a position to follow an independent course of sovereign development. More than 2 billion people have thrown off the shackles of colonial slavery.

34. "On the whole, the colonial system of imperialism in its classic forms can now be considered to have been eliminated." This was said by the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, Leonid Ilyich Brezhnev, at the ceremonial meeting held on 2 November last year to celebrate the sixtieth anniversary of the Great October Revolution. "This phenomenon", he said, "is one of world-wide historical significance".

35. The major successes which have been achieved by the national liberation movement in recent years have been greatly assisted by the easing of international tension, and the USSR and other countries of the socialist community have been directing their efforts consistently to the deepening and consolidation of this. It is obvious that détente creates conditions which limit the capacity of imperialist forces to carry out a policy of suppressing the liberation struggle and violating the sovereignty and territorial integrity of young States. At the same time, the overwhelming majority of States which have freed themselves from colonial domination have become able to defend peace and freedom more and more actively and to oppose all forms of aggression and domination and the exploitation of one State by another. The role and influence in international life of the liberated countries have been growing and their solidarity in the struggle against imperialism and colonialism has been strengthened. However, in spite of these positive changes, colonialism still exists, politically, economically and ideologically. Its vestiges still have life and poison the international atmosphere, engendering hotbeds of international tension and conflict.

36. In the Declaration on the Deepening and Consolidation of International Détente which was adopted by the General Assembly last year [*resolution 32/155*] emphasis was laid on the need:

"6. To ensure the free exercise of the right of the peoples under colonial and alien domination to self-determination and to promote majority rule, especially

where racial oppression, in particular *apartheid*, has deprived peoples from exercising their inalienable rights.”

37. The total elimination of the vestiges of colonialism in all its forms and manifestations will be an important contribution to the cause of strengthening peace and security, the further development of broad international co-operation and the national and social progress of peoples.

38. Within the context of the historic task of the total elimination of colonialism, this special session of the General Assembly has to consider and outline concrete ways and means of liberating Namibia from the colonial racist occupation of the Pretoria régime. Over the three decades during which the problem of Namibia has been considered in the United Nations the illegal character of its occupation by South Africa has been irrefutably proved. The aggressive actions undertaken against Namibia and neighbouring African States have been repeatedly condemned and described as a threat to international peace and security. It is noticeable that recently that threat has become even greater. The South African racists not only have been defiantly disregarding the numerous decisions of the General Assembly and the Security Council of the United Nations calling for the ending of the illegal occupation of Namibia but also have been undertaking measures to strengthen their colonial domination of Namibia and stepping up their acts of repression against the Namibian people and its universally recognized representative, SWAPO.

39. Over the last few months South Africa has increased its already large army of occupation in Namibia in order to prepare for a military strike against SWAPO and the establishment of a puppet régime in Namibia. A large amount of military technology and munitions and additional contingents of South African troops have been sent to Namibia. The increase in the strength of the armed forces has been accompanied by large-scale repression of the inhabitants of the country. These massive acts of brutality, which were begun on 28 February in Windhoek and then extended to other parts of the country, were primarily directed against the members and supporters of SWAPO. As a result, in the past few weeks dozens, hundreds, of representatives of the patriotic forces have been killed, wounded or detained. The breaking up of meetings and demonstrations, the hiring of mercenary killers, the imprisonment of Namibian patriots without trial or investigation, the incitement to tribal hatred and encouragement of the activities of African puppets subservient to the Pretoria régime make up the policy which has been pursued in our time by that régime in Namibia.

40. Speaking here yesterday, the President of SWAPO, Mr. Sam Nujoma, gave a very clear picture of the repression which is being carried out by the racist régime and the widespread struggle being waged by the people of Namibia against that régime. There are numerous facts to demonstrate that the primary responsibility for the continued occupation of Namibia lies with the Western Powers which have been giving political, economic and military support to the racist régime of South Africa in defiance of the numerous decisions of the United Nations. The reasons for this support are no secret. They lie primarily in the deep

interest of the Western transnational monopolies in continuing their shameless exploitation of the natural resources of Namibia, an exploitation which is carried out both directly and jointly with the South African racists. It is well known how close are the economic ties between South Africa and the Western Powers. According to press reports, about 80 per cent of what is produced in the private sector in South Africa in one form or another is controlled by foreign capital, primarily by investments from countries of the European Economic Community and the United States. The total capital investment of Western countries in South Africa amounts to no less than \$20 billion. More than 500 British and more than 400 American companies are operating there, and their capital investments exceed \$10 billion.

41. Three quarters of American investments in the South African economy are accounted for by 13 major United States monopolies. The average profits in these subsidiaries considerably exceed the average world level, and in the key sector, mining, they have achieved the record figure of 30 per cent.

42. International monopolies show particular interest in the exploitation of the natural riches of Namibia, and here a major role belongs to the Anglo-American corporation which unites 14 transnational mining, industrial and investment companies with a share capital of more than \$6 billion. There is no doubt that it is precisely because of the presence in Namibia of potentially major deposits of minerals, primarily of uranium ore, that we can explain the consistent desire of Western Powers to preserve in one form or another colonial domination in that part of the African continent.

43. Another important aspect of the activities of Western Powers in strengthening their positions in southern Africa, particularly in Namibia, is their ambition to convert that part of the world into a bridgehead for the pursuit of neo-colonial policy in the African continent in order to exert pressure on the independent African States and for the purpose of direct intervention in the internal affairs of those States.

44. The Territory of Namibia has repeatedly been used by the South African régime for acts of armed provocation against neighbouring sovereign States. It was the springboard for the direct armed aggression against Angola. The situation that has arisen in southern Africa as a result of the activities of the South African racist régime is a source of tension throughout the area. It is fraught with dangerous consequences for the independent development of the liberated countries of Africa. Particular alarm has been caused by the work undertaken in South Africa for the purpose of creating nuclear weapons. It is clear that the development by the Pretoria racist régime of a nuclear potential represents a threat to the security both of African States and of the States of the whole world. The manufacture in South Africa of nuclear weapons would have the most serious consequences in every way for international peace and security. That was precisely the point made in the statement of TASS dated 9 August 1977, which pointed to the need for the most urgent adoption of effective measures by all States, the United Nations and the international community to prevent the production of nuclear weapons in South Africa.

45. In spite of the attempts of the Pretoria authorities to deny that work is going on to produce nuclear weapons, there is evidence that such work is nearing its conclusion and that direct preparations are under way for the carrying out of nuclear-weapons tests. The policy of those Western countries and of Israel which, in defiance and violation of the decisions of the United Nations prohibiting assistance to South Africa in the field of armaments, are continuing their co-operation with the Pretoria authorities in the nuclear field and are helping the racists to develop their own nuclear potential is deserving of severe condemnation. It is the duty of the United Nations and all those who cherish the cause of peace to make new and persistent efforts to prevent consummation of the plans of the South African régime to acquire their own nuclear weapons and to prevail upon that country to put all its activities in the nuclear field under the control of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

46. The position of principle of the Soviet Union on the question of Namibia favours the immediate exercise by the people of Namibia of its inalienable right to self-determination and independence on the basis of respect for the unity and territorial integrity of that country. The USSR recognizes the national liberation movement of Namibia, SWAPO, as the sole and authentic representative of the people of Namibia. We support the struggle of the Namibian people under the leadership of SWAPO against the illegal occupation of its territory by the racist régime of South Africa, and we support the transfer of all power in Namibia to the patriotic forces headed by SWAPO.

47. On the basis of this position of principle, the Soviet delegation at this session of the General Assembly is ready to support any effective measures designed to encourage the efforts of SWAPO in the struggle for the attainment of genuine independence for Namibia, the immediate elimination of the illegal occupation of that country by South Africa and cessation of the plundering of its human and natural resources by the South African occupation régime and Western monopolies. It is precisely this course towards a just solution that is proposed in the document prepared by the United Nations Council for Namibia for consideration by the General Assembly [A/S-9/7]. Along with other delegations, the delegation of the USSR took part in the preparation of this document. In our view, basically it gives a correct assessment of the current dangerous situation. It contains a programme of international action the implementation of which by all countries would make possible a solution of the Namibian problem in accordance with the aspirations of the whole Namibian people. The Declaration and Programme of Action produced by the Council for Namibia quite rightly draw the attention of all Members of the United Nations to the fact that a just settlement in Namibia will be possible only on the basis of full and unswerving observance of all the fundamental principles formulated in the decisions of the Security Council and the General Assembly of the United Nations.

48. The South African régime has been occupying Namibia illegally and should therefore unconditionally and without delay withdraw from the whole territory of Namibia, including Walvis Bay. It should withdraw its troops, its police and its administration and disarm the military and paramilitary contingents of its puppets. In its

turn, the United Nations should ensure the transfer of power in the country to the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people, SWAPO. Until that is done, and as long as the racists continue to preserve their domination in Namibia, all Members of the United Nations are in duty bound not only to observe the requirements of the United Nations resolutions on Namibia but even to step up their efforts to evolve additional effective measures which could force the racists to defer to the will of the international community.

49. We believe that the Security Council's decision to impose an embargo on arms deliveries to the South African régime in its resolution 418 (1977) should be strictly and unswervingly applied.

50. The Soviet Union supports the demands of the African countries for an immediate imposition of additional mandatory sanctions against South Africa, in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter; the cessation of all economic co-operation with South Africa; and the establishment of political and diplomatic isolation of that racist régime. We are in favour of giving all possible support to the liberation struggle of the Namibian people, headed by SWAPO. The implementation of those measures would be the shortest and most effective route to ensure the Namibian people an early victory, independence and freedom.

51. At the same time, the international community cannot overlook the threats of the Pretoria régime to effect its own so-called internal settlement and to establish its own puppets in power in Namibia. We cannot fail to pay attention also to the dangerous manoeuvres undertaken by those countries which, in close co-operation with the racists, are striving at the same time to put forward various proposals whose aim is motivated not by concern for the indigenous population but by their own selfish interests in Namibia.

52. In so far as concerns the Soviet Union, it has always unswervingly provided, and will continue to provide, moral and material support to the colonial peoples in their struggle for liberation and to the young States which have already thrown off the shackles of colonialism.

53. In our time, and indeed in the past, imperialist propaganda has not spared us all kinds of insinuations and direct slander with regard to the policy of the Soviet Union in Africa. In this regard, I should like to quote the following words uttered by Leonid Ilyich Brezhnev:

“We have often said, and we should like to repeat it once again, that we have not and cannot have any special interests, in either the south, the north or any other part of Africa. We are not looking for any advantages for ourselves there. All we want is that the sacred right of all peoples themselves to determine their own fate and to choose their own path to development to be recognized. That is our unswerving principle, and our Party and all Soviet people will never depart from it.

“It is our belief that a free people cannot fail to aspire to the freedom of other countries and cannot fail to support genuine freedom fighters. And we are sure that if all the peoples of Africa and all the oppressed peoples



without exception become free and independent international peace and security in the world will only stand to gain.”

54. An important constituent element in the foreign policy of the Soviet Union is assistance to colonial peoples in their struggle for national liberation. This foreign policy plank was confirmed in the decisions of the Twenty-fifth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. The unshakable Leninist principles of foreign policy of support for the struggle of peoples for national liberation and social progress were reflected also in the new Constitution of the Soviet Union and thus achieved the force of law.

55. The Soviet Union states its total solidarity with the peoples waging a struggle for national liberation and for the elimination of the last bastions of colonialism, and we wish the people of Namibia too the earliest possible victory in their just struggle.

56. Mr. MKAPA (United Republic of Tanzania): Mr. President, it gives my delegation and me great pleasure and satisfaction to see you in the Chair once more. Your unanimous election to the presidency of the General Assembly at its ninth special session is a sign of the great confidence that we place in you. Your great performance in steering the thirty-second session into the success that it leaves no doubt at all in our mind that we can expect the same skill and competence in your presidency of this very historic session.

57. But your election is a tribute not only to your person but also to the great country which you represent. It represents a recognition by the international community of Yugoslavia's veritable contribution within 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, the United Nations and the non-aligned movement, to the cause of human freedom, national liberation and international justice. It is with great satisfaction, therefore, that I note the closeness and harmony with which our two countries labour in all these arenas for a better world.

58. The struggle for self-determination, independence and full sovereignty in Namibia has, in the last few months, entered a critical phase. The South African régime, in illegal occupation of Namibia, has taken measures to consolidate its hold over the Territory of Namibia. By administrative and legislative fiat it has violated the territorial integrity of Namibia by its annexation of Walvis Bay. In further contempt of the will of the United Nations, it has continued to export to Namibia as a whole its abhorrent system of *apartheid*, which has inflicted untold suffering in South Africa's own backyard.

59. The South African régime has relentlessly pursued its policy of divide and rule by setting tribe against tribe and race against race. To that end, it has recruited and trained tribal armies indoctrinated to resist the advent of genuine national independence. It has also massively reinforced its army of occupation.

60. The South African Government has done all those things in the face of two developments. The first is the

escalation of the armed war of liberation being waged by SWAPO. The second is the effort by the five Western members of the Security Council to effect a negotiated settlement of the Namibian problem.

61. The frantic political, administrative and military measures that South Africa has undertaken in the last few months are acknowledgement of the mounting power of the people's internal resistance and the increased fire-power and fighting spirit of SWAPO's liberation army.

62. My delegation listened to the address by the President of SWAPO, Comrade Sam Nujoma, yesterday with both encouragement and anger. With anger at the tales of vicious subjugation, of repression, assassination and murder by which South Africa occupies Namibia. With encouragement at the will and valour by which the people of Namibia are resisting that vile occupation. It behoves my delegation and me to pay a high tribute to the people of Namibia and their national liberation movement, SWAPO, for their gallantry and sacrifices in their determination not to be outmanoeuvred or terrorized into silence and submission by the illegal racist régime.

63. That South Africa should be perpetrating these atrocities and constructing these administrative and military structures in spite of what the contact group affirms are earnest efforts to negotiate a settlement is, at the very least, ominous. For, in truth, these are preparations for an internal settlement defying the authority of the United Nations and the norms set out by it and, in particular, by Security Council resolution 385 (1976). They are actions designed to pre-empt, not to facilitate, a negotiated settlement that would command the acceptance of the international community. We condemn in advance any kind of internal settlement calculated to defy the United Nations and to deprive the people of their right fully to elect the Government for an independent Namibia.

64. We have always contended that any attempt to achieve decolonization through negotiations should not be dismissed out of hand. For this reason, we have encouraged initiatives of the kind undertaken by the five Western members of the Security Council. But we have done so on one pre-eminent condition: negotiations must not seek to circumvent the victory of the freedom fighters or to set aside the fundamental objective of unfettered independence.

65. The objective circumstances which have made this special session necessary do not need repetition. But let me outline what we ask the Assembly at this session to do.

66. First, we expect the Assembly to tell the South African régime clearly and unequivocally that we are now embarked on an unremitting, irreversible effort to live up to our United Nations direct responsibility to achieve the decolonization of Namibia, and therefore to end South Africa's illegal occupation and domination of that country and its people.

67. Secondly, we expect the Assembly to reaffirm the territorial integrity of Namibia, and therefore to repudiate emphatically South Africa's proposed annexation of Walvis Bay.

68. Thirdly, we expect the Assembly to affirm that it will not brook the promulgation of a so-called internal settlement, and that only a settlement in full agreement with Security Council resolution 385 (1976) will merit international support and acceptance.

69. Fourthly, we expect the Assembly to strengthen its solidarity with the people of Namibia under the leadership of SWAPO in their endeavour to rid themselves of a régime and a political doctrine universally condemned as anachronistic and evil. To this end, we expect increased support for the work of the United Nations Council for Namibia and its work programmes.

70. Fifthly, we expect the Assembly to lay the groundwork for the total economic isolation of South Africa. Let the international community put an end to the dangerous delusion that one way of weakening *apartheid* is to strengthen the South African economy.

71. Sixthly, we expect the Assembly to tell South Africa in no uncertain terms to stop using Namibia as a bridgehead of aggression and subversion against neighbouring independent States.

72. Finally, in anticipation of South Africa's continued intransigence, we call on the Member States of the United Nations to pave the way for action to be taken against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter.

73. Such progress as has been registered in the decolonization of Namibia has been a product of the armed struggle waged by SWAPO. We whole-heartedly support that armed struggle, in the full knowledge that only its intensification can bring about military defeat or successful negotiations. We shall continue to render our support to it, and commend such action to those who wish to see the decolonization of Namibia speeded up.

74. By its continued illegal occupation of Namibia, by its forceful imposition of the doctrine of racial supremacy, South Africa is defying the will of the United Nations and undermining its ideals and objectives. Every resolution we have adopted since the termination of South Africa's Mandate over Namibia by the United Nations in 1966 is one more brick in this monument of defiance. Every special conference and colloquium is in part a recognition of South Africa's unbridled arrogance. Surely, the time has now come for us to say in all honesty and self respect: enough is enough.

75. South Africa has humiliated us long enough. It has defied international opinion and law long enough. It has affronted us long enough. We continue to suffer and acquiesce in this humiliation, this effrontery, this defiance, paying a price that is no longer defensible or acceptable. That price is the massive erosion of our dignity, our self-respect, our principles, our honour and our lives. The people of my country will not be resigned to such violent negation of their very humanity. We shall continue to struggle alongside our brothers, the people of Namibia, for that victory which alone can attest to our brotherhood and our unity.

76. Mr. JAMIESON (Canada): Mr. President, it is a very real pleasure for me to be here in this forum once again and

to be speaking under your distinguished leadership and to take this opportunity to compliment and congratulate you on the splendid manner in which you have been dealing with so many extremely difficult and important problems during your tenure.

77. I have the honour to address the General Assembly at this ninth special session on behalf of the Governments of France, the Federal Republic of Germany, the United Kingdom, the United States and Canada. Our five countries, members of the Security Council, have, over the last year, devoted much attention and effort to the resolution of the serious issue which is the very reason for our gathering here today—that is, the question of the independence of Namibia. We should, therefore, like to present to the Assembly our common view of the situation at this juncture and to make known our common belief that an internationally acceptable solution of this problem may well be within our grasp, if all concerned will manifest the necessary determination and political will to put an end to years of injustice in that Territory.

78. With all members of the Assembly, we have shared the conviction that the international Territory of Namibia is illegally occupied by South Africa and that this occupation must come to an end. With all members, we have shared an intense concern at the extension into Namibia of *apartheid* and racial discrimination and at the continuing repression of Namibians under that system. Like many members, we have been concerned that the perpetuation of this deplorable situation would sooner or later affect the political stability of the entire southern African area. It is, therefore, in full accord with the aspirations and objectives of the international community that we undertook, as the members of this international community in the best position to do so, to seek out practical ways and means to end this 30-year-old stalemate.

79. In the spring of 1977, it became apparent to all of us that the installation of the Turnhalle Constitution, as it was called, was imminent. The adoption of legislation to bring it into effect, forecast for June of 1977, would have resulted in the unilateral establishment of a government based on ethnic groups and excluding participation by any political party, and most importantly by one of the major political movements in the Territory, SWAPO. Such an action, it was clear, would not result in an internationally acceptable solution to the Namibian question and would, furthermore, by dividing the population of Namibia among itself on an ethnic basis and by ignoring the aspirations of its people for true independence and unity lead to increased violence. It would have perpetuated the unsatisfactory situation that has prevailed in that Territory. In the face of this dismal prospect, our five countries decided to make a concerted effort to investigate whether, by means of the existing relations between themselves and South Africa, it might not be possible to find a practical way of implementing Security Council resolution 385 (1976), which was adopted unanimously. That resolution comprises the most comprehensive approach ever adopted by the Council to the desired resolution of the Namibian problem.

80. The General Assembly will recall that resolution 385 (1976) embodies in its terms the following essential elements: it calls for free elections to be held for the whole

of Namibia as one political entity in order that the people of Namibia may freely determine their own future; it envisages the establishment of the necessary machinery within Namibia by the United Nations for the supervision of such elections, and of conditions that would enable the people of Namibia to organize politically for the purpose of such elections; it envisages the withdrawal of the illegal administration of South Africa and a transfer of power to the people of Namibia with the assistance of the United Nations; and it demands that South Africa in the interim comply with the provisions of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, release all Namibian political prisoners, abolish the application of all racially discriminatory and politically repressive laws and practices and accord unconditionally to all Namibians currently in exile for political reasons full facilities for return to their country without risk of arrest, detention, intimidation or imprisonment.

81. From the outset, our five Governments have recognized that we had no mandate to enter into negotiations or to make any agreements regarding Namibia. We were acting as a result of the responsibilities that we bear as members of the Security Council. We have acted as an informal contact group, and it has been our intention, clearly expressed to all parties, to bring this exercise within the scope of the Security Council at the earliest feasible time.

82. I believe that it would be useful for me to provide to the Assembly a résumé of our experience over the past 12 months and of the evolution of this matter. At the outset, our efforts were greeted with mistrust and suspicion on all sides and, in particular, on the part of the principal interested parties, the Government of South Africa and SWAPO. Indeed, each was convinced that our efforts were designed to deliver Namibia into the hands of the other without regard for their interests or for the interests of the Namibian people as a whole. I wish to emphasize this fact as it serves as a benchmark for measuring the distance that we have come since that time, and that distance is very considerable.

83. On 7 April 1977, our five Governments presented to South African Prime Minister Vorster an aide-mémoire expressing our belief in the necessity for a Namibian settlement in keeping with resolution 385 (1976) and thereby acceptable to the international community. We emphasized that the activities of the Turnhalle Conference did not meet those standards and informed the Government of South Africa that in the absence of an early South African agreement to pursue an internationally acceptable solution the Five would be obliged to consider very seriously the measures to be taken. Initially, the South African Government indicated that it would be willing to engage in further talks with the five Governments but that it would not interfere with the Turnhalle process.

84. After further informal exchanges, the Five determined that it would be necessary for them to form a contact group and to embark upon more detailed discussions with South Africa on the possibilities of moving towards the stated objectives. To this end a contact group, comprising senior officials of our Governments and including senior representatives of our New York missions, went to South Africa during the period 27-29 April for discussions of most

of the issues associated with the Namibian question and of the elements embodied in resolution 385 (1976). At the conclusion of those discussions, in an important development, South Africa indicated the intention to forego the implementation of the Turnhalle Constitution through the proposed legislation; to establish, instead, a central administrative authority in Namibia; and to hold territory-wide elections with direct United Nations involvement for a Constituent Assembly, whose task it would be to decide upon a constitution for Namibia.

85. I wish to emphasize that during the period April 1977 until January 1978 our five Governments took no position whatsoever on elements that might lead to a practical implementation of resolution 385 (1976). We made clear to each of the principal parties and to all others that we were exploring attitudes and ideas and that we would take no position. Our means of consultation and exploration evolved as the exercise progressed. For example, following the first round of discussions by the contact group in South Africa, we subsequently engaged in discussions with SWAPO, the United Nations Secretary-General, representatives of the United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia, Mozambique, Angola, Botswana and Nigeria, and, as well, other internal Namibian groups on the results of the initial exploratory talks with South Africa. Those early consultations were particularly important in providing us with an understanding of various concerns.

86. Further talks took place in southern Africa and in New York between the contact group of the Five and the principal interested parties as follows: with South Africa in Cape Town, 8-10 June 1977; with SWAPO in New York, 8-11 August 1977; with South Africa in Pretoria, 22-26 September 1977; and with SWAPO in New York, 14-19 October 1977. Following each round of discussions, we again provided full briefings to all parties and States concerned, including the members of the Security Council and the Council for Namibia.

87. In late November and early December, the contact group carried out an exhaustive round of consultations and discussions with African countries in a position to assist in the effort to bring about a negotiated settlement in Namibia. During the period 21 November to 12 December, they met in the relevant capitals with President Nyerere of the United Republic of Tanzania, Foreign Minister Chissano of Mozambique, President Khama and Vice-President Masire of Botswana, President Kaunda of Zambia, Prime Minister Do Nascimento and Foreign Minister Jorge of Angola, and with Head of State Obasanjo of Nigeria. They met once more with South Africa and twice during that period with SWAPO.

88. Following this exhaustive round of consultation and discussion, the five Governments determined that the areas of concern of the different parties had become so apparent and the differences between them sufficiently narrowed as to make it advisable for the Five to take a position on what they considered to be a pragmatic, reasonable and fair means of implementing resolution 385 (1976). Therefore, during the month of December, the five Governments invited South Africa and SWAPO to participate in discussions with them in New York. Each party was informed that it was the intention to hold similar discussions in New

York during the same period with the other principal parties. The importance which the five Governments attached to these "proximity" talks, which eventually took place on 11 and 12 February, was reflected in the participation in them by my colleagues, the Foreign Ministers of France, the Federal Republic of Germany, the United Kingdom, the United States and myself. At the ministerial level meetings, the Government of South Africa was represented by its Foreign Minister, Mr. Botha, and SWAPO by its President, Mr. Nujoma. I might add that the SWAPO delegation to those talks for the first time included representatives of the internal Namibian branch of SWAPO.

89. Apart from the talks with the principal parties, ministerial level consultations also took place with the Secretary-General and his officials. We held discussions also with the Foreign Ministers of the front-line States present in New York, Mr. Mwale of Zambia, Mr. Mkapa of the United Republic of Tanzania, Mr. Mogwe of Botswana, and with senior representatives or ambassadors of Angola, Mozambique, Nigeria, Mauritius and Gabon. Also during this period delegations from other Namibian parties travelled to New York and were received by officials of the five Governments. The exercise was discussed with them in considerable detail and their views and concerns were presented to my colleagues and to me.

90. At the conclusion of the February talks, our five Governments were convinced that the proposal which had been put to the parties during the talks embodied in its elements a very reasonable means of implementing resolution 385 (1976) in a manner which took into full account the real and the perceived concerns of each, and in a manner which could bring about in the very near future a resolution of the Namibian question. There none the less remained certain areas which demanded further study on our part and further consultations with various parties. Certain of the provisions required clarification or improvement in drafting. This process of clarification was an extremely complicated one and required numerous exchanges between our capitals, with the principal parties through embassies, with some African States, and with the Secretary-General. Our proposals were finalized at the end of March and were presented to the interested parties on 29 and 30 March. They were circulated in a letter addressed to the President of the Security Council on 10 April, 1978.<sup>4</sup>

91. I have taken the time to describe this process in order that all should understand the measure of intense diplomatic activity that has been involved in this consultation process.

92. We wish to pay a tribute to the seriousness and conscientiousness of the participation and the constructive attitude which has emerged on the part of all with whom we have dealt. Whatever their initial hesitations, they have, for the sake of Namibia's future, suspended to a degree their suspicions and have sought to identify, in practical terms, their concerns and the means by which those concerns might be met while taking account of, though not necessarily accepting, those of others.

93. In terms of substance, initially each of the parties was preoccupied by the conflicting legal and political positions

on this issue. At the outset of the initiative the Five were only too well aware that, as it was these contradictory legal positions which had for more than 30 years impeded any progress towards the resolution of the Namibian situation, it was essential neither to endorse nor to challenge the position of any party but rather to seek, without prejudice to that position, a practical means of implementing the provisions of resolution 385 (1976). Our proposal, therefore, at no point takes any stand which prejudices a long-held legal or political position; rather, it moves between questions of legality as the only effective way to bring about a resolution of the issue.

94. The positions of South Africa and SWAPO have evolved substantially since April 1977. South Africa, originally unwilling to contemplate any alternative to the Turnhalle concept, has come to accept in the context of an internationally acceptable solution far-reaching measures involving United Nations involvement in such a manner as to guarantee the impartiality of the electoral process and the necessity of full arrangements to ensure that there will be no intimidation from any source during that process. In the proposals which it put forward in December 1977 South Africa acquiesced in the general concept, and in many specifics, of the approach embodied in our proposal. Up to the present time there have remained some crucial areas of disagreement, including the number and location of the residual element of the South African forces. On these issues, as on others, however, there has been a considerable narrowing of the differences between the parties.

95. On the SWAPO side there has been as well considerable evolution since the exercise was undertaken. SWAPO's initial position was that the South African administration in its entirety should be removed from the Territory. SWAPO was convinced that elections could not be held in the presence of South African forces, that the symbolic presence of even one South African soldier would provide a counter-productive psychological climate in the Territory. At the last round of discussions with SWAPO, SWAPO had come to accept, without prejudice to its legal position, or to that of the United Nations, that it was possible to envisage an election process free of intimidation, in the presence of the *de facto* administration, as long as the South African military presence were reduced to a maximum of 1,500 and confined to one base in the south of the Territory, and as long as the police were appropriately monitored and supervised, and that these tasks were undertaken by a substantial United Nations civilian and military force. SWAPO, furthermore, indicated a readiness to envisage the release of Namibians, wherever they were held, in the context of an internationally acceptable solution. SWAPO has, moreover, emphasized its commitment to participate in free and fair elections under United Nations supervision and control and to abide by the results of such elections.

96. I should like to describe very briefly the essential elements of our proposal for a settlement of the Namibian question. On the basis of resolution 385 (1976), we consider that the key to an internationally acceptable transition to early independence is free elections for the whole of Namibia, as one political entity, with appropriate United Nations supervision and control. To that end, we shall seek the establishment of a substantial United Nations

<sup>4</sup> S/12636.

presence, both civilian and military, which we have tentatively called the United Nations transition assistance group, to be led by a United Nations special representative, appointed by and responsible to the United Nations Secretary-General. Working together with the South African Administrator-General, this special representative would have as his primary task to satisfy himself that all conditions existed to ensure free and fair elections. Thus, he would see to it that all repressive measures or regulations were repealed, all freedoms restored and all Namibian political prisoners or detainees, wherever held, released so that they could participate fully and freely in the electoral process.

97. Free elections cannot be held in conditions of repression; neither can they be held in conditions of insecurity and intimidation. Until an independent Namibia assumes responsibility for its own security the international community must insist that there be adequate means to ensure law and order and the over-all security of the Territory. Thus the proposal calls for a comprehensive cessation of all hostile acts. It makes provision for the maintenance of law and order and for the introduction of a military section of a United Nations transition assistance group combined with the phased withdrawal of all but 1,500 South African soldiers. These 1,500 men will be restricted to one or two bases and monitored by the United Nations pending their withdrawal. We would argue for a firm and specific mandate to ensure observance of the provisions of the agreement.

98. We believe these provisions are adequate for security. But they will obviously have to be applied in the light of developing conditions. It is our hope that the parties and the surrounding States will take the necessary measures to ensure that the security provisions of the proposal are strictly adhered to. For our part, as members of the Security Council, we would view with grave concern any actions during the transition period that could threaten the security of Namibia and its prompt achievement of independence, and we would act accordingly.

99. Once the elections have been certified, the constituent assembly will meet to consider the remaining steps towards independence, including the drafting of the future constitution of Namibia.

100. The Assembly will note that this proposal places its full confidence in the ability of the United Nations to discharge the substantial and complicated task involved in assisting the process of the Namibian elections and transition to independence. We believe that the United Nations will show itself equal to this task. The important role that it will play in guaranteeing the stability and the security of the Territory with the co-operation of the *de facto* administration can result in the impartial process which is envisaged. It is important to be aware that, initially, some Namibian parties were sceptical about the ability of the United Nations to undertake this task with impartiality. We believe that they have been persuaded that, on each occasion that the United Nations, under the guidance of the Secretary-General, has been involved in a process either of peace-keeping or of assisting a Territory to achieve independence, it has done so with competence and impartiality. The proposal calls for free and fair elections in accordance

with Security Council resolution 385 (1976), and it is to this task that the United Nations transition assistance group will address itself.

101. The General Assembly will have noted that we have omitted from our proposal the difficult question of Walvis Bay for the reason that we see no way of settling the question in the context of the present negotiations. We feel strongly, however, that the issue should not delay the long-sought-after independence of Namibia. We consider that all aspects of the question of Walvis Bay must be subject to discussion between the South African Government and the elected government of Namibia. We have, furthermore, obtained assurances that the strength of the South African force in Walvis Bay will not be increased during the transitional period and that Namibians in Walvis Bay will be able to participate in the political life of the Territory during the transitional period, including by voting in the elections.

102. The Governments of Canada, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, the United Kingdom and the United States give our unreserved backing to the proposal which we have transmitted to the Security Council. We believe that the proposal provides an effective and pragmatic basis for implementing resolution 385 (1976), while taking account of the interests of the parties involved and of the special circumstances associated with the decolonization of Namibia. So far as we are concerned, South Africa's presence in Namibia is illegal and must be ended. At the same time, we have to recognize the facts of life—that South Africa controls and remains in Namibia and has done so for 60 years. The proposal is the result of lengthy and intensive consultations with the interested parties.

103. Our five Governments are now presenting these proposals not as a basis for negotiation but as a practical means of implementing resolution 385 (1976) and, therefore, bringing about the independence of Namibia in an internationally acceptable manner and in the very near future. We believe that it is essential now to proceed urgently in order to forestall any counter-productive developments which might precipitate an internal settlement with all the repercussions for peace in the area that would follow and that would result in the continued suffering of the Namibian people.

104. We are fully aware that our proposal will, in one element or another, cause difficulties to the principal parties. None the less, in our discussions we have narrowed the differences between the parties to the point that the reasonable middle ground has clearly emerged. It has been embodied in our proposal. It is now a question of political will. All parties concerned must decide whether to accept this proposal as a means for an early and peaceful resolution of the question or face the tragic alternative of many years of violence and turmoil.

105. We must appeal to all members of this Assembly to devote their energy to what is possible. We are not asking anyone to sacrifice principles; we are not advocating the perpetuation of current abhorrent practices. On the contrary, we urge all members of the international community to seize this opportunity to bring to a very early end what we have repeatedly condemned in this hall. We wish to see

within the next few months the people of Namibia—all the people of Namibia—enjoy their fundamental right to a peaceful, freely determined and viable existence within an independent and sovereign Namibia. We for our part—and, we hope, with the assistance of every member of the international community—will continue to exert every effort to this end. Let us not fail to answer the call of the Namibian people in their hour of need.

106. Shortly before arriving in this hall this morning, I was informed that formal acceptance of our proposal by the South African Government was communicated to our Ambassadors in Cape Town. As our five Governments have not had sufficient time to study the statement made by Prime Minister Vorster in South Africa's Parliament, we do not propose to comment on it at this stage, except to welcome this important development in the position of one of the main parties concerned.

107. Mr. NUSEIBEH (Jordan): The present special session of the General Assembly on Namibia, under your wise leadership, Mr. President, is not intended to elicit repetitious and largely rhetorical verbal support for the long-delayed sovereign independence of Namibia. Such verbal support has already outlived its purpose. We are meeting at a crucial crossroads to articulate our full support for our brothers in Namibia by concrete programmes of effective action. That is our solemn responsibility under the Charter and a reaffirmation of the direct responsibility of the United Nations over Namibia.

108. All the great accomplishments in decolonization by the United Nations over the past quarter of a century are at present being blatantly challenged by the illegal and abominable racist subversions of the South African régime. Shall we by ineffective action permit South Africa to prevail over the United Nations, or do we still have the collective muscle to see to it that justice and the termination of enslavement and inhumanity are not without their means of fulfilment?

109. I have stated that we are at present at a crucial turning-point. That was not said in vain or as a platitude. The reason is that the South African régime, having over-taxed resort to all avenues of dilly-dallying, false pretences and total inaction, has come to the moment of reckoning as a result of internal, as well as external, ever-mounting pressures. But, rather than reconciling itself, as have all other colonial empires, to the inevitability, let alone the desirability, of liquidating their colonial régimes, South Africa is now actively engaged in subverting the process of a genuinely independent and sovereign Namibia.

110. The internal solution upon which South Africa has embarked—even though I was happy to hear his Excellency the Minister of Canada state that they have decided to cease this operation—is intended to sow the seeds of a bloody civil strife, in which African would be killing his brother African, in a process which experience and history have taught us can be no less than catastrophic. Social scientists long ago formulated the theory known as the “iron law of oligarchy”. In plain language it means that once an entity or entities or vested interests are created, they have a built-in and impelling tendency for self-perpetuation.

111. We all know that in Namibia, as indeed in most countries before nationhood, peoples are generally aligned along tribal or other divisive lines. The vicious internal settlement, as originally envisaged by South Africa, would inevitably lead to the creation of multifarious and feuding entities, with the racist régime in South Africa fuelling the fires of strife and discord and thereby perpetuating its stranglehold upon Namibia, its people and its resources.

112. Such a mischievous plan would not only be a retrogressive and potentially catastrophic step; it is blatantly in total contravention of the Lusaka Declaration of the Council for Namibia, the legitimate arm of our United Nations to administer and lead the people of Namibia to steps which will ensure the immediate and genuine independence of Namibia, a direct and solemn responsibility of the United Nations. What that trust and responsibility means is not to acquiesce in booby-traps and machinations, to create fragmentation, strife and bantustans, but to ensure the emergence of the people of Namibia to full nationhood and statehood. That is the only way by which all nations of the world at varying points in history have put aside their tribal or feudal or parochial loyalties and supplanted them by cohesive and genuine loyalty to nation and State. Thin as a fig-leaf is South Africa's frenzied and unconscionable attempt to reverse and subvert this movement of history.

113. My Government endorses unreservedly, and with profound conviction based on long and sordid experience, the entire Lusaka Declaration and recommendations adopted in 1978, and pledges to shoulder whatever responsibilities would devolve upon it as a Member of the United Nations towards fulfilling its avowed and long overdue objective. The Arab world in its Eastern wing, to which Jordan belongs, has suffered an inordinate share of fragmentation, vivisection and political deceitful manipulations, and we have paid and continue to pay heavily for it. It is, therefore, not a theoretical sermon in which I am engaging.

114. I can see visibly and concretely what the abominable and oppressive régime of South Africa has in store for our oppressed and valiant brethren in Namibia. It would be nothing short of disastrous if South Africa had its way. Beware, my brethren of Namibia, of falling into the ingeniously contrived trap. The cost will be exorbitant and unending, as I am sure you are fully aware.

115. Needless to state that the stratagem of the South African régime which has the most serious implications for the future of independent Namibia is Pretoria's decision to annex Walvis Bay as part of South Africa. It is designed to deprive Namibia and its people of its main deep water port and vital economic resource, as well as to retain a strategic military stranglehold over Namibia. The United Nations has already declared South Africa's annexation as illegal, null and void. My delegation endorses the Council for Namibia's declaration of Walvis Bay as an inviolable and non-negotiable part of Namibia.

116. My delegation, likewise, endorses the rejection of any South African military presence in Namibia, which is presently being reinforced to harass not only the Namibian people but also neighbouring African States as well.

117. The letter dated 10 April 1978 from the representatives of Canada, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, the United Kingdom and the United States and addressed to the President of the Security Council is basically sound in that its objective is a united independent Namibia, in accordance with resolution 385 (1976), unanimously adopted by the Security Council on 30 January 1976.

118. The steps outlined in that document also appear to be practical and sound. Not being well-versed in the situation on the spot, except for the current oppression by the South African régime, we feel it would be best for the people of Namibia, their legitimate representative SWAPO and the contiguous African States to determine whether there are any loopholes in the proposed settlement, particularly with regard to control of security during the elections and the transfer of power.

119. In the meantime, it would be extremely valuable if highly qualified personnel from within the United Nations apparatus were to begin, without delay, the drawing up of a few drafts, taking into account the situation in Namibia, for a constitution to be deliberated upon by the proposed constituent assembly for possible debate and adoption. I know that the United Nations Secretariat had utilized its constitutional expertise to prepare such drafts on at least one occasion with which I am familiar, more than two decades ago. This will greatly expedite the work of the constituent assembly, although of course the constitution will be the assembly's own decision and no one else's. Moreover, and even though time is pressing, the Secretariat might well initiate a training programme to prepare a highly qualified cadre of technicians as well as administrators. The preparation of a comprehensive programme of economic and social development, such as a three-year or five-year programme, would also assist in the transition towards an efficiently functioning Government in an independent Namibia.

120. Let us hope and pray that the year 1978 will herald the long-delayed independence of Namibia, and we all look forward to welcoming Namibia into the fold of the United Nations.

121. Mr. HEIDWEILLER (Surinam) (*interpretation from Spanish*): First of all, Sir, I should like to express my warmest congratulations to you on your unanimous election to the presidency of this special session of the General Assembly. My delegation considers your election to this important post to be a tribute to your personal qualities and a sign of the esteem in which your country is held.

122. My delegation would like to pay a tribute also to the Secretary-General and to the United Nations Council for Namibia for their tenacious efforts to put an end to the illegal occupation of this Territory by South Africa.

123. The euphoria caused in many sectors by the adoption in 1960 of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples was short-lived, at least as far as Namibia was concerned. Indeed, more than two decades after the adoption of the Declaration we still have the same problem. The appalling results and upheavals have destroyed the lives of many innocent victims who have

been caught in this web of death, war, destruction, hatred and violence.

124. This has led to the disillusionment and disappointment of those who believed in the effectiveness of the United Nations, while the South African authorities continue to disregard the resolutions of the Security Council, the General Assembly and other United Nations organs with a complete absence of moral values or respect for the international community.

125. It need hardly be said that this stalemate could lead to another widespread war which might in the end affect the lives and well-being of those who live far from southern Africa.

126. For these reasons the delegation of Surinam, at the beginning of the second special session devoted to Namibia, would like to express its sincere hope that our deliberations and discussions will result in specific conclusions and decisions. It would indeed be tragic if this session were to devote its attention more to the failures of the past than to the possibilities offered by the future.

127. I should like to quote something Ambassador Gwendoline Konie of Zambia, President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, said recently in a statement before the Special Committee:

“The ninth special session of the General Assembly on Namibia offers the United Nations a decisive opportunity to ensure that the United Nations exercises its responsibilities towards the Namibian people by defining unequivocally the conditions and the steps which will ensure the immediate and genuine independence of Namibia.”<sup>5</sup>

128. In this connexion it should be borne in mind that following the initiative of the representatives of the Western Powers which are members of the Security Council negotiations have taken place with SWAPO in the course of which some movement has been created. We therefore followed with great interest the statement made by the Foreign Minister of Canada in this Assembly this morning.

129. It is too soon to comment on the possibility of there having been progress. All that we can say now is that we hope that those negotiations will lead to transition to independence by the end of this year within a structure acceptable to the Namibian people and to the international community.

130. My Government considers that the following conditions are basic to any peaceful, democratic and genuine transition to independence for Namibia: transition must take place under suitable control by the United Nations and in conditions acceptable to the United Nations; elections must be free and honest in Namibia as an integral political entity and must be based on universal suffrage; All South African claims in the Territory of Namibia, including its claim to Walvis Bay, must be rejected; South African military and police forces in the Territory must be replaced by appropriate forces well before the electoral campaign in order to ensure that the election takes place without

<sup>5</sup> See A/AC.109/PV.1103.

interference or intimidation; All political prisoners in Namibia must be released, as must all political detainees arrested by the South African authorities, before the electoral campaign begins so that they may be able to participate fully and freely in the electoral process; and all Namibian refugees, whether exiled or outside the country for other reasons, must be given the option of returning of their own free will to the Territory before the beginning of the electoral process so that they may have an opportunity to participate in the political process.

131. This special session marks a critical stage in the efforts to reach a long-awaited settlement of the problem of Namibia. The delegation of Surinam cherishes the sincere hope that this will prove to be a turning point for the future of the people of Namibia, for the promotion of international peace and security and, last but not least, for the prestige of our Organization.

*The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.*





CONTENTS

Agenda item 7:  
Question of Namibia (*continued*)

**President: Mr. Lazar MOJSOV (Yugoslavia).**

**AGENDA ITEM 7**

**Question of Namibia (*continued*)**

1. Mr. JACKSON (Guyana): This most important special session, the ninth in the history of the United Nations, takes place at a critical juncture in the long and arduous struggle for a universal system of interstate relations founded truly on sovereign equality and mutual respect. It is an all-embracing struggle, having among its objectives the eradication of oppression, exploitation and the degradation of the human personality. Today, through the individual and collective efforts of progressive forces, the process of the democratization of international relations advances despite strong and persistent attempts to retard progress. This is evident in the political no less than in the economic field. Yet, even those citadels from which power has traditionally been wielded are themselves not uninfluenced by the pressures for change.
2. In the ongoing struggle against imperialism, colonialism and alien domination, the non-aligned countries have been in the forefront. We who are engaged in prosecuting that struggle should not flinch from our duties and responsibilities, nor should we be deflected from our strategic objective by the difficulties and obstacles that are inevitably placed in our way.
3. Thus, Comrade President, the Assembly is extraordinarily fortunate to have you, a distinguished son of non-aligned Yugoslavia, presiding over this special session. I congratulate you most warmly on your unanimous election. Your well-known breadth of vision, your skill and experience in the art of diplomacy and your tact and wisdom were put at the disposal of the international community during the course of the thirty-second regular session as well as the recently concluded eighth special session of the General Assembly. I have every confidence that during the current session you will once again place your considerable talents at the service of us all and that under your mature guidance this session will mark a historic milestone on the road to genuine independence for Namibia. As we confront the challenges which this session poses, I pledge to you my fullest support and co-operation and that of the entire Guyana delegation.
4. Colonialism is on the retreat. It is dying but it is not yet dead. The battle for access to and control over raw materials and their supply, perceptions informed by strategic considerations and a manifest desire to maintain and extend so-called spheres of influence have forced a resort to new stratagems. Such stratagems can delay but never for a long time thwart the march to genuine national liberation and independence. Within recent times, nowhere has the inevitability of the process of decolonization been more self-evident than in the continent of Africa. Guinea-Bissau in 1973, Mozambique, Sao Tome and Principe, Cape Verde and Angola in 1975 are true testimony to this reality. Those who harbour the ambition of perpetuating white minority supremacy in southern Africa are now cornered in Zimbabwe, South Africa and Namibia.
5. There was a time—and it is not so long ago—when within the decision-making mechanisms of several countries, attitudes were struck and plans developed which were premised upon the continuation into perpetuity of white supremacy in southern Africa. Today, even those countries acknowledge the desirability, nay the inevitability, of the demise of racist supremacy in that area.
6. Namibia and its future cannot be analysed and discussed in isolation. That there are features specific to that Territory is not in doubt. But it is clear that a correct appreciation of the situation requires that Namibia be viewed in the context of the correlation of forces influencing the course of events in southern Africa as a whole; and those forces are both internal and external to the region. Critical to any such analysis is the role of the Pretoria régime, the agents of which illegally occupy Namibia. For South Africa, ruled by a racist white minority, through its manifold actions and the external support it attracts in various forms, seeks to frustrate the attainment by the peoples of southern Africa of their legitimate aspirations to liberation, freedom and independence.
7. It is not really necessary to recount in detail the nefarious activities of the white minority régime in South Africa; nor is a thoroughgoing assessment of the impact of those activities on the process of desirable change warranted. Suffice it to recall that the United Nations has had cause on several occasions to condemn the Pretoria régime for its unrestrained application of violence within and outside South Africa. The several aggressions against Zambia and the massive invasion of Angola are some examples. There are many more affecting Botswana and Lesotho. And the record of internal repression needs no description here.
8. In Namibia, which is the immediate focus of our concern, South Africa has defiantly flouted the authority

of this Organization for many years. Nearly 11 years ago this Assembly meeting in special session agreed [resolution 2248 (S-V)] upon modalities through which the United Nations could best discharge its responsibilities with regard to Namibia and expedite the attainment of genuine independence by the people of that Territory. The Mandate of South Africa over Namibia having been earlier terminated, the United Nations Council for Namibia was established with the purpose, *inter alia*, of administering the Territory until its accession to genuine national independence. The successful exercise of that responsibility by the United Nations was however premised upon an important consideration: compliance by the South African régime with the prescriptions of the General Assembly, and its co-operation for the transfer of the administration of the Territory of Namibia to the United Nations Council for Namibia, the legal Administering Authority. South Africa's response then and over the period which ensued up to this ninth special session is well known to Members of this Organization. It has been consistently defiant.

9. Yet the situation in Namibia has not remained static. Under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the authentic representatives of the Namibian people, the struggle for independence and freedom has been waged relentlessly against the illegal South African régime. Nor have the valiant people of Namibia been alone in their struggle. Their just struggle has received unreserved support from the Organization of African Unity (OAU), the non-aligned movement and, indeed, the majority of Member States of the United Nations. The United Nations itself has over the years been active in this regard. The United Nations Council for Namibia, through a series of diplomatic and political programmes endorsed by this Assembly, has pursued against great odds the ultimate objective of genuine independence 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 has also been in the forefront of initiatives which sought to advance the cause of independence for Namibia. The work of the Security Council has however been hampered by perceived strategic and other interests which are grounded in global political alignments. Suffice it to say that these interests have on more than one occasion stifled and impeded meaningful action by the United Nations.

10. The United Nations Council for Namibia continues to exert every effort in initiating action aimed at effecting the withdrawal of the illegal occupation régime from Namibia and at securing the independence of the Territory. In accordance with its mandate, the Council has formulated and implemented over the years a policy of dissemination of information to mobilize international public opinion in favour of the struggle of the Namibian people. The establishment of the United Nations Institute for Namibia, the creation of the United Nations Fund for Namibia and the Nationhood Programme are some of the initiatives taken by the Council in the discharge of its mandate. It is perhaps unfortunate that certain Member States have given less than full support to the Council for Namibia and its ongoing activities.

11. On its part, South Africa has always perceived Namibia as its own peripheral territory, as a source of

economic enrichment of the *apartheid* State, and as an integral part of its own defence system. In an effort to perpetuate that relationship the Pretoria régime exported its system of racism, *apartheid* and bantustans to Namibia and progressively introduced an apparatus of repression designed to secure forced compliance with its dictates. It is the contradiction between those interests as perceived by South Africa and the legitimate interests of the Namibian people, led by SWAPO, for their freedom and independence, and with it their right to fashion the society in accordance with their own needs, with which we have to grapple.

12. Today, irrefutable evidence from inside Namibia itself has alerted the international community to the deteriorating situation within the Territory and to the need for this General Assembly to adopt timely and appropriate measures. For even as the racist South African régime intensifies its acts of aggression and repression against the peace-loving people of Namibia, it seeks to confound international public opinion by an affected willingness to enter into and participate in negotiations.

13. The international community needs to take close cognizance of the present situation in Namibia, where Namibian patriots are daily subjected to illegal arrests and harassment, to intimidation and various forms of brutality, and where the South African régime has embarked upon a huge military build-up, including the shipment into Namibia of large quantities of war material and the development of nuclear weapons. This escalation of military activity is coupled with officially sanctioned acts of violence against members of SWAPO by South Africa's pliant surrogates inside Namibia. It is therefore not difficult to appreciate that the promotion of ethnic strife and hostilities in Namibia by the Pretoria régime is a devious tactic designed to provoke an internal situation which would create a climate in which South Africa could hope that a sham independence of Namibia would be effected and the transfer of a semblance of power to its puppets and quislings enabled.

14. South Africa is reported to have accepted certain proposals. We must however be wary and vigilant. Its real wish—no matter how well concealed—is to have a refurbished Turnhalle charade. While South Africa has confronted the United Nations and the international community with studied and deliberate prevarication, it has pursued with determination its conspiracy against SWAPO.

15. There is an ominous parallel between South Africa's intention in relation to Namibia and recent developments in Zimbabwe. Both Vorster and Smith profess a willingness to have negotiated settlements in Namibia and Zimbabwe respectively. But, in our view, this is only a tactic, for they are pursuing the objective of retaining power through chosen puppets under the guise of so-called internal settlements even as they intensify repression and direct organized violence against the peoples of those Territories.

16. We have followed with keen interest the initiatives for a negotiated settlement in Namibia by the five Western countries. We are convinced that those countries, as pivotal and major trading partners of South Africa, have the capacity to bring some influence to bear on the Pretoria

régime to take account of the considered wisdom of the international community.

17. During the course of the most recent exchanges, it became increasingly evident that SWAPO's sincerity and willingness to enter into serious negotiations over the future of Namibia were paralleled only by South Africa's intransigence and its unwillingness to respond and to deal with the major concessions made by SWAPO. Thus SWAPO has continued to demonstrate its good faith. That should be borne in mind as we assess the recent belated announcement emanating from Pretoria.

18. The five Western countries have now formally submitted their proposals for a settlement as a document of the Security Council.<sup>1</sup> We do not at this stage wish to comment in detail on those proposals. Nevertheless, we are constrained to observe that the important question of Walvis Bay, which South Africa has purported to annex and which is allegedly compounded by legal considerations, did not form part of the proposals.

19. Walvis Bay is, as SWAPO has consistently asserted, an integral part of Namibia, and this position has been fully endorsed by the Council for Namibia. If current reports are to be believed, the huge contingents of South African military personnel in Walvis Bay may conceal the real motive of the Pretoria régime for ensuring South African hegemony over Namibia.

20. Until there is matching action and not merely words, we shall remain vigilant to ensure that there is a credible change in South Africa's attitude towards Namibia, for we are not yet totally convinced that that régime has irrevocably abandoned its devious plans in relation to the future of the international Territory of Namibia. Rather, as I remarked earlier, we are aware that the racist régime intends to pursue a series of manoeuvres aimed at continued control over Namibia, even if under different guises.

21. What of the future of Namibia? What further action can be taken to bring about the desired but long-delayed goal of genuine Namibian independence with full territorial integrity? Whatever the programme of action this Organization contemplates and approves, it is important to be constantly aware that Namibia is an international Territory, as so decided by this Assembly. Special responsibility therefore devolves on the Council and, through it, on the United Nations. Thus we should ensure that the Council for Namibia is neither consciously nor by default excluded from full participation in action agreed upon or endorsed by this Organization for securing the goal of liberation, freedom and independence in Namibia.

22. Of importance for advancement on the question of Namibia is pressure on the Pretoria régime. SWAPO, backed by the broad masses of the Namibian people, is waging an armed struggle which achieves new victories and continuously harasses the enemy. Inside Namibia, SWAPO patriots vigorously pursue the mobilization of the Namibian people in their opposition to the repression and brutality of the racist oppressors. The international community, with progressive forces in the vanguard, must increase its support

for SWAPO and should not relax its pressure upon South Africa.

23. I should like to take this opportunity to pay a warm tribute to SWAPO for its valiant struggle to attain independence for the Territory of Namibia. We wish to salute the members of that organization for the dedication and steadfastness with which they have pursued their objective.

24. The Co-ordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Countries will be meeting in Afghanistan next month. Later this year, in July, all the foreign ministers of that movement will convene in Belgrade, the capital of your own country, Mr. President. During those consultations, the non-aligned movement will as in the past engage in its own analysis and review of the situation in Namibia and will, I am sure, adopt measures to lend support to the sterling efforts of the people of Namibia, led by SWAPO, to wrest their freedom from their racist oppressive overlords. Guyana will fully support those activities.

25. In regard to international action, I should like to address myself to the draft Declaration and Programme of Action on Namibia submitted by the Council [A/S-9/7]. It is our view that these proposals, if approved by this Assembly and faithfully implemented, will contribute significantly to the achievement of genuine independence for the people of Namibia.

26. Everyone knows that Namibia is a country which is rich in natural resources. It presents, potentially and actually, a classic model of exploitation. In the eyes of those who exploit, there is in Namibia a unique combination of readily available raw materials and, with the appropriate political direction, cheap labour. One is tempted to reflect on the extent to which this has been an inhibitory factor for adequate political commitment and action on the part of those who seek to benefit and do benefit from the exploitation of Namibia.

27. Cognizant of this situation, however, the Council for Namibia, acting on behalf of the people of Namibia, sought, through the promulgation of Decree No. 1 of December 1974,<sup>2</sup> to ensure as a first step that the "natural resources are not exploited to the detriment of Namibia, its people or environmental assets". It is, I venture to suggest, a sad commentary that that Decree, like so many resolutions of this Assembly and the Security Council on Namibia, languishes in the archives of this Organization. Those who participate in the exploitation of Namibia's resources, in addition to whatever else they may propose for the future of Namibia, ought to implement the provisions of that Decree immediately.

28. Simultaneously with these actions, every support must be given to SWAPO to enable it to intensify the armed struggle, even as proposals for a negotiated settlement are pursued. In this respect, the Party, the Government and the people of Guyana will continue to accord the fullest support to the people of Namibia under the leadership of SWAPO, until the goal of genuine independence for Namibia is realized.

<sup>1</sup> S/12636.

<sup>2</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-ninth Session, Supplement No. 24A*, para. 84.

29. The situation in Namibia is a threat to international peace and security. Its continuance in time can only exacerbate that threat. We need therefore to consider the imposition of a time-frame for decisive action by the United Nations. The struggle of the people of Namibia under the leadership and guidance of SWAPO, and supported by progressive forces throughout the world, will inevitably triumph. That notwithstanding, the Security Council, which under the Charter has primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, needs to keep a close and continuous watch on the situation and should stand ready to take appropriate and effective action, should this be necessary.

30. The people of Namibia have for a long time expected decisive action from this Organization. Let us not disappoint them once again.

31. Mr. YANGO (Philippines): Mr. President, first of all, I should like to take this opportunity to congratulate you on behalf of my delegation on your unanimous election to the presidency of the ninth special session of the General Assembly devoted to the question of Namibia, and to wish you and the other officers of the Assembly all success.

32. If the success of the thirty-second regular session of the General Assembly and of the eighth special session concerning the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon is any indication, the ninth special session, under your dynamic and able leadership, will, my delegation is confident, accomplish its work with characteristic distinction and efficiency.

33. I should like to assure you of my delegation's support and co-operation with a view to helping in the fulfilment of the responsibility of the United Nations towards the people of Namibia in their legitimate struggles for self-determination, sovereignty, territorial integrity, freedom and independence, in accordance with the United Nations Charter and the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and other relevant resolutions of the General Assembly.

34. As the General Assembly meets in this ninth special session on Namibia, I wish to reiterate with all the clarity at my command the position of the Philippines on this important question that involves the destiny of a people on behalf of whom the United Nations must exercise its solemn responsibility. The Philippine position on this question was set forth by the Secretary for Foreign Affairs of the Philippines, Mr. Carlos P. Romulo, at the 41st plenary meeting of the thirty-second session of the General Assembly on 21 October 1977.

35. Since then, the United Nations Council for Namibia has met in extraordinary session at Lusaka and has adopted the 1978 Lusaka Declaration [see A/S-9/4, para. 31], while the Special Committee has adopted the text of a consensus on Namibia [see A/S-9/6, annex]. On 20 April 1978, the United Nations Council for Namibia adopted by consensus a draft declaration and programme of action on Namibia. My delegation supports firmly and unequivocally the thrust of and the goals embodied in these important documents.

36. In 1977, my delegation supported the call of the African Group and of the OAU for a special session of the

General Assembly on Namibia under resolution 32/9 of 4 November 1977. The grave situation in Namibia and the events of the past months have shown the wisdom and timeliness of the General Assembly action.

37. The colonialist and racist régime of South Africa continues its illegal occupation of Namibia and has escalated its brutal repression of the people of that international Territory, in defiance of Security Council resolution 385 (1976) and the numerous resolutions of the General Assembly relevant to the question of Namibia.

38. It is known that South Africa is creating tribal armies in Namibia clearly with an eye to post-independence control of the Territory. The international community must see that for the subterfuge that it is. South Africa is also undertaking an ominous military build-up in Namibia, using the Kalahari desert for its nuclear tests in violation of Namibia's territorial integrity and posing a grave threat to international peace and security. South Africa has also used mercenaries and made military incursions into and violated the territorial integrity of the neighbouring States, in particular Angola and Zambia. The existence of South African military bases at Walvis Bay, an integral part of Namibia, constitutes a violation of Namibia's territorial integrity, a contemptuous defiance of United Nations decisions and a blatant disregard of the international community's universal will in this respect. The international community must not, by default, condone these illegal actions by South Africa. The General Assembly must once again declare the South African decision to annex Walvis Bay illegal, null and void and an act of aggression against the Namibian people.

39. It is abundantly clear that the United Nations must now take concerted international action to put an end, once and for all, to the intransigence of the colonialist and racist régime of South Africa. The situation calls for immediate and effective action by the General Assembly and the Security Council.

40. The draft declaration and programme of action constitute the elements that should ensure the United Nations effectively to assume its direct and special responsibility over Namibia until genuine self-determination and national independence is achieved in the Territory. It will be necessary for the General Assembly to reaffirm the mandate given to the United Nations Council for Namibia as the legal Administering Authority for Namibia until the advent of independence.

41. My delegation firmly supports the inalienable rights of the Namibian people and recognizes the legitimacy of their struggle for self-determination which could be realized through elections freely held under United Nations control and supervision. My delegation also supports SWAPO as the sole and authentic representative of the people of Namibia, as proclaimed by the General Assembly and reaffirmed by the Security Council. The United Nations should take immediate and effective measures now, to effect the complete and unconditional withdrawal from Namibian territory of the illegal South African régime. Otherwise, the Namibian people, under SWAPO's leadership, will have no choice but to take matters into their own hands in their determination to gain their sovereignty, freedom and independence and to ensure their territorial integrity.

42. SWAPO has shown commendable restraint in the face of great provocation and intimidation by the colonialist and racist régime. It has shown a willingness to enter into negotiations for the achievement of genuine independence for Namibia in conformity with Security Council resolution 385 (1976). It has even gone to the extent of making far-reaching and substantive concessions, while on the other hand South Africa has continued to refuse to demonstrate its good faith or willingness to enter into meaningful negotiations for its withdrawal from Namibia.

43. My delegation is of the view that any negotiated settlement arrived at must have the agreement of SWAPO and must be within the framework of the resolutions of the United Nations. My delegation therefore condemns any so-called internal settlement in the context of the formula worked out at the Turnhalle Conference as a manoeuvre designed to mislead the international community, justify continued illegal and racist occupation, incite to civil war and propagate the fiction that the struggle of the Namibian people for the liberation of the international Territory is "aggression perpetrated from the outside". The United Nations must not be taken in by such blandishments.

44. On the other hand, my delegation is also appreciative of the efforts of the five Western Powers members of the Security Council to initiate a negotiated settlement on the question of Namibia, and we express the sincere hope that such a negotiated settlement under United Nations auspices will not lose sight of the legitimate concerns I have already mentioned.

45. Until genuine independence is achieved in Namibia, my delegation will support the activities of the United Nations Council for Namibia as the legal Administering Authority for Namibia, and its policies and programmes designed to pave the way towards the lofty objective of independence for the Namibian people. At the thirty-second session of the General Assembly my delegation affirmed its support for increased assistance to Namibians in the context of the Nationhood Programme for Namibia, the United Nations Institute for Namibia at Lusaka and the United Nations Fund for Namibia. My delegation asserts the determination of the Philippine Government to continue that support until genuine independence is achieved by the Namibian people.

46. My Government has consistently given moral and financial assistance to the Namibian people by its continued annual contributions to these funds, including the Solidarity Fund for southern Africa established by the non-aligned group of countries in Colombo. We urge others, especially the more affluent, to do likewise.

47. I express my Government's hope that the General Assembly at this special session will put an end to outside help that encourages and abets South Africa in its illegal and racist activities in Namibia. At the same time, my delegation joins the United Nations Council for Namibia, the Special Committee, OAU, SWAPO and the Secretary-General in calling upon Governments of Member States, intergovernmental organizations, specialized agencies and non-governmental organizations to give all possible assistance to the Nationhood Programme for Namibia and to the United Nations Institute for Namibia, to be more generous

with their aid and to contribute, if they have not done so previously, to the United Nations Fund for Namibia. My delegation also calls on all concerned to support the Council's Decree No. 1 in order to safeguard the patrimony of the Namibian people for their benefit now and in the future.

48. In view of the extraordinarily grave situation in Namibia in particular and in southern Africa in general, and the intransigence of the colonialist and racist régime, stronger measures are called for, even including sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter, particularly economic sanctions and oil and arms embargoes. Meanwhile it is imperative that the measures of the illegal and racist régimes be fully exposed to the public by all means. My delegation notes that there has been little publicity on the ninth special session on Namibia, but expresses the hope that the Office of Public Information, in co-operation with the United Nations Council for Namibia, will be able to undertake a full-fledged publicity campaign on behalf of the United Nations so that the situation in Namibia may be fully understood by the peoples of the world.

49. For the second time in less than six months the General Assembly is seized of the question of Namibia, an indication of the great urgency of a just and enduring solution to this problem. The people of Namibia look to the United Nations to assume its direct and special responsibility for Namibia. The time has come for the United Nations to act, and act effectively. It is time for the international community to rally to the side of the peoples of Namibia and southern Africa. My delegation is confident that the United Nations will not be found wanting, and that the entire membership of the Organization, which represents the will of the international community, will take concerted action to enable the Namibian people to exercise its inalienable right to self-determination, freedom and independence in accordance with the principles enshrined in the Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

50. Mr. DATCU (Romania) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, the Romanian delegation is pleased to have an opportunity once again warmly to welcome your presence in this august forum of the United Nations. In your person we greet an eminent representative of Yugoslavia, our neighbour and friend, and you have given us abundant proof of your skill in guiding the work of our Assembly. We reiterate our complete confidence in you and our support for success in the accomplishment of your responsible task.

51. The present special session of the General Assembly is being held at a crucial time in the struggle of the Namibian people for their national liberation and dignity. This session has a special significance because it is the first of its kind to be held since 1966, when the General Assembly assumed direct responsibility for Namibia. Accordingly, the present debate should represent a decisive step in the efforts of the United Nations and the peoples of the world to remove the illegal régime from the Territory and to ensure the conditions necessary for the free and independent development of Namibia.

52. The convening of a special session of the General Assembly to consider the problem is an indication of a growing concern and legitimate anxiety on the part of Member States because of the ever more striking deterioration of the situation in Namibia and the obstacles set up along the course in exercise of the responsibility assumed by the United Nations towards the Namibian people. At the same time, the convening of the present session represents a natural reaction of Member States to the manoeuvres of South Africa designed to perpetuate the colonial occupying régime in Namibia by establishing in that Territory a subject government.

53. In these circumstances the present debate is intended to emphasize once again the firm determination of all of us in the United Nations to act more resolutely to put an end to the grave situation in Namibia and to give the Namibian people the opportunity freely to decide their own fate and to choose the course of their economic and social development without any foreign interference.

54. The experience acquired in the efforts to implement the relevant resolutions on Namibia stands as proof that we have strong reasons and a sound political and legal basis for settlement of the burning issue now before the United Nations. The Security Council sanctioned the termination of the South African Mandate over Namibia and the placing of that Territory under United Nations jurisdiction until its accession to independence and at the same time decided that the continued presence of South Africa in Namibia is illegal and contrary to the principles of the Charter and to United Nations resolutions and in flagrant violation of the sacred right of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence.

55. The repeated affirmation of the unique responsibilities of the United Nations concerning Namibia, the appeal repeatedly addressed to the Pretoria Government to withdraw from the Territory, which has international status, as well as the warnings issued by the General Assembly regarding the grave danger to peace and security in the region and the entire world have so far not proved able to generate any substantial change in the attitude of the Pretoria authorities with regard to Namibia. The absence of firm measures for the implementation of United Nations resolutions on Namibia and, above all, of a common political determination shared by the members of the Security Council regarding the adoption of enforcement measures in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter in respect of South Africa, has been used by the latter to maintain and consolidate the illegal régime of occupation in Namibia and further to plunder the natural resources of the Territory. This position of South Africa has been rightly described as undermining the authority and credibility of the United Nations, in which peoples have placed their hopes.

56. The United Nations Council for Namibia, which is entrusted with the administration of the Territory until its accession to independence, and the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples have undertaken intense activity in support of the Namibian people and its liberation movement, SWAPO. They have had broad consultations with the

Governments of many States Members of the United Nations and of the OAU and above all with the front-line African States so as to be able to decide on the most appropriate measures to eliminate the illegal occupation régime in Namibia. I avail myself of this opportunity to pay a well deserved tribute to Ambassador Gwendoline Konie of Zambia, who with her competent and dynamic action provides exemplary guidance in the United Nations Council for Namibia.

57. Efforts to arrive at a political settlement of the Namibian problem have also been reflected in Security Council resolution 385 (1976), an important resolution that was adopted unanimously. My country, Romania, was one of its sponsors. But, acting counter to all these efforts, South Africa has unceasingly escalated its measures of repression against the national liberation struggle directed by SWAPO and has intensified the atmosphere of terror with arrests and condemnations of Namibian patriots. The Pretoria authorities have also militarily strengthened the régime of occupation and have redoubled their acts of violence, provocation and aggression against the Namibian people and against the neighbouring States, thus creating a permanent state of tension with serious consequences for the peace and security of the continent and of the world.

58. South Africa has persistently acted against the national unity of the Namibian people, among other actions, by attempts to impose upon Namibia a so-called internal solution and violations of the territorial integrity of Namibia, as reflected in the decision of the Pretoria authorities on the annexation of Walvis Bay. These actions have been vehemently condemned by the United Nations.

59. In emphasizing the multilateral support granted by Romania to the just struggle of the liberation movements of Namibia and Rhodesia, President Nicolae Ceausecu recently declared:

“We have welcomed and we consider useful the continuing efforts to seek political solutions by way of negotiations, but if those negotiations lead to no results it is obvious that there will remain only recourse to arms. It is difficult to advise the national liberation movements to renounce their struggle to win independence and to accept the old policy in another guise. The advice we can give the national liberation movements is to consolidate their fighting unity and to use all political and diplomatic means as well as resorting to arms to win final victory.”

60. The experience of Namibia shows beyond doubt that, so long as relations of subordination and exploitation of one people of another State persist in the world, sustained efforts are needed to strengthen the role of the United Nations and its capacity to act in support of oppressed peoples.

61. In present conditions it is imperative further to intensify efforts intended to implement United Nations resolutions on Namibia and enable the Organization to exercise the responsibilities it has assumed towards the Namibian people, so that that courageous people will be able to fulfil its legitimate aspirations for a life in freedom and dignity in its own country.

62. The Romanian delegation listened with interest to the statement made to this Assembly by the President of SWAPO, Mr. Sam Nujoma [*1st meeting*], confirming its determination to continue the struggle until Namibia's liberation, and its position regarding the settlement of this problem by peaceful means. We appreciate the fact that the proposals put forward by SWAPO constitute a solid, realistic and constructive basis for a solution that is in accord with the inalienable interests and rights of the Namibian people and with the interests of peace. Today I should like to reaffirm here, on behalf of the delegation of Romania, that we whole-heartedly support the efforts being made by SWAPO.

63. Romania has felt from the outset that the political settlement of the problem of Namibia requires that the Pretoria authorities clearly and unequivocally commit themselves to respect the sacred right of the Namibian people to decide their own fate for themselves and to choose their path of economic and social development without restrictions. We are firmly convinced that so long as South Africa persists in its refusal to commit itself to that course the United Nations will have no choice but to intensify its actions and political measures against the South African régime and support by every means the legitimate national liberation struggle of the Namibian people. United Nations responsibility towards Namibia will not cease as long as the Namibian people has not taken its destiny in its own hands.

64. In our view, the General Assembly should call on the Security Council to act firmly to implement the relevant United Nations resolutions, and in particular its own resolutions concerning Namibia, making use of all the means provided for in the Charter. SWAPO, the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people, should also be granted broad political and diplomatic support and, above all, the aspirations of its people for a peaceful settlement under the aegis of the United Nations should be satisfied.

65. The delegation of Romania supports application of the measures advocated in the Lusaka Declaration, of which it was a sponsor, and we are prepared to co-operate with other States Members to complete the draft Declaration and Programme of Action drawn up by the United Nations Council for Namibia. We are convinced that by adopting and, above all, by implementing the measures contained in the two documents the United Nations will be able to contribute effectively to a just solution of the problem of Namibia, ensuring that that country will develop as a single independent and sovereign State.

66. The Socialist Republic of Romania energetically condemns the continued domination of Namibia by South Africa and the persistent refusal of the Pretoria authorities to comply with United Nations resolutions on Namibia. My country condemns also South Africa's actions designed to undermine the national unity and territorial integrity of the Namibian people, as well as all direct or indirect attempts to try to impose on the Territory a so-called internal settlement.

67. Consistent with our firm position of solidarity with the peoples which are fighting for their freedom and

independence and against foreign domination, Romania accords to the Namibian people and its national liberation movement, SWAPO, permanent and multilateral support.

68. The relations of solidarity between our two peoples were also confirmed in the joint Romanian-Namibian communiqué signed in 1973 at the highest level. That document enshrines Romania's firm will to support by all means and in the most diverse ways the legitimate struggle of the Namibian people, under SWAPO's direction, for the final abolition of foreign domination and for the independent development of Namibia.

69. For our part, President Nicolae Ceausescu of Romania declared in his message addressed on 26 August 1977 to the President of SWAPO, Sam Nujoma, on the occasion of Namibia Day:

"I should like to assure you that, in the spirit of our constant position of militant solidarity, we are determined to accord the Namibian people, now and in the future, all our political, diplomatic, moral and material support, to promote relations of friendship and co-operation with the future independent Namibia in the interest of both peoples, and in the interest of the general cause of the fight against imperialism, colonialism and racism and for peace, independence and social progress."

70. It is in the spirit of those considerations that the delegation of Romania will act during the present session and co-operate with all other delegations to formulate the most effective measures and the most adequate guarantees that will live up to the hopes of the Namibian people and lead to the solution of the Namibian problem in conformity with the responsibilities that the United Nations has assumed.

71. Mr. VAJPAYEE (India):<sup>3</sup> We have assembled here at this ninth special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to the question of Namibia at a very crucial phase in the momentous struggle for human rights and freedom in southern Africa. We are gathered together to proclaim our continued determination to make Namibian independence a reality.

72. In the last three decades, the map of Africa has changed swiftly. Winds of change have been blowing all over what was dubbed by colonial Powers the "dark continent". Colonial empires have vanished. Africa is awake. Africa is resurgent.

73. And yet, pockets of colonialism, racial discrimination and *apartheid* still exist in southern Africa. The racist minority régimes pose a challenge to the collective conscience of humanity by their continued and brazen defiance of world opinion, callous intransigence and ever-mounting barbarism, brutality and repression.

74. In recent years, profound changes have decisively tipped the balance of forces in favour of the completion of the process of decolonization in the region. The victories of the liberation movements of Mozambique, Angola, Guinea

<sup>3</sup> Mr. Vajpayee spoke in Hindi; the English version of this statement was furnished by the delegation.

Bissau, Cape Verde and Sao Tome and Principe have extended the frontiers of freedom in Africa right to the borders of Namibia and Zimbabwe. The foundations of the racist minority régimes of southern Africa have been shaken.

75. Southern Africa stands at the threshold of freedom. National liberation movements have intensified the tempo of their struggle. The front-line States have extended full support and solidarity to them in the face of persistent attempts at undermining their stability and territorial integrity through aggression, harassment, intimidation and economic hardships inflicted on them by the racist minority régimes.

76. This special session provides the United Nations with a last chance to take decisive steps to bring genuine independence to the people of Namibia. We meet here in an atmosphere of both challenge and opportunity.

77. It is our hope and expectation that the much delayed process of change would come through a negotiated settlement. All our combined energies should be bent towards finding a solution through peaceful means. For if these efforts fail, the only alternative would be a stepped-up armed liberation struggle, with all its attendant consequences.

78. When I addressed the General Assembly at its thirty-second session [18th meeting] last year, I stressed the collective and direct responsibility of the United Nations for securing the complete withdrawal of South Africa's presence from Namibia and underlined the fact that the United Nations had all the means at its disposal to do so.

79. The success of this special session has relevance not only to what the United Nations can do for the people of Namibia, but to what it can do for the universal freedom of man. Seen in this context, Namibia is not just a geographical entity on the map of the world. It has become a symbol of the final phase of struggle against colonial domination and the pernicious doctrine of superiority on grounds of race or colour of skin. Till such time as we do not completely eliminate racial discrimination and exploitation from the face of the earth, we shall not be able to make liberty and human dignity a universal phenomenon.

80. Why are we meeting now in a special session? It is because South Africa not only has continued to ignore the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice and to defy the will of the international community, but also is trying to consolidate its position in Namibia by offering it spurious independence under its own auspices. South Africa has consistently refused to recognize the legitimacy of the interests of the United Nations in Namibia.

81. Nowhere is the credibility and authority of the United Nations more at stake than in the case of Namibia, which has the unique distinction of being the only national entity which is legally an international responsibility. The United Nations here has a direct responsibility by virtue of General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI), adopted at the twenty-first session on 27 October 1966. It is now for us at this special session to take measures which would enable the United Nations to discharge its obligations and prevent this

world body from being made a mockery by one of its own Member States.

82. India fully shares the sense of frustration and outrage over the fact that even though 11 years have elapsed since the United Nations terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia, South Africa not only retains its unlawful presence but seeks to consolidate it further by installing a puppet régime and promoting a fake internal settlement.

83. Evidently the danger of a so-called internal settlement is a very real one. South Africa would like the United Nations to observe the elections to be organized by it for the purpose of legitimizing an internal settlement. It is obvious to my delegation that the United Nations should denounce in advance any such internal settlement, for it would result in depriving the people of their birth-right, their natural resources and their self-respect, as well as mortgaging their future to permanent dependence on South Africa.

84. South Africa has master-minded the internal negotiations with a view to breaking up the Territory into various tribal units, each in a state of permanent dependence on South Africa. Its aim is clearly to perpetuate Namibia's continued overlordship by the whites so that they can remain in control of 43 per cent of the area containing the best agricultural land, mineral resources and the main seaports.

85. The blacks, who outnumber the whites by 8 to 1, are to be given only 40 per cent of the area, consisting of poor-quality land divided into 10 non-contiguous tribal enclaves. The remaining 17 per cent of the Territory, containing diamond and other mines, is to remain under direct South African control.

86. The right of Namibians to self-determination and genuine independence is inalienable. That right must be restored to them. The historic Maputo Declaration of 1977<sup>4</sup> and the more recent Lusaka Declaration adopted by the United Nations Council for Namibia at its extraordinary session in Lusaka have provided us with a correct and genuine perspective of the serious crisis and the consequences if a right solution is not found expeditiously.

87. Security Council resolution 385 (1976) provides an appropriate basis for the orderly progress of Namibia towards genuine independence through free and democratic elections on the basis of one man, one vote, under United Nations supervision and control and with no interference of any sort from South Africa.

88. India's commitment to the struggle for liberation in southern Africa dates back to 1893, when Mahatma Gandhi launched his non-violent crusade against *apartheid* in South Africa. Bonds of shared experience and common suffering unite us with our African brethren. I recall with pride that in 1946, at the first session of the United Nations General Assembly, it was India which raised the issue of *apartheid* and racial discrimination in South Africa.

<sup>4</sup> A/32/109/Rev.1-S/12344/Rev.1, annex V. For the printed text, see *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-second Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1977*.



89. At this special session may I once again reiterate India's firm and abiding support for the struggle of the people of Namibia for liberation from the illegal occupation by the racist minority régime. I should like to declare our complete solidarity with our valiant Namibian brethren who are carrying on the struggle for the liquidation of colonialism and racial discrimination with courage and determination.

90. On behalf of the Government and people of India, I should like to pay homage to all those freedom fighters who have sacrificed their lives in the long struggle, and to all those who are languishing in prisons and are victims of colonial exploitation and *apartheid*. I should like to tell them that our prayers are with them—and, more than our prayers, all the support that we can give.

91. Notwithstanding the odds against which the United Nations Council for Namibia has been working, it has succeeded in the difficult task of mobilizing international opinion in favour of the just and legitimate struggle of the Namibian people. It has undertaken imaginative efforts to ensure that Namibia enters the comity of nations well prepared for its duties and functions.

92. India has been an active member of the United Nations Council for Namibia ever since its creation and has co-operated in every possible manner to make the Council for Namibia effective. India will continue to render assistance to the Namibian people, both bilaterally through SWAPO, which we regard as the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people, as well as multilaterally through the various United Nations agencies. India pledges its full support for the successful execution of the Nationhood Programme of Namibia not only for the present period of its struggle for independence but also for the initial years of independence.

93. In keeping with our tradition of non-violence and resolving conflicts along the path of peace and negotiations, we should be happy if, even at this late hour, the question of Namibia were settled peacefully without bloodshed or violence. We are at the same time aware of the historical circumstances in which armed struggle has been forced on the liberation movements of Namibia and Zimbabwe. It is up to the United Nations and its Member States to try to minimize bloodshed and further suffering and frustration by using all the means at their command to ensure a peaceful and rapid transition to genuine majority rule and independence.

94. A negotiated settlement should not be a ruse for buying time or finding temporary palliatives. My Government will lend its support to all initiatives that sincerely and seriously aim at working out a peaceful transition to total and complete independence of the people of Namibia and the total eradication of the evil practices of racism and *apartheid*.

95. We would welcome it if change were brought about peacefully, but if these efforts do not succeed because of the obduracy of the South African régime and armed struggle becomes necessary, India will continue fully to support and to help the patriotic forces both morally and materially.

96. The Security Council has so far not taken any formal action to implement its resolution 385 (1976), although the contact group of five Western countries members of the Security Council which have diplomatic relations with the Pretoria régime has been discussing with that régime and with SWAPO the mechanics of implementing that resolution.

97. SWAPO has expressed its readiness to follow the path of negotiations and has been considering Western proposals. Recently we had the pleasure of welcoming the President of SWAPO, Mr. Sam Nujoma, in New Delhi. My talks with Mr. Nujoma convinced me that SWAPO has an open mind for any peaceful initiatives that could lead to a genuine change in Namibia and a just solution of all connected problems.

98. For nearly a year, talks have been going on on the initiative of the five-member contact group of Western countries. The latest proposals presented by the contact group of Western countries to SWAPO and to the Government of South Africa are a step in the right direction but fall short of certain crucial elements. We recognize that those efforts are well meaning. However, we have to see if they go far enough.

99. SWAPO has shown flexibility in the negotiations and, as Mr. Sam Nujoma has repeatedly said in recent weeks, SWAPO has made concessions and displayed a constructive spirit.

100. India feels that the world community should not fritter away a chance, if there be one, for reaching a negotiated settlement if honourable and reasonable conditions are being created for it. However, there has been no evidence so far that South Africa is sincerely interested in giving up its colonial designs in Namibia. On the contrary, it has tried to annex Walvis Bay. While carrying on negotiations with the five Western Powers it has also been promoting an internal settlement, creating tribal armies, dividing up the Territory along tribal lines and persecuting nationalist forces. There are also disturbing reports of preparations for testing nuclear weapons in the Namibian desert. Given South Africa's record of aggression against its African neighbours, there is no doubt that the policies and actions of the Pretoria régime in Namibia constitute a threat to international peace and security.

101. Unless effective political, economic and diplomatic pressure is brought to bear on the South African régime, the process of negotiation is unlikely to make real headway. On the recommendations of the Maputo Conference, the Security Council adopted a resolution last year placing an arms embargo on South Africa [418 (1977)]. If South Africa continues to be unco-operative and does not accept reasonable proposals, the United Nations would have to take the next logical step of applying sanctions against it according to the terms of Chapter VII of the Charter, as was demanded in the recent Lusaka Declaration.

102. In any solution that is being worked out, we cannot acquiesce in any effort seeking to limit or to diminish the role of the United Nations and the United Nations Council for Namibia in the transition to independence, nor can we grant any measure of recognition to the illegal occupying forces of South Africa in Namibia.

103. The announcement by South Africa today of the acceptance of Western proposals suffers from these two serious limitations: that, according to South Africa, “the primary responsibility for maintaining law and order during the transitional period shall rest with the existing police forces” and “the issue of Walvis Bay is not included in the proposals”.

104. We should like to know the attitude of the Western Powers on those points, and the assurances or clarifications that they gave to South Africa on the basis of which it has announced the acceptance of the Western proposals in a very dramatic way.

105. According to the Secretary of State for External Affairs of Canada, the decision concerning the future of Walvis Bay should be discussed between the South African Government and the elected Government of Namibia. But we should like to know the views of the Western Powers on this question. Do they regard Walvis Bay as an integral part of Namibia? A clear declaration in this regard is necessary.

106. The silence of the Western Powers on the question of the future of Walvis Bay and the hesitation to adopt a clear-cut attitude regarding the leading, and not secondary, role of the United Nations in the transitional period and in ensuring completely free and impartial elections leaves further room for negotiations.

107. In our view, the following elements should determine the conditions and steps which could ensure the immediate and genuine independence of Namibia through peaceful negotiations: first, termination of South Africa’s illegal occupation of Namibia and accession to complete independence by the end of this year; secondly, free and democratic elections under direct United Nations supervision and control on the basis of one man, one vote. This clearly implies rejection of any so-called internal settlement; thirdly, recognition of the territorial integrity of Namibia and of Walvis Bay as an integral part of Namibia. South African military bases in Walvis Bay should be withdrawn, since they constitute a threat to the territorial integrity and national security of Namibia; fourthly, stepped-up assistance to Namibians by the international community in the task of economic reconstruction in the post-independence phase. Full support should be given to the Nationhood Programme and all other projects and plans designed to prepare the people of Namibia in the skills and expertise needed to build a strong, stable and independent Namibia.

108. Both the General Assembly and the Security Council have to supplement and complement each other in promoting an early and effective solution to the problem. Time is running out. The United Nations must act and act quickly and purposefully. The United Nations cannot afford to fail. If it does, that will be a severe blow to the cause of freedom and human rights. It will be a severe set-back to the role of the United Nations in international affairs. It will have grave consequences on the tenuous fabric of peace in the region and in the world.

109. Freedom has been too long denied to Namibia. Let it not be delayed any longer. Let us work for bringing the day nearer when, like their fellow brethren elsewhere, the

people of Namibia may breathe the air of liberty and join, on the basis of equality and justice, in the collective endeavours of the human race to build a new world of its dreams.

110. Much has been said about Namibia over a whole decade. Year after year resolutions have been adopted and declarations made. Enough lip service has been paid to the principle of majority rule. We must now proceed from deliberations to decisive action. The time for a final step is here and now.

111. Mr. ABDEL MEGUID (Egypt) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The subject before us today—the question of Namibia—is indeed one of the problems which has confronted the United Nations for a long time now and for which it has assumed the responsibility. The United Nations has been dealing with this question since 1946, when the General Assembly adopted the decision [*resolution 65 (I)*] to place the Territory under the International Trusteeship System, and South Africa, refusing to comply with that decision, proceeded to annex the Territory and would not send the United Nations any information about its administration of the Territory.

112. Everyone knows what the United Nations position has been since that date. Everyone is familiar with the successive measures the United Nations has taken to affirm its responsibility for Namibia. We are all aware of the efforts made by the Organization to solve this question since the first resolution adopted by the General Assembly, in 1966 [*2145 (XXI)*], calling for the termination of South Africa’s mandate over Namibia. That resolution placed the Territory under the direct responsibility of the United Nations. The next year, during the fifth special session, the Assembly adopted a resolution [*2248 (S-V)*] establishing the United Nations Council for Namibia and giving it the task of administering the Territory and leading it to independence. That resolution was followed by others in which the Government of South Africa was called upon to withdraw from the Territory, to terminate its occupation and to grant the Namibian people the right to self-determination and genuine independence. The positive efforts of the United Nations in this field were crowned by Security Council resolution 385 (1976) and, subsequently, by resolution 418 (1977).

113. That is what the United Nations has done so far as the body responsible for the Territory of Namibia and the guarantor of its total and immediate independence.

114. What has been the reaction of the Government of South Africa to these successive resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council? There has been no reaction—unless one has in mind South Africa’s obstinacy and its pursuit of its illegal policy of occupation, colonialism and repression of the Namibian people. It has flouted all these resolutions, defying the will of the international community with an arrogance and stubbornness without precedent in history.

115. Now we are faced by the racist Vorster Government, which has recently been attempting to consolidate its military position as a prelude to large-scale military operations against the militants, the Namibian people and

SWAPO, with the aim of annihilating the national struggle—even at the risk of becoming involved in armed attacks and acts of aggression against the neighbouring independent African States. All this is done under the pretext of striking at gatherings of militants, and to apply the “right of hot pursuit”. In that way the Vorster Government intends to prepare the way for the implementation of its political plan—that is, to impose an internal arrangement under which some fictitious powers would be transferred to collaborators who agreed to play the Government’s game, and thereby to strengthen once and for all its control over and domination of the Territory. This time that would be done under the screen of a so-called acceptance of the representatives of the Namibian people. Thus the Vorster Government thinks that this would lead both the Namibians and the entire international community to believe that it had found a solution to the problem.

116. In fact, this evil plan is not new. The racist Vorster Government has been preparing it since the implementation of its bantustanization policy, which consists of parcelling out the country into small States that are easy to control, giving a veneer of independence to these bantustans. Thus they intend to avoid pressure by the international community and to ensure that their domination of the Territory will continue.

117. We should like here to warn Mr. Vorster very solemnly that the attempt to continue the policy of trying to impose an internal solution similar to the system established by his ally Smith in Rhodesia is unacceptable to the international community. We declare to him from this lofty rostrum that the efforts to undermine SWAPO and to deceive the United Nations and the United Nations Council for Namibia, which is legally responsible for the administration of the Territory, are doomed to failure and cannot lead to any real solution of the problem.

118. To anyone seeking the reasons behind the obstinacy of the Government of South Africa we would reply that that racist régime is striving to exploit the natural riches of that Territory, and what is involved are economic and strategic resources of major importance. The régime is particularly interested in the uranium of the Territory, a metal of which it is one of the biggest exporters in the world. Everyone is aware of the great importance of uranium throughout the world, and, from a strategic point of view, it adds a further dimension to the occupation of that territory. The intensive exploitation of those natural resources by the racist régime is solely for its own advantage and without regard for the interests of the people of Namibia and is tantamount to international plunder and banditry. It should be denounced as a crime against this victimized people. We must all assume our responsibilities with a view to terminating that exploitation, unprecedented in human history.

119. Vorster’s Government went too far in its policy of colonialism and aggression when in 1977 it proclaimed its domination over Walvis Bay, an area which, administratively speaking, it considers as part of the Cape Province. Thus it tried to change the map of Namibia by this manoeuvre, which has been condemned by the international community and on 7 September 1977 denounced by the United Nations Council for Namibia, since Walvis Bay

has always been an integral part of Namibia and it is not for South Africa to make any changes in that arrangement. That move constitutes a violation of the territorial integrity of Namibia, which has been recognized by United Nations resolutions, in particular Security Council resolution 385 (1976).

120. The facts are irrefutable. The Government of South Africa cannot persist in its policy of barbaric colonialism without the support of certain States and the assistance granted by certain allies of racist régimes of the same kind. We wish to underscore the seriousness of the continuing co-operation with the South African régime. The cause of colonialism and racism is doomed to failure, and these positions must be changed before it is too late.

121. In view of the acts of occupation, terrorism and repression against the Namibian people, an armed resistance movement has emerged to try to dissipate this nightmare of occupation and attain total independence. The people of Namibia has recognized SWAPO as its sole and authentic representative and the spearhead of its just struggle. That explains the support of the international community in this movement and its recognition of it as the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people. That also explains the hatred of the Government of South Africa for that organization, and the fact that it misses no opportunity to arrest, terrorize and kill members of SWAPO and those Namibians who support it.

122. The Namibian people has rejected the policy of the racist Government and its illegal occupation. We believe that we should support the intensified struggle of SWAPO to achieve total victory in the area. Similarly, we support the political and diplomatic efforts exerted by SWAPO for the realization of a genuine total independence of that Territory within the framework of United Nations resolutions, particularly Security Council resolution 385 (1976). There is no doubt that SWAPO’s efforts are striking proof of its good intentions in assisting the Namibian people to achieve a peaceful solution of the problem in so far as is possible; but it appears that the South African Government, with its well-known arrogance, has not shouldered its responsibility and has not responded to the sincere desire of SWAPO. That quite clearly shows that it is determined to pursue its illegal hegemony over Namibia, and lately it is using perverted means to achieve its ends by attempting to dupe public opinion by setting up a group of collaborators and granting them specious powers, so as to reflect a mere semblance of legitimacy upon its occupation of the Territory.

123. Egypt is deeply concerned and aware of its responsibilities. We accept them fully. My country has played a part both within and outside the African continent. This role is dictated by the principles to which we adhere. We have used all the influence which we enjoy in the Arab and African Group. Egypt will continue its support for the liberation movements in the African continent and assist them in all international forums and with all the means at its disposal—both material and moral—so that their struggle may be crowned with total victory and the complete independence of Africa may be achieved.

124. My country is a member of the United Nations Council for Namibia, and we support all the resolutions

adopted by that Council, in particular the Lusaka Declaration. We consider ourselves bound by these resolutions. Egypt has defined its position on that important issue as follows: first, we give absolute support to the struggle of the Namibian people to achieve self-determination and independence; secondly, we recognize SWAPO as the sole and authentic legal representative of the Namibian people; thirdly, Egypt supports all United Nations resolutions on Namibia as well as the resolutions of the OAU and the Maputo and Lusaka Declarations; fourthly, we denounce the Government of South Africa for its barbaric actions, its continued illegal occupation of Namibia and its flaunting of the various United Nations resolutions; fifthly, we condemn the Government of South Africa for its pillage of the natural resources of Namibia and demand the payment by it of due compensation to the people of Namibia on the day when Namibia achieves independence; sixthly, Walvis Bay is an integral part of Namibia and all South Africa's actions and attempts to annex it are null and void and constitute a threat to international peace and security; seventhly, Egypt does not recognize any negotiations conducted without the participation of SWAPO and rejects any solution which is not accepted by that movement; eighthly, Egypt condemns any State which collaborates with or provides any assistance in the military or economic fields to South Africa and requests those States to end such assistance immediately; ninthly, Egypt supports all sanctions against South Africa pursuant to Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter with a view to extending the embargo to economic aspects as well; tenthly, Egypt supports the peaceful efforts undertaken to resolve this question in a just manner on the basis of majority government and the right of the Namibian people to self-determination and total independence.

125. Egypt, which supports the armed struggle for the attainment of Namibia's independence, supports also all peaceful efforts which are aimed at achieving the same result. We are not in favour of bloodshed, but we shall always favour armed struggle so long as peaceful efforts remain fruitless, as they have been in previous phases.

126. Indeed, Mr. Vorster has been given many opportunities by United Nations resolutions and, particularly, by Security Council resolution 385 (1976). He has not responded to them. The five Western States members of the Security Council have given him a last chance. In response, he has merely hardened his position, and resolution 418 (1977) on the imposition of a military embargo against the Government of South Africa is striking proof of the common conviction of the futility of giving that régime more chances still, and of the need to have resort to Article 41 of the Charter and at the same time to afford increased support and assistance to the militant leaders of the Namibian people.

127. More recently we have witnessed new attempts to reach a peaceful solution. Once again, we affirm here that we are in favour of any sincere and impartial effort whose goal is the attainment by the Namibian people of self-determination and independence. But we must be on guard against the attempts by Vorster to try to turn those peaceful efforts to his own advantage by establishing in Namibia a régime run by his collaborators. Egypt and the African States will not tolerate his deceptive manoeuvres.

128. The present stage of the question of Namibia is critical and decisive. It has now reached a point where its elements may be summarized as follows: a people dispossessed of all authority over its territory, so that the only thing that remains for it is sacrifice and struggle; an occupation by a racist government which brutalizes the true nationals; attempts and efforts and resolutions that remain a dead letter and that call for implementation; and a special session of the General Assembly to deal with this matter.

129. History and the world look to us and are watching to see how we conclude our work and what contribution we make to solving this question. The delegation of my country urges that our resolutions and recommendations be decisive and forceful and respond to the requirements of the present situation.

130. Mr. JANKOWITSCH (Austria): Mr. President, my delegation shares with all those present here the immense pleasure of having before it another term of service under your wise and experienced leadership. Furthermore, if I offer you the sincere wishes of the delegation of Austria upon your successive re-election as, first, President of the eighth special session and now as President of the ninth special session of the General Assembly, it is out of a long and pleasant experience of common endeavour which has left me and my delegation with the firm conviction that the rare combination of personal commitment, political acumen and tact that you bring to your high office could not be a better augury for the success of our work in the coming days.

131. The Assembly over the past two days has debated a subject which has become one of the major concerns of this Organization. This fact is illustrated by the circumstance that once again a special session of the General Assembly itself has been called upon to deal with the question of Namibia, and is underlined also by the high quality and the profound nature of the contributions we have heard so far, as well as by the fact that many delegations here are represented on the ministerial level.

132. The history of the involvement of the United Nations with Namibia and its people stretches over most of the past 20 years. But the first dramatic turn in this history was the resolution of the General Assembly at its twenty-first session adopted some 12 years ago [*resolution 2145 (XXI)*] to terminate forthwith South Africa's mandate over South West Africa–Namibia–and to declare Namibia henceforth to be under the direct responsibility of the United Nations.

133. From 21 April to 13 June 1967, exactly 11 years ago, the Namibian question was debated at the fifth special session of the General Assembly and a resolution was adopted to the effect that, the United Nations having assumed direct responsibility for the Territory, it had thereupon become incumbent upon the Organization to discharge its obligations by taking practical steps for the transfer of power to the people of South West Africa–Namibia [*resolution 2248 (S-V)*]. With these objectives in mind, the United Nations Council for Namibia was founded and the office of a United Nations Commissioner for Namibia was created.

134. The Security Council convened many times to further the attainment of the goal set in those resolutions

of the General Assembly. On 20 March 1969 it adopted a resolution [264 (1969)] calling for the immediate withdrawal of South Africa from Namibia. On 12 August 1969 South Africa was condemned [resolution 269 (1969)] for its "persistent defiance" of the United Nations. A year later, on 29 July 1970, the Council in a resolution [283 (1970)] called on all States to refrain from any relations with South Africa implying recognition of its illegal occupation of Namibia. On 4 February 1972, during the first historic meetings of the Security Council on African soil, in Addis Ababa, further resolutions were adopted. In resolution 309 (1972) the Secretary-General was directed to initiate contact with all the parties concerned

"... so as to enable the people of Namibia, freely and with strict regard to the principle of human equality, to exercise their right to self-determination and independence ..."

The Government of South Africa was called upon in that same resolution to co-operate fully with the Secretary-General in the implementation of the resolution.

135. The general requirements for a peaceful solution in Namibia were illustrated once again in a most comprehensive and constructive manner in Security Council resolution 385 (1976). In paragraph 7 of the resolution it is said, among other things, that:

"... in order that the people of Namibia may be enabled freely to determine their own future, it is imperative that free elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations be held for the whole of Namibia as one political entity."

In the same resolution the Council demanded a solemn declaration by South Africa accepting the provision concerning the holding of free elections and defined more clearly the steps necessary to ensure the transfer of power to the people of Namibia and guarantee their human rights.

136. Many more declarations and resolutions of this nature could be quoted here, resolutions and declarations of this Organization designed to give freedom, independence and non-discrimination to the people of Namibia, but let me just mention one of the most important ones adopted recently—the Declaration on the Liberation of Namibia adopted at the Maputo Conference in May 1977.<sup>5</sup> In that Declaration the Conference solemnly proclaimed its full support for the just struggle of the people of Namibia and paid a tribute to SWAPO for having assumed the role of leader and as the vanguard of those fighting for the freedom of the Namibian people. Finally, the Lusaka Declaration adopted in March 1978 summed up once again the principal aims and objectives of the United Nations in regard to Namibia.

137. For all those who believe in the rule of law and the right of peoples to self-determination it has come as a bitter disappointment again and again that despite the massive concern of the international community expressed so forcefully over such a great number of years Namibia still remains at the centre of one of the most dangerous crises in southern Africa. It comes as a bitter disappointment most

of all, however, that the suffering of the people of Namibia, which began long before that people's voice was first heard in the halls of the League of Nations and later the United Nations, has still not come to an end; that men, women and children must die and that violence, including political assassination, is not absent from the daily calendar of events in Namibia. The fact that Namibia still has not gained its independence is even more difficult to understand now that there is such a broad international consensus on self-determination and independence for Namibia.

138. The United Nations and its Secretary-General have not ceased to increase their commitment to a free, independent, united and multiracial Namibia able to take a place of honour in the international community, and a broad range of institutions have been created to prepare for Namibia's independence. Let me pay a tribute here to the untiring work of the United Nations Council for Namibia and the succession of brilliant Presidents, of whom Gwendoline Konie is the latest example, and all the more remarkable since she is the first woman to have occupied this position.

139. Great talent has been recruited by the United Nations for the office of United Nations Commissioner for Namibia, and we are particularly impressed by the enormous commitment and high dedication which the latest incumbent, Martti Ahtisaari of Finland, has brought to his mission.

140. It is impossible to speak about all these efforts for the freedom of Namibia without paying a special tribute to the sacrifices of Namibia's liberation movement, SWAPO, which has gained such a universally accepted role under the wise guidance of its leader, Sam Nujoma. We are deeply impressed by the statesmanlike qualities he has displayed, which have won him respect and admiration not only among the other African leaders but far beyond his continent. If anybody should ever have had the slightest doubt about the future course of an independent Namibia, the steadfast qualities of a man such as Sam Nujoma would have dispelled it a long time ago.

141. If all these efforts which I have enumerated briefly have so far failed, the main obstacles have not come from the people of Namibia; the main obstacles were not built up by the United Nations or by any of the African front-line States which have taken such a deep interest in the freedom of Namibia. The main obstacle has been and remains the unwillingness of South Africa to release its illegal hold on Namibia.

142. Therefore, after the failure of many previous efforts, after the adamant and seemingly inflexible attitude displayed by South Africa and its rulers throughout so many years, our hopes were raised again, and raised legitimately we believe, when the five Western members of the Security Council, in an effort to secure the implementation of Security Council resolution 385 (1976), proceeded over the past year with efforts to ensure a peaceful transition to a sovereign and independent Namibia. This plan presented formally to the Security Council on 10 April 1978<sup>6</sup> has

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, annex V, chap. II, sect. B.

<sup>6</sup> S/12636.

received even more attention as violence and bloodshed have increased dramatically over the past months in Namibia. The main elements of this plan, as we understand it, are designed to respond faithfully, we trust, to some of the major objectives which the United Nations has proclaimed for Namibia, including as a centre-piece the holding of free elections under the supervision of the United Nations, and the attribution to the United Nations of a central role in the transition to sovereignty and independence.

143. My Government, which has constantly condemned the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa, has no reason to doubt the honesty, goodwill and sincerity of the authors of that plan, which was voiced again this morning by the Foreign Minister of Canada. Indeed, a plan of such a nature providing for genuine self-determination by a united, undivided Namibia is a most timely step at a crucial stage when any further delay in reaching a solution might be utterly perilous, not merely for southern Africa but for peace and international security all over the world.

144. If South Africa now appears prepared to accept this plan, as the latest news suggests—and to our minds acceptance would mean not only compliance with the mechanics of the plan of transition to independence but also acceptance of the spirit underlying any such plan—a basis could be laid down for it to work together with the United Nations and SWAPO for the speedy attainment of independence. For its part, SWAPO will have to be satisfied that the plan as it now stands meets the basic objectives of the people of Namibia. We trust that in this task SWAPO will again show its noted flexibility and willingness to compromise.

145. Such a course of events would for the first time in many years allow optimism to replace pessimism, would allow hope to replace despair. For the first time in many years people of all races in Namibia could look to the future with some confidence. Those who have suffered much in the past could look to a future in freedom without oppression and discrimination. Those who were uncertain of the future could gain a new sense of security.

146. These days could, therefore, mark a turning-point in the history of Namibia. In these days the United Nations could see the end of a long effort to win freedom for a people for which it has assumed direct responsibility. These days could mark the true beginning of a new nation which all of us are keen to see one and undivided, from the Orange River to the shores of Walvis Bay and to the wide stretches of the Kalahari Desert, a nation all of us strongly desire to see represented here among us in the Assembly of the United Nations. And may the momentum created by this Assembly ensure that that day is not too far away.

147. In the days to come, in the weeks to come, in the months to come the United Nations will again be endowed with a great responsibility. My country is prepared to join in this effort and to provide to the United Nations such means as the situation may require.

148. Mr. CORRÊA DA COSTA (Brazil): This special session of the General Assembly is meeting at a crucial time for the future of Namibia and for the whole of southern Africa.

149. During 1977 the international community exerted a major effort to hasten a solution to the three main political problems of that region: the question of Namibia, the question of Rhodesia and the question of *apartheid*.

150. We met in Maputo in May 1977 at the International Conference in Support of the Peoples of Zimbabwe and Namibia. We met again in Lagos in August 1977 at the World Conference Against *Apartheid*. We dealt with these pressing problems once more during the thirty-second session of the General Assembly. During all this time the United Nations Council for Namibia has done the utmost to implement its programme of work and to discharge the responsibilities which were entrusted to it by the Security Council and the General Assembly of the United Nations. I believe we all commend the Council for its work under the able leadership of Ambassador Gwendoline Konie. We also praise the work of the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia, Ambassador Martti Ahtisaari.

151. Now we are gathered here in the hope and with the aim of finding the way to a solution of the problem of Namibia and thus of speeding up the solution of the other two major questions of southern Africa.

152. For a year talks have been held with the objective of implementing Security Council resolution 385 (1976). It is our understanding that those talks regard only the formal aspects of the mechanisms of the transition process and not the rights of the Namibian people.

153. That Namibia is to attain independence as a single territorial unit—and I repeat that: as a single territorial unit—through the freely exercised will of its people is certainly not a matter for negotiation. On the contrary, it is the fundamental premise of any negotiation based on good faith, honesty and frankness.

154. We have followed with interest the ongoing process of negotiation. Quite recently we were informed of the substance of the proposals for a settlement of the Namibia situation that were formulated by five members of the Security Council. I must say that we did not have enough time to study those proposals in depth or to engage in consultations to obtain clarification on some of their provisions. There are some points of principle in the plan that may give rise to doubts. For instance, the role of the United Nations Council for Namibia appears to have been minimized; in fact, the Council is not even mentioned explicitly in the proposals, which seems a paradox since it is the organ recognized by all of us as the legal Administering Authority for the Territory until its independence.

155. The substance of the proposals and the details of their implementation are fundamentally a matter for decision by the representatives of the Namibian people. Despite some reservations on matters of principle we would be prepared to support such a plan if it were to prove conducive to the attainment of a fair and just solution to the question of Namibia.

156. The problem of Namibia concerns first and foremost the people of Namibia, whose rights have been suppressed by the continued illegal South African occupation of the Territory. It is also of special concern to the African countries, particularly Namibia's neighbours, whose secu-

rity is endangered by the persistence of the present situation.

157. The solution of the Namibian problem is also of direct interest to the whole international community, which has undertaken to uphold and further the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations. For its part the delegation of Brazil wishes to reiterate and reaffirm the position it has taken over a number of years and more recently during the discussions on the question of Namibia at the thirty-second session of the General Assembly.

158. The delegations gathered here today have a clear commitment: to help to bring to an end the illegal occupation of Namibia and to ensure that the Namibian people may freely exercise their right to self-determination and independence. May I express the hope that at this special session of the General Assembly a concrete and positive step will be taken in that direction.

*The meeting rose at 5.50 p.m.*

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

NINTH SPECIAL SESSION

Official Records



**5th  
PLENARY MEETING**

Wednesday, 26 April 1978,  
at 11.05 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Address by Mr. Léon Mébiame, Prime Minister of the Gabonese Republic

Agenda item 7:  
Question of Namibia (*continued*)

*President: Mr. Lazar MOJSOV (Yugoslavia).*

*Address by Mr. Léon Mébiame, Prime Minister of the Gabonese Republic*

1. The PRESIDENT: This morning the Assembly will hear a statement by the Prime Minister of the Gabonese Republic. I have great pleasure in welcoming His Excellency Mr. Léon Mébiame and inviting him to come to the rostrum to address the General Assembly.
2. Mr. MEBIAME (Gabon) (*interpretation from French*): It is my honour, as Prime Minister of the Gabonese Government, to deliver to the Assembly the following message which His Excellency El Hadj Omar Bongo, President of the Gabonese Republic and spokesman for our continental community, sends on the occasion of this special session devoted to Namibia:
3. On 14 October last, during the thirty-second session [34th meeting], I spoke before the Assembly as current President of the Organization of African Unity (OAU). Today again I am speaking as the spokesman for the pan-African organization.
4. Hence I take the opportunity to renew to you, Mr. President, and to the Secretary-General my warmest congratulations on the remarkable work that was accomplished at the thirty-second session of the General Assembly. There can be no shadow of a doubt that the qualities which you demonstrated at the thirty-second session are a sure guarantee of the success of this ninth special session, since the Assembly has unanimously renewed its confidence in you.
5. I also offer my greetings and compliments to all the other officers of the Assembly, whose skill and seriousness of purpose constitute a supplementary guarantee of the success of our work.
6. I should also like to congratulate the United Nations Council for Namibia and its President on the useful and unremitting work that they have done and are still doing on behalf of that Territory, which has had to wait too long for justice and which has suffered and continues to suffer under the yoke of foreign domination.
7. I cannot begin this message without reminding members of the reasons why not only the leaders of the African States but also their peoples and all those who share with them a love for justice and dignity are angered by the constant outrages which are inflicted on them. As I already stated on 14 October from this same rostrum,  
  
"The primary reason for our frustration and our revulsion stems from the repeated setbacks of the United Nations and its inability to heal the wound in Africa's side and to remedy the ills and distress from which Africa is suffering.  
  
"The wound is the insult to the aspirations, the dignity and the freedom of too many of our brothers, to their inalienable right to be human beings, to their unchallengeable sovereignty over their own soil, their own country." [*Ibid.*, paras. 35-36.]
8. Those words spoken here six months ago retain their burning topicality because it is in application of resolution 32/9 of the General Assembly, adopted 4 November 1977, that we are meeting today to debate the free destiny of 1 million of the sons of Africa who aspire to live as free men in peace and dignity on the land of their ancestors.
9. For what are we dealing with unless it is a special aspect of a general problem which has confronted the United Nations for more than a decade, of a tragedy which pierces the heart of all Africans and wounds the spirit of all men of good will, just as it insults the honour of peoples who love the cause of justice and freedom. This justice and freedom for which man has always fought in all places and at all times must also triumph today throughout the African continent. For—and we can never repeat this often enough—it is unacceptable that peoples in their own country, and especially when they form the majority, should see their legitimate aspirations to dignity, freedom, justice and happiness trampled underfoot by minority governments which base their political, economic and military supremacy solely on the mere colour of their skin.
10. The United Nations, which was established to safeguard and protect those fundamental rights, which are freedom of conscience, freedom of expression, freedom to possess and dispose of goods, must spare no effort to ensure that justice is finally done to the black peoples of southern Africa.
11. It is now, and immediately, that we must not only define but above all implement concrete and realistic solutions, because the least delay, the least procrastination, will transform the just disaffection of the ever less silent majority into fury. The more we delay, the more we shall increase the risk of a conflagration which not only will



engulf our continent but, without doubt, will engender an international crisis that will be difficult to constrain. The world has had enough crises; people long for peace and they all want peace and agreement among men. That is why, systematically rejecting the policy of the worst possibility, the African peoples have resolutely committed themselves to aid their brothers in their fight to establish national power, including multiracial power, as the only factor and the only guarantee of peace in their countries.

12. The support of Gabon, like that of the OAU, for the liberation movements of southern Africa does not date from today, nor does the pursuit of a realistic policy, the keyword of which is the accession of blacks to public responsibility and the exercise of such political responsibility in harmonious collaboration with other inhabitants of different origins or races.

13. This solution, which is in keeping with good sense and justice, is the only one that can avoid a disaster, especially if the Western Powers agree to give their effective support. From this rostrum we launch a solemn appeal to them to heed the voice of wisdom and to bring their acts into line with their principles. It is thus in this global context of the freedom of the regions of our continent and with a view to the establishment of a just peace advantageous to all that we view the problem which is the subject under discussion and which concerns the accession of the Namibian people to independence.

14. The occupation of Namibia by its powerful neighbour has economic and strategic reasons which are evident and to which must be added reasons of security. Moreover, Namibia has become a true public company, whose wealth, according to United Nations experts, is being systematically exploited by a large number of transnational corporations. We can thus understand that, faced with that state of affairs and with the failure of the peace proposals made by the OAU in the Lusaka Manifesto, the Namibian people, disappointed and abandoned, decided to have recourse to armed struggle to recover its freedom. Since 1966, it has taken up arms under the leadership of its mass organization, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO).

15. In liaison with the other liberation forces in the region, SWAPO has engaged in a long struggle whose final goal is the elimination of colonialism and all racial discrimination from the African continent. Recognized by the OAU and by the United Nations, SWAPO has also obtained the declared support of many other non-white political groups.

16. For its part, the United Nations has not stood idly by. On the basis of resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960, the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples, the United Nations has proclaimed the right of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence. But, despite all the efforts made by the United Nations and its specialized agencies to preserve the international character of Namibia, it is quite clear that, deprived of the sincere and effective support of the major Powers, our Organization is not capable of assuming fully its historic responsibilities towards the Namibian people.

17. The General Assembly has affirmed that foreign economic, financial and other interests operating in colonial territories constitute a major obstacle to political independence as well as to the enjoyment of the natural resources of those Territories by the indigenous inhabitants [*resolution 2703 (XXV)*]. It has also stated that any administering Power, by depriving colonial peoples of the exercise of their rights or by subordinating them to foreign economic and financial interests, violates the obligations it has assumed under Chapters XI and XII of the Charter of the United Nations [*ibid.*].

18. It is clear that this analysis and these resolutions apply in particular to the case of Namibia. That is why the Pretoria authorities must accept urgently the establishment of a democratic régime in Namibia. The provisions leading to a splitting up of Namibia into "indigenous nations" and "homelands" established along tribal lines on unproductive terrain must be vigorously rejected.

19. My delegation thinks, as representative of the Gabonese people, that all the parties concerned must take part in the negotiations on the future of the country—all the political parties without exception, the representatives of the white and racially mixed minorities—because in our conception of politics and the value of human life we fight with the same aversion any *apartheid* and any "anti-racist racism".

20. General elections, preceded by security measures clearly defined and applied by the Security Council, must be organized under the surveillance of observers of the OAU and the United Nations, whose neutrality will be above reproach. In other words, we must guarantee security before and during the electoral period. These elections must be entirely free, based on universal suffrage, that is, the guarantee of the equality of all citizens, without distinction as to race, colour or religion.

21. This also implies that all political detainees shall be released, that the return of exiled Namibians shall be assured and that the independence of the country shall be conceived and accepted in a unitary form. It is on these bases that a true interim government can be established responding fully to the aspirations of the Namibian people as a whole and, hence, to the ideal of democracy. Such a government, of the kind familiar to the former French colonies thanks to the umbrella law, would better guarantee the political future of the country through the experience of conducting the affairs of State which the nationals of all races could acquire during this interim period.

22. While it refused to endorse by its official presence the Turnhalle constitutional conference, SWAPO nevertheless remains ready to meet the representatives of the Government of South Africa at any time and anywhere, provided certain conditions are fulfilled, conditions which, moreover, were for the most part solemnly reaffirmed by the OAU at its fourteenth summit meeting held at Libreville. But it is also more than ever necessary that the Western countries on the Security Council assume their responsibility to do everything possible to prevent a major world crisis and to increase the pressures necessary to bring all the parties concerned together.

23. It is necessary, in fact, that the essential solution be firmly imposed in the shortest possible time if we do not want to see the freedom fighters give way to despair, at the risk of allying themselves even with the devil in order at last to be free and masters of their own sovereignty. In our political world, which is torn by contradictory ideologies, we know perfectly well that the devil is always in the opposite camp. It is no doubt because of this terrifying possibility that the five Western Powers have initiated a plan for a peaceful settlement, which we welcome as a positive step which should be encouraged.

24. However, if we have noted with satisfaction that the Secretary-General was associated with those negotiations with a view to uniting at the same table the authentic representatives of the Namibian people, that is, the leaders of SWAPO, and the South African Government, we must state at this rostrum that we were astonished that the body which is representative of the whole of independent Africa and over which the President of the Republic of Gabon, in whose name I am speaking to you today, has the honour to preside this year was left out of a process so important and so fraught with consequences for our continent.

25. I should like to think that this special session on Namibia, during which many proposed solutions will be discussed, including that of the five Western Powers, which seems to us to constitute the minimum acceptable proposal without which, it must be understood, there can be nothing but a struggle to the death into which the whole of Africa is prepared to throw its total strength, will see the solemn dedication of the right of the OAU to participate in the discussion of all African problems without exception.

26. We cannot continue to leave in the balance on the one hand the lives of thousands of human beings, slaves in their own countries, and on the other the no doubt considerable material interests, the benefits of which can hardly be compared with the cost in suffering and humiliation. If we do so, we can only despair for ever of the human race.

27. Our presence among you gives ample proof of the fact that we retain our confidence in mankind, which can only flourish in peace and harmony among all men of all races.

28. The PRESIDENT: On behalf of the Assembly, I wish to thank the Prime Minister of the Gabonese Republic for the statement he has just made and for transmitting to the General Assembly the important message from the current Chairman of the Organization of African Unity, His Excellency El Hadj Omar Bongo, President of the Gabonese Republic.

#### AGENDA ITEM 7

##### Question of Namibia (*continued*)

29. Mr. PASTINEN (Finland): Mr. President, I should like to convey to you, on behalf of the Government of Finland, the expression of its sentiments of esteem and respect. For its part, the Finnish delegation is honoured to continue to work in the General Assembly under your experienced and efficient leadership during this special session also.

30. I should also like to extend our congratulations to Ambassador Konie of Zambia on her well-deserved election

to the chairmanship of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, the principal subsidiary organ of this special session.

31. A special session of the General Assembly is a rarely used instrument of the United Nations. As stipulated in the Charter, the General Assembly shall meet in such special sessions as occasion may require. The crucial stage in the pursuit of independence for Namibia evidently requires the use of this special instrument now. On the one hand, time is rapidly running out as regards possibilities of a peaceful negotiated settlement, which is the main goal of the United Nations in any dispute. On the other, should the efforts at a peaceful settlement fail, this would most likely lead to an internal settlement imposed by South Africa. This would be clearly unacceptable to the international community. In fact it would mean the perpetuation of the illegal occupation by South Africa and the *apartheid* system it entails. Further, it would mean increased bloodshed and violence and delay the attainment of genuine independence for Namibia, a goal to which we all are equally committed. In the view of the Government of Finland, the task of the ninth special session is to do whatever can be done to bring about the advent of an independent Namibia by peaceful means in accordance with United Nations decisions, particularly Security Council resolution 385 (1976).

32. Of the nine special sessions of the General Assembly two have been concerned with the question of Namibia. During its fifth special session held in 1967, subsequent to the termination of South Africa's mandate, the General Assembly, in resolution 2248 (S-V), established the United Nations Council for Namibia to administer the Territory until its independence. The Council and its current President, Ambassador Konie, are to be commended on their efforts to promote independence for Namibia and to assist the Namibian people. However, for reasons beyond its control, the Council has not been able to accomplish its main task. The intransigence of the illegal occupation régime has led to the continued deterioration of the situation inside Namibia. The Lusaka Declaration [*see A/S-9/4, para. 31*] approved by the Council at its special meeting a month ago in Lusaka contains a graphic description of the circumstances now prevailing in Namibia.

33. Special ties of friendship and solidarity between the Namibian and the Finnish peoples have prevailed for a long time. We have been and are supporting SWAPO morally and materially by extending humanitarian assistance, which includes education and training of SWAPO members in Finnish schools and universities. Contacts between my Government and SWAPO leaders have been frequent and fruitful. Namibia has also been designated, in anticipation of its independence, one of the major recipients of Finnish development assistance. We have contributed annually to the United Nations Fund which is assisting Namibians. It is natural, therefore, that the Government of Finland should for a long time have been involved in United Nations efforts to promote Namibian independence. In 1970 my country took the initiative which led to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice in 1971 on the illegality of the continuing occupation of Namibia by South Africa.

34. Later, Finland took initiatives which led to the establishment of the United Nations Fund for Namibia as well as the Institute for Namibia and, most recently, on the

Nationhood Programme for Namibia. That Programme was, we are glad to say, implemented by the Council at Lusaka, as it approved the Commissioner's report on the guidelines for the Programme. That means that the Programme has now entered the operational stage.

35. Since the termination in 1966 of South Africa's mandate to administer Namibia, this question has posed a unique challenge and test case for our Organization. Security Council resolution 385 (1976) reiterates the demand that South Africa take the necessary steps to effect the withdrawal of its illegal administration and the transfer of power to the people of Namibia with the assistance of the United Nations.

36. Security Council resolution 385 (1976) was adopted unanimously. On the basis of that resolution, those Powers which really have the means to put pressure on South Africa have undertaken serious efforts in order to implement the provisions of that resolution. Last year, the five Western Members of the Security Council entered into a series of discussions with SWAPO and the Government of South Africa with a view to achieving by peaceful means the termination of the illegal occupation of South Africa, free elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations and genuine independence for Namibia in accordance with that resolution. These efforts have now reached a juncture where the five Powers have circulated their proposal for the settlement of the question of Namibia as an official document of the Security Council.<sup>1</sup>

37. In these matters my country acts in close concert with the other Nordic countries. As early as last September, the Nordic Foreign Ministers expressed their joint support for the activities conducted with a view to achieving a peaceful settlement of the question of Namibia with the objective of that country's becoming independent in 1978 in conformity with Security Council resolution 385 (1976). Since then, the Nordic countries have closely followed the efforts to achieve a negotiated settlement and have been in frequent contact on this matter with the five Western Powers, the originators of the proposals, with SWAPO and with the African front-line States. Recently the Prime Minister of Finland made an official visit to two of those front-line countries, namely Zambia and the United Republic of Tanzania. During his visit he had most useful discussions with the Zambian and Tanzanian leaders and also with the leaders of SWAPO and other liberation movements in southern Africa.

38. The discussions initiated by the Five have dealt with a wide range of problems concerning the transfer of power to the Namibian people and the genuine independence of the country. It is our understanding that progress towards a settlement has been made. We hope that these discussions will lead to a peaceful settlement in conformity with Security Council resolution 385 (1976).

39. At their recent meeting in March, the Nordic Foreign Ministers reiterated their support for the efforts to find a peaceful and internationally acceptable solution in Namibia. It is the firm view of my Government that all the possibilities of finding a just and peaceful solution leading

to the independence of Namibia which a negotiating process may offer should be fully utilized. The proposals of the Five seem to offer a good basis for reaching a settlement in accordance with Security Council resolution 385 (1976). Indeed, for the time being we cannot see any other viable peaceful alternative to armed struggle, which would mean years of further bloodshed and suffering.

40. My delegation has recognized with appreciation and admiration the constructive attitude that SWAPO has assumed in the negotiating process. We also want to commend the African front-line and other States for the support they have given SWAPO in every way.

41. The Finnish delegation has noted that yesterday the Government of South Africa gave its reply to the proposals of the five Western members of the Security Council. Obviously, it is for the parties principally concerned to assess the contents and the significance of that reply.

42. While giving our support to the negotiated settlement, we are under no illusion concerning the attitude of South Africa, nor are we unaware of the situation prevailing in Namibia. Without going into the details of a possible negotiated settlement, we wish strongly to emphasize the importance of an adequate United Nations presence in Namibia during the transition period. Without a strong United Nations civilian and peace-keeping presence, a peaceful transition to majority rule and independence will not be possible.

43. In that context I should like to recall that in March, the Nordic Foreign Ministers reiterated the willingness of their Governments to make their services available within the United Nations framework so that a peaceful transition could be secured. This offer includes the political will and readiness of my Government to participate in a United Nations peace-keeping effort in Namibia, provided, of course, that the Security Council decides upon such an operation.

44. My delegation is fully aware that the main obstacle to a peaceful settlement in Namibia has been and still is the Government of South Africa. That Government has deprived the people of Namibia of all its basic human rights, political, economic, social and cultural. It has subjected Namibians to continued physical and spiritual brutality, suffering and humiliation under the *apartheid* system and the depletion of the rich natural resources of Namibia. For years, representatives of the genuine aspirations of the Namibian people—that is, SWAPO leaders and members—have been harassed, arbitrarily detained and killed by the illegal occupation régime.

45. As the Lusaka Declaration states, South Africa has embarked on a further military build-up in Namibia with the evident objective of consolidating the illegal position of the occupation régime and creating conditions for imposing a puppet régime in Namibia. South Africa has also proceeded with the fragmentation of Namibia into homelands similar to South African bantustans, and its policies have provoked ethnic confrontations and hostilities to consolidate that process. Moreover, South Africa continues to exploit the natural resources of Namibia to the detriment of the Namibian people. This has been properly

<sup>1</sup> See S/12636.

condemned by the United Nations Council for Namibia as well as the General Assembly. Furthermore, South Africa is undermining peace and stability in Africa through acts of aggression against independent African States. These acts stand condemned by the United Nations.

46. The world community must now do its utmost to assist the Namibian people and their liberation movement, SWAPO. The United Nations must fulfil its obligation to give the Namibians a peaceful alternative leading to the implementation of the decisions of this world Organization. The political pressure against South Africa must be unrelenting and it must be increased through measures taken with one accord by the international community. If it proved impossible to reach a negotiated settlement in conformity with its resolution 385 (1976), the Security Council would have to consider other appropriate measures to be taken under the Charter.

47. The Security Council took an important step towards increasing pressure on South Africa when it adopted resolution 418 (1977) on a mandatory arms embargo. The full implementation of that resolution is particularly important in connexion with the Namibian situation in view of the large South African military build-up there. In the view of my delegation, the arms embargo in order to be effective should also be more comprehensive.

48. Another possible measure which the Nordic Foreign Ministers have urged is a ban on new foreign investments in South Africa. In this connexion, may I recall that the Nordic Governments have already agreed on a joint action programme for widened economic and other measures against South Africa, and they have decided to continue those efforts to find further ways and means of increasing pressure against South Africa.

49. The question of Namibia has been a problem for the United Nations for more than 30 years. Namibia has been a special test case and challenge to the world Organization for almost 12 years. The fulfilment of our responsibility to the people of Namibia is long overdue and, truly, we are at the brink of failure. Constructive and meaningful decisions by the General Assembly at this session and by the Security Council are therefore needed immediately.

50. Mr. DARUSMAN (Indonesia): Mr. President, allow me to express my delegation's great pleasure at seeing you in the Chair at the ninth special session of the General Assembly. We are confident that under your wise and experienced guidance the session will be able to contribute substantially to the solution of the problem of Namibia. When we speak of a solution, we can only mean one thing: the termination of the illegal rule of South Africa over Namibia and the simultaneous achievement of national freedom and independence by the Namibian people within the established frontiers of the former trust Territory of South West Africa.

51. My delegation would also like to express its deep satisfaction at seeing Her Excellency Ambassador Konie elected Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee of the Whole, as it was under her able leadership as President of the United Nations Council for Namibia that the preparatory work for this special session was carried out in Lusaka last month

52. The United Nations, the people of Namibia and the world community as a whole are at present faced with the continuing intransigence of the Pretoria régime, which insists on perpetuating its illegal occupation and control of the Territory of Namibia. Despite the revocation of its Mandate over the Territory by the General Assembly in its resolution 2145 (XXI), despite the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice which affirmed the legality of the Assembly's action, and despite the repeated demands by the Security Council that South Africa end its illegal occupation of Namibia, the Pretoria régime has adamantly refused to withdraw from Namibia.

53. On the contrary, the South African régime has taken a number of steps designed to perpetuate its control over the Territory and has intensified its efforts to eradicate opposition to its illegal rule. Those steps have included efforts to promote a self-styled "internal settlement", the imprisonment, torture and execution of hundreds of Namibian men and women fighting against racism and colonialism, the encouragement of the unrestrained exploitation of Namibia's natural wealth by transnational corporations, the militarization of the Territory, and the forced evacuation of thousands of innocent civilians from their homes and land in a futile effort to repress the intensified fight of the Namibian people for self-determination and independence. The illegal régime has even brazenly invaded the territories of neighbouring States. It has announced the "annexation" of Walvis Bay, Namibia's only developed seaport and single harbour suitable for large ships. In addition, South Africa had exploited the vast uranium deposits in the Territory to launch its own nuclear weapon development programme—an action with grave implications for the future. The international community has rightly denounced those measures both as the illegal acts of an illegitimate régime and as threats to international peace and security.

54. Various efforts have been made to promote a peaceful solution to the problem of Namibia through South Africa's withdrawal and a swift transition to majority rule. The Secretary-General has urged the Pretoria régime to negotiate in good faith in order to break the impasse over Namibia—an impasse attributable solely to the intransigent attitude of the illegal régime. In addition, the five Western Powers members of the Security Council have attempted to negotiate a settlement in accordance with resolution 385 (1976) which provides, *inter alia*, for free elections under United Nations supervision.

55. Until recently, South Africa has continually rejected those and other initiatives, indicating its determination to proceed with its plan for a so-called internal settlement. The President of SWAPO has stated that, while his organization longs for peace, it will never seek to obtain it to the detriment of the interests of the oppressed people of Namibia. The people of Namibia, through their sole and authentic representative, SWAPO, and the international community have rightly rejected that attempt by South Africa to impose a sham settlement on the Territory. Both have insisted that a genuine settlement must place full power in the hands of the majority, so that the people of Namibia will be able to take control of their own destiny.

56. In the meantime, the political and diplomatic efforts of SWAPO to achieve a settlement of the problem are

particularly to be commended. SWAPO has demonstrated its willingness to enter into negotiations for the achievement of genuine independence for Namibia. It has displayed great flexibility in making far-reaching and substantive concessions to facilitate such a solution. My delegation hopes that South Africa will be able to display similar evidence of good faith in response to those efforts.

57. My delegation is of the opinion that at the current special session the Assembly can make an important contribution to the liberation of Namibia by adopting measures for the implementation of the objectives spelt out in the Lusaka Declaration. This session will also serve the valuable purpose of spotlighting South Africa's misleading and evasive tactics with regard to the question and of rallying international support for the struggle of the Namibian people. Moreover, SWAPO has been intensifying its struggle against the illegal occupying régime. Properly concerted, these efforts can reinforce one another and significantly contribute to the termination of the rule of the Pretoria régime in Namibia.

58. The Indonesian delegation once again calls upon the illegal occupying régime to withdraw forthwith from the Territory in consonance with the expressed will of the international community, thus permitting the Namibian people to exercise their sacred right of self-determination, and thereby preventing further suffering and bloodshed. In order to resolve the Namibian question, it is clear that the Pretoria régime must accept a settlement based on the provisions of Security Council resolution 385 (1976) and the other relevant United Nations resolutions. The international community will never accept a sham solution of the type represented by the Turnhalle meeting.

59. As a member of the United Nations Council for Namibia since its inception, Indonesia strongly reaffirms its support for the authority of the United Nations over Namibia and for the struggle of the Namibian people for freedom and independence. My delegation would also like to take this opportunity to affirm its full support for the principle of the territorial integrity of Namibia, of which the area of Walvis Bay forms an integral part. It is impossible to imagine an independent Namibia from which Walvis Bay has been amputated.

60. It also seems, in the opinion of my delegation, that the United Nations Council for Namibia can usefully play a broader and more positive role in any effort to promote the attainment of independence and majority rule by Namibians. As the legal Administering Authority, it deserves the full support of the members of the international community for such an enhanced role. In this context, the role and authority of that Council must be recognized in any efforts being made to solve the problem of Namibia.

61. At this crucial juncture in the struggle of the Namibian people for self-determination and independence, my delegation believes that the international community must reject all efforts by the Pretoria régime to mislead world public opinion, and that the members of the international community must cease any form of co-operation with the illegal occupying régime in Namibia. Besides the efforts made by the Namibian people on their own behalf under the valiant leadership of SWAPO—efforts which are, of course, funda-

mental and decisive to the success of their struggle—redoubled efforts on the part of the United Nations and its Members will play a significant role in assisting the Namibians to attain their sacred goal. For this reason it would seem essential for the Members of the international community to spare no effort to implement and enforce existing programmes and legislation designed to secure South African withdrawal. In particular, the Council should seek to persuade Member States to enforce the provisions of Decree No. 1 which it promulgated<sup>2</sup> in order to curb the unconscionable exploitation of Namibia's natural resources. In addition, vigorous efforts should be made to implement the provisions of the Maputo Declaration and Programme of Action<sup>3</sup> as they relate to Namibia, and of General Assembly resolution 32/9.

62. The continuing intransigence of the South African régime also requires, as urged by the Lusaka Declaration, that the Security Council seriously consider the imposition of even stronger measures, as stipulated in Chapter VII of the Charter, to force the illegal occupying régime to fulfil its international obligations. Such measures would be fully supported by my delegation. In addition, the Members of the United Nations should give their full support to the Nationhood Programme for Namibia contained in resolution 31/153, which will help to prepare the people of Namibia for Independence. In this connexion, the assistance of the United Nations specialized agencies is of great importance, and my delegation hopes that they will both continue and increase the aid they have already rendered to the Territory.

63. It is also to be hoped that all specialized agencies and other members of the United Nations system will abide by the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council and refuse to permit South Africa to act as the representative of Namibia in their deliberations. This role should be reserved for the United Nations Council for Namibia, as the legally constituted Administering Authority of the Territory.

64. My delegation has always been hopeful that a peaceful solution to the problem of Namibia could be formulated in order to spare the oppressed people increased suffering and bloodshed. My delegation has listened carefully to the statement by the Secretary of State for External Affairs of Canada [*3rd meeting*] concerning the latest developments regarding the proposals of the five Western members of the Security Council for a peaceful settlement of the question. It is the hope of my delegation that the Five may be able to exercise their influence on South Africa and that their efforts will lead to the complete withdrawal of South Africa from Namibia and the attainment of genuine independence by the Namibian people within the shortest possible time.

65. In short, Indonesia favours any initiative which seeks to promote a settlement of the Namibian question. Any such settlement must however, conform to the provisions

<sup>2</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-ninth Session, Supplement No. 24A*, para. 84.

<sup>3</sup> A/32/109/Rev.1-S/12344/Rev.1, annex V. For the printed text, see *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-second Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1977*.

of Security Council resolution 385 (1976). In addition, in the view of my delegation, it must be acceptable to SWAPO, as the representative of the Namibian people, and must recognize the role and authority of the United Nations Council for Namibia.

66. While my delegation continues to hope that a peaceful solution may be arrived at in the near future, under the circumstances we believe that full support should be given to those who have been forced to take the path of armed struggle when confronted by South Africa's obdurate attitude.

67. My delegation is convinced that the strength of will demonstrated by the international community with regard to Namibia may well have a determining effect on the future course of events in southern Africa. In this light, we feel that concerted international action will help to compel the South African withdrawal from the Territory and thus help to secure for the Namibian people the exercise of their right to self-determination and independence. In this connexion, my delegation would like to renew the pledge of the Government and people of Indonesia to co-operate fully with the United Nations in whatever efforts may be considered necessary to attain that goal.

68. In conclusion, my delegation would like to reaffirm its commitment to support the fight of the Namibian people for national freedom and independence under the leadership of SWAPO. My delegation wishes to assure this Assembly of its full co-operation in the efforts to find a programme of action to help bring the presence of the illegal South African régime in Namibia to an end and to assist the Namibian people to secure their freedom and independence.

69. Mr. TSVETKOV (Bulgaria) (*interpretation from French*): First of all, Sir, I should like to congratulate you warmly on your unanimous election to the presidency of the ninth special session of the General Assembly and to offer you my delegation's wishes for success in the discharge of your important duties. We are confident that the work of this session will benefit greatly from your qualities as an outstanding diplomat of your country and from your rich experience within the United Nations.

70. The Bulgarian delegation attaches great importance to the ninth special session of the General Assembly, which is called upon to take vital decisions, the immediate implementation of which will enable the Namibian people to exercise its legitimate right to self-determination and to a free existence as an independent State, in full conformity with the Charter and the historic Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. We are ready to join fully and actively in the efforts of other delegations present here which are taking the side of the valiant Namibian people in order to ensure the triumph of its just cause.

71. The question of Namibia has repeatedly been the subject of lengthy debates. Many important decisions have been taken concerning it. I am referring here to resolution 2248 (S-V) adopted at the special session on Namibia held in 1967 that led, *inter alia*, to the establishment of the United Nations Council for Namibia, which was to exercise

the functions of the legal Administering Authority of the Territory until the granting of independence, to Security Council resolution 385 (1976) and to many other decisions. Having taken those decisions, the United Nations reaffirmed categorically and unequivocally the fact that it had direct and special responsibility for the fate of Namibia.

72. The years that have passed have fully confirmed the wisdom of those decisions. However, the changes that have taken place in the world in the last decade have stressed the need for new and more decisive measures to be taken with a view to the final elimination of the last bastions of colonialism in Africa.

73. The present session is taking place in rather complicated circumstances. In recent years, following the efforts of countries and peoples that love peace, tangible successes have been recorded in the field of détente and in the reconstruction of the entire system of international relations on progressive and democratic principles. It is encouraging to note that at the international level real and objective conditions exist to make it possible to transform 1978 into a year of decisive international action against the colonialist and racist régimes in southern Africa in order to eliminate, once and for all, the last vestiges of the hateful colonial system of oppression and exploitation.

74. Internally, one of the outstanding features of the situation in Namibia at present is the extraordinary intensification of the political, diplomatic and armed struggle of the Namibian people to liberate their country from fascist and racist tyranny.

75. Moreover, we are witnessing unprecedented feverish activity on the part of the racist régime of South Africa and of certain well-defined Western circles with a view to finding their own solution to the problem. It really is not difficult to unmask the essence of such a solution: it is to stifle the flame of the liberation struggle and to sow among the ranks of the freedom fighters the illusion that it is possible to obtain independence without a struggle. All this is being done with a view to preventing the immediate and true independence of a unified Namibia and to perpetuating the domination and exploitation of the Namibian people in another form. In that respect, we should draw attention to the speedy strengthening of the already enormous machine of war and oppression upon which South Africa has embarked in Namibia. The goals of this intensive militarization can hardly be concealed: they are to consolidate the position of the régime of occupation, to undermine the peace and stability of the region, especially in the neighbouring countries, the People's Republic of Angola and the Republic of Zambia, and to intensify the terror against the Namibian people. In fact, the brutal repression and the acts of intimidation and harassment against the Namibian people, and especially against the officers and fighters of SWAPO, are multiplying at an accelerated rate. Those acts have been described at length by the President of SWAPO, Sam Nujoma [*1st meeting*]. The Bulgarian delegation takes this opportunity to express to SWAPO our unswerving solidarity with the heroic struggle waged by the Namibian liberation movement.

76. At the same time, the Pretoria régime has tried to aggravate the ethnic conflicts and hostilities in order to

create conditions favourable for imposing a puppet régime and preventing the transfer of power to SWAPO. It is not necessary to be a prophet to predict that in the long run those treacherous manoeuvres are doomed to fail. They are capable of prolonging the misfortunes and suffering of the Namibian people and of delaying its independence, but they cannot restrain the will of the Namibian people to win freedom and independence.

77. The Bulgarian delegation fully and unreservedly shares the point of view that any solution along the lines of the South African prescription or the Southern Rhodesian model that does not take into account the true interests of the Namibian people and of its sole authentic representative, SWAPO, must be condemned and rejected by the international community. The racist régime's policy of brutal oppression underlines the fact that South Africa has no intention of respecting the resolutions of the General Assembly and of the Security Council or of putting an end to its unlawful occupation of Namibia.

78. The racist régime of South Africa would have great difficulty in pursuing its policy of oppression and domination without the moral, diplomatic, economic, financial and military aid that certain Western countries continue to give it. Fortified by this support, the Pretoria régime has been able to build its enormous military-industrial complex and to proceed to its further expansion. That complex is already capable not only of satisfying the needs of South African militarism with all that is necessary for it to carry out its role as watchman of the peoples of Africa and occupier of Namibia, but also of giving moral, economic and military support to the illegal régime of Ian Smith, which was long ago rejected by the international community. Buttressed by the support of those same Western countries, South Africa has been able to make preparations for the production of nuclear weapons. There is hardly any reason to doubt that that will lead to the further aggravation of the situation in Africa, to an increase in the immediate danger to peace and security in the world.

79. South Africa continues to receive enormous aid from foreign monopolies which are operating not only in its territory but also in Namibia. South African and foreign monopolies continue, in flagrant violation of the relevant decisions of the United Nations, to exploit the natural and human resources of Namibia and to amass astronomical profits. The dimensions of the financial aid given to the racist régime can be eloquently illustrated by the following fact: in 1976 South Africa received, through the International Monetary Fund, a loan amounting to \$366 million, a loan that in 1977 was increased to \$464 million. This figure exceeds the total that all other African countries together had received from the Fund during the two years in question. Of the \$464 million allocated to South Africa, \$107 million came from United States contributions to the International Monetary Fund.

80. These facts are contained in the special report of the Center for International Policy based in Washington.

81. The financial, economic, military and strategic interests of the South African and foreign monopolies, as well as those of certain Western countries, serve to buttress the ambitions and claims of South Africa to annex Walvis Bay.

82. The Bulgarian delegation fully shares the views on this subject expressed in the Lusaka Declaration—that is, that Walvis Bay is an inviolable and non-negotiable part of Namibia and cannot be subject to any kind of bargaining.

83. The South African colonizers and their patrons are unwilling to hand Namibia over to the Namibians. They propose to solve the Namibian problem by a subterfuge, to the detriment of the fundamental interests of the Namibian people. They are thus trying to involve the United Nations, as an intermediary, in carrying out the plans of certain Western Powers.

84. The People's Republic of Bulgaria is firmly convinced that the most direct means for a peaceful settlement of the Namibian question is the strict and unconditional implementation of the relevant resolutions and decisions of the General Assembly and Security Council, in particular, Security Council resolution 385 (1976).

85. In this connexion it is of major importance to ensure that the sanctions against the South African racist régime should be applied strictly and consistently by all the Members of the United Nations. It is urgent that all States, without exception, should break off their contacts with South Africa as soon as possible, and, above all, end their economic and military co-operation with it. It is essential to adopt speedy and effective measures to cut short the recruitment of mercenaries for the regiments of South Africa's army of occupation.

86. The *sine qua non* condition for solving the Namibian problem in full conformity with the aspirations and hopes of the Namibian people is to guarantee the transfer of all powers in Namibia as quickly as possible to the patriotic forces of the country, whose spearhead is SWAPO, recognized by the United Nations as the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people. There can be no doubt that without the participation of SWAPO there cannot be any free and complete exercise by the Namibian people of their right to self-determination and independence; there can be no free, inviolable and independent Namibia.

87. In those circumstances it is extremely urgent that the United Nations should discharge its special responsibility and that all the true allies of the Namibian people's liberation struggle should increase their support for the national liberation movement in Namibia, with a view to creating the kind of international climate that can ensure the speediest possible end to South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia. A just and complete settlement of the question of Namibia is possible only through an immediate, total and unconditional withdrawal of all South African armed forces and police and the entire South African administration from Namibian soil.

88. In order that that may be done as quickly as possible and that South Africa may be compelled to withdraw from the Territory, it is essential that during the current ninth special session, the General Assembly should approve further measures not only to extend the economic sanctions but also to impose other measures in conformity with Chapter VII of the Charter. The United Nations has a duty also to discharge its responsibilities with regard to the Namibian people by defining the conditions and measures

that can ensure Namibia's true and immediate independence, by giving Namibia increased moral and material assistance in the political, diplomatic and armed struggle that the Namibian people are waging.

89. It is in that way that the United Nations can contribute to the attainment of the ideals of freedom, national self-determination and independence in full conformity with the fundamental principles stated in the Charter and in the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

90. As a member 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, the People's Republic of Bulgaria is taking an active part in the struggle against colonialism, neo-colonialism, racism and *apartheid*. Bulgaria gives its full support to the people of Namibia and to SWAPO.

91. In March this year, Todor Zhivkov, First Secretary of the Communist Party of Bulgaria and President of the Council of State of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, stated:

"Adhering to the principles of proletarian internationalism, friendship and co-operation, and as a socialist State, we are giving and shall continue to give our assistance to other peoples that turn to us for help in overcoming their underdevelopment and rejecting their degrading dependence on imperialism".

92. Guided by those principles, the Bulgarian delegation gives its full support to the draft political declaration and programme of action that the present session is to adopt.

93. Mr. VON WECHMAR (Federal Republic of Germany): Mr. President, I should like first to express our satisfaction at seeing you at the helm of this special session. My delegation is convinced that under your skilled and experienced leadership the Assembly will conclude its work successfully. We are particularly happy to see in the Chair a President who is not only a former colleague of many representatives in this hall but also a distinguished representative of a country with which we maintain most cordial and close relations, a country which has been very active in the United Nations Council for Namibia.

94. Namibia, a country of vast geographical dimensions, endowed with an abundance of mineral resources and enjoying a moderate climate in large parts of its territory, has a population of fewer than 900,000 inhabitants. One would assume this to be a perfect setting for people to live together peacefully in secure economic conditions and in a society freely exercising its right of self-determination without racial discrimination.

95. Yet the harsh facts look very different indeed. In reality, none of these anxiously desired conditions exist today. A tense atmosphere prevails in Namibia which may precipitate new outbreaks of violence every day. Despite the recent abolition of a few discriminatory laws, there is still no end to the gross discrimination against the great majority of the population. This overwhelming majority continues to live in a state of colonial dependency, with

only a minimum of political rights. Responsibility for that situation lies with South Africa, which has refused until recently to abandon its illegal rule over Namibia and to allow the country to develop peacefully as an independent State.

96. From its inception the United Nations has rightly made strenuous efforts to solve this problem. A continuous and untiring battle has been fought to secure for the people of Namibia their legitimate rights under the Charter. The Federal Republic of Germany pays a tribute to all those in the United Nations who took the lead in this struggle. We acknowledge with gratitude the great achievements of the United Nations Council for Namibia and of the Special Committee in their endeavour to promote a peaceful and democratic solution for Namibia. We have always appreciated the significant role played by the Fourth Committee and the plenary General Assembly in alerting the international public to the growing urgency of a settlement of this problem. The explosive atmosphere in Namibia now calls for immediate decisions. Such circumstances demand powerful action by the United Nations. We therefore welcome the convening of a special session of the General Assembly and we emphasize our readiness for constructive co-operation in its work.

97. In our view, the objective of this special session must be to mobilize all available forces in support of the immediate attainment of an internationally acceptable solution. As early as January 1976 the United Nations laid down the principles for such a solution in Security Council resolution 385 (1976), which was unanimously adopted.

98. Over the past year Canada, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, the United Kingdom and the United States, members of the Security Council, have undertaken a joint initiative to evolve a settlement proposal. This proposal was presented to the members of the Security Council on 10 April 1978 and explained to the Assembly yesterday [3rd meeting] by the Secretary of State for External Affairs of Canada on behalf of the Five. Consistent with the terms of resolution 385 (1976), it provides for South African withdrawal from Namibia and for free elections under United Nations supervision and control.

99. The Five have spared no effort in trying to narrow the differences separating the principal parties—South Africa and SWAPO. In this endeavour they have consistently borne in mind the legitimate interests of other African Governments and other parties in participating in this search for a compromise. Throughout, the Five have been in close touch with the Governments of the front-line States and with the African members of the Security Council. In evolving their proposal for a settlement, they have carefully taken into account both the concerns of the parties directly involved and the views of those Governments.

100. Following the proximity talks in New York last February, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Federal Republic of Germany stated in this context:

"It is of great significance that the five Western Foreign Ministers have met not only with the parties directly involved but also with quite a number of their African



counterparts in the endeavour to find a solution to one of the most difficult problems of the post-colonial era. The talks have shown that all sides are resolved to make this proposal for a peaceful settlement succeed.”

101. On the motivation of the Federal Republic in undertaking this exercise, our Foreign Minister stated on the same occasion:

“As a member of the group of the five Western representatives of the Security Council, the Federal Government has done everything in its power for the past year to help bring about a transition to independence in such a way that security and order are guaranteed and that all groups will be able to participate in the decision on the future. What we are concerned with is an internationally recognized, peaceful settlement. The Federal Government will not slacken its efforts towards this end.”

102. In the light of these explorations and consultations of the past 12 months, the Federal Government is convinced that the proposal, as it has now been presented, constitutes a reasonable and realistic basis for a settlement. It meets in a fair and balanced way the demands of all the parties concerned and also fulfils the requirements established by the United Nations.

103. The proposal must be seen as a balanced package, the individual parts of which should neither be changed nor burdened with new conditions, so as not to jeopardize the feasibility of the settlement as a whole. It is a genuine compromise which, naturally, none of the principal parties will consider ideal, but it does represent the best possible harmonization of the interests of all concerned, evolved by the Five in painstaking, detailed work, marked by the overriding concern for a peaceful development in southern Africa. The Federal Government requests all participants in the special session of the General Assembly to understand and to recognize the need for this nature of compromise of the proposal and to join in its appeal to the parties concerned to accept the proposal as a whole, as it stands now.

104. Without underestimating the remaining difficulties, my Government is convinced that the settlement proposal is both acceptable and workable if reason and good sense prevail.

105. The friendly advice and open support with which our initiative has met throughout the past year from the African Governments most directly concerned have been a further encouragement to us. The same applies to the favourable comments from representatives during this special session of the General Assembly. I should particularly like to refer to the support already expressed in this forum by African States and by members of the United Nations Council for Namibia. We also regard as encouraging the favourable response which the proposal has had from political groups and, in particular, from the churches in Namibia itself.

106. On 7 April 1978 the leaders of the three most important church organizations in the country comprising

more than half of its black population made the following public announcement:

“We call upon all to accept the ‘Proposal for a settlement of the Namibian situation’ of 13 March 1978. We believe that this proposal is a basis upon which can be founded the long-awaited united and free country of Namibia. We would be failing in our duty and concern if we were not to warn of the possible terrible consequences of hesitating at this eleventh hour.”

107. As the Secretary of State for External Affairs of Canada already said in his statement of 24 April on behalf of the five Western members of the Security Council, the Five welcome the important development in the position of one of the main parties concerned.

108. Understandably, a number of questions have been raised in the debate and in the wake of the comments made in the South African Parliament on 24 April—yesterday. I should like to state the following in the name of the Five: Our proposals are comprehensively, clearly and firmly on the public record. We have made no separate or private arrangements with any of the parties.

109. Concerning the question of the withdrawal of the South African troops from Namibia, the Five, on 24 April, informed one of the parties that they did not intend to change their proposal. They repeated a statement which they had already made to all parties in identical terms, in which they acknowledged that the proposed constituent assembly might express its opinion on the question of South African forces. They added that the five Governments would take such views carefully into account and would expect others to do the same, but only on the strict understanding that this would not result in any action which would imperil the attainment of independence in the manner envisaged in the proposal. They also observed that they did not believe that it would be to anyone’s advantage to have the constituent assembly concern itself with matters other than the drafting of the constitution.

110. Another question that has arisen concerns the relationship between the United Nations special representative and the administrator-general, posts that we recommend be established. It is the view of the Five that this relationship will clearly be of crucial importance. They are anxious to avoid resurrecting the legal disputes over Namibia. We see the special representative as having two main roles. He will be the watchdog of the international community, and the guarantor that the provisions of the agreement will be respected by South Africa and by all parties.

111. The special representative will have to satisfy himself at each stage as to the fairness and appropriateness of all measures affecting the political process at all levels of the administration before such measures take effect. We hope that he will build up a working relationship with the administrator-general, so that, as far as possible, disputes between the two officials can be settled informally and amicably. While the Security Council must remain vigilant to ensure that the agreement is respected, we believe that the special representative should be left to get on with the job, using the broad terms of reference with which the Security Council will entrust him.

112. Concerning questions relating to the police, I should like to recall the unchanged provision of the proposal which says that "Primary responsibility for maintaining law and order in Namibia during the transition period shall rest with the existing police forces."<sup>4</sup> Largely as a result of representations made to us during the proximity talks in New York, we added an additional provision to the effect that the administrator-general, to the satisfaction of the special representative, shall ensure the good conduct of the police forces and shall take the necessary action to ensure their suitability for continued employment during the transition period. The special representative shall make arrangements, when appropriate, for United Nations personnel to accompany the police forces in the discharge of their duties. The police forces would be limited to the carrying of small arms in the normal performance of their duties.

113. It should be borne in mind in this connexion that the special representative will take steps to guarantee against the possibility of intimidation or interference with the electoral process from whatever quarter. The proposal provides for a substantial United Nations presence, both civilian and military, to be led by the special representative.

114. This concludes that part of my statement which I made on behalf of the Five. We firmly believe in the ability of the United Nations fully to comply with the task entrusted to it. We have also elaborated our settlement proposal in close and continuous contact with the Secretary-General, whose spokesman's statement of 30 March 1978 should be regarded by all participants in this special session of the General Assembly as an encouraging sign. It says, *inter alia*:

"In the discussion with the 'Group of Five', the Secretary-General recalled the terms of Security Council resolution 385 (1976) and made clear that he was ready to assist in any solution of the problem if mandated by the Security Council.

"Throughout its history of involvement in peace-keeping and procedures for transition to independence, the United Nations record of competence, objectivity and impartiality is well proven. Any task assigned to the United Nations in this regard would be performed in full co-operation with all concerned."

115. We fully concur with the Secretary-General's view that the implementation of the proposal requires a mandate from the Security Council. We recommend that the Security Council should be given this mandate without delay and we hope that during the present special session, the basis for early Security Council action will significantly improve.

116. Once an agreement has been reached, the Federal Republic of Germany will not stand aside when called upon to realize the proposal. We are ready to assist the Secretary-General in the discharge of his mandate, as he himself considers necessary, in accordance with the explicit assurance jointly given by the Five in the settlement proposal.

117. Yet, this is not where our task will end. On 25 February 1978, our Foreign Minister, Mr. Genscher, stated:

"It is our aim to create in Namibia a model of peaceful coexistence between blacks and whites under equal conditions. There must be no racial war. Racial war means bloodshed and the destruction of all hope of blacks and whites living peacefully together and it involves the danger of an intervention by non-African Powers to gain influence."

118. We are ready to engage in economic co-operation with an independent Namibia, should its Government so desire, of the kind we have successfully entered into with other African States. We have at our disposal an entire set of instruments of capital aid and technical assistance. Stability in an independent and internationally recognized Namibia will also invite significant investments from private sources. The Federal Government will encourage such private investments to the extent that they are capable of assisting in the promotion of Namibia's economy.

119. We are prepared to contribute to the development of this new State on the basis of a well-functioning economy and an equitable social system. For the sake of these objectives, there must be no recourse to a reverse form of racial discrimination.

120. All available forces in the country are needed, and they will best serve the common interest if, after the elimination of the existing inequities, everybody is given a chance, without distinction as to colour and without any restriction of fundamental human rights, to contribute to this task on an equal basis. All whites in Namibia must realize that shaping the future of the country in conformity with these principles is for them, too, a great chance which demands a constructive attitude towards the changes now required.

121. Time is running out. Not only do we want to remove the threat to stability in this region, but we must also not hesitate any longer in securing for the people of Namibia their basic rights. Difficult decisions and a long period of hard work are ahead of us. We know that not everything can be accomplished in one day, but let us begin now.

122. Mr. MINIC (Yugoslavia):<sup>5</sup> Comrade President, I should like to express the great satisfaction of the Yugoslav delegation at the renewed confidence that the General Assembly has demonstrated in electing you, the President of the thirty-second regular session, to preside over this special session too.

123. My country views this special session as one of exceptional importance. In its convening we see the determination of the United Nations finally to put an end to the rule of the colonial and racist régime of South Africa in Namibia.

124. More than a decade ago the United Nations terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia and assumed direct international responsibility for the Territory and for

<sup>4</sup> See S/12636, para. 9.

<sup>5</sup> Mr. Minić spoke in Serbo-Croatian. The English version of his statement was supplied by the delegation.

its people, pending its accession to independence. In the efforts to fulfil the Mandate entrusted to it by the United Nations to administer the Territory, the United Nations Council for Namibia—of which Yugoslavia is a member—has undertaken a number of important initiatives. Throughout this long period of time South Africa has done everything it could to prevent the United Nations from fulfilling its international commitment concerning Namibia. It has persisted in its illegal occupation of the Territory, thereby further aggravating the situation in Namibia and over-all conditions in southern Africa.

125. Such a course of events in Namibia constitutes a threat to peace and security in that part of the world. This session should help the United Nations to discharge its direct international responsibility for Namibia and its people. It should give added support to international political efforts aimed at the decolonization of Namibia and, above all, to the liberation struggle waged by the people of Namibia—led by SWAPO, which is recognized by the United Nations as its sole and authentic liberation movement—for the exercise of its right to self-determination and independence.

126. South Africa has recently increased its military and police actions against SWAPO and reprisals against the people of Namibia. We see from the statement made by the President of SWAPO, Mr. Sam Nujoma, that South Africa is creating a civil-war situation in Namibia by establishing tribal armies and favouring a group of its own puppets. It is introducing weapons of mass destruction into this international Territory, recruiting foreign mercenaries and threatening to make new aggressive attacks against neighbouring countries. By continuing to develop its own nuclear weapons it hopes to blackmail and frighten the entire international community and to suppress any resistance to its illegal occupation of Namibia and its hegemonic policy in Africa.

127. Such a policy on the part of South Africa constitutes aggression against the people of Namibia. It is aimed directly at the United Nations, which is responsible for that Territory. It threatens peace and security and is leading to bloodshed in Namibia, in which various powerful non-African factors are bound to be involved also. Such a development could have dangerous and unpredictable consequences for the over-all development of international relations.

128. The action of the five Western countries aimed at reaching a solution of the problem of Namibia through negotiations has aroused wide interest in the international community. However, that action has not yet produced results. South Africa has done everything to create an untenable situation in Namibia, exacerbate the conflict and increase the danger to peace and security, while using the action of the five Western countries in order to bargain over the vital interests of the people of Namibia and further postpone the independence of that Territory. The reply of the Government of South Africa to the five Western countries confirms our conviction that South Africa wants to perpetuate the annexation of Walvis Bay and its domination of Namibia. Its interpretation of the proposals of the five Western countries shows how South Africa intends to make use of them in order to achieve that aim.

The least the General Assembly can expect at this session from the five Western countries is that they make a statement to the effect that they consider Walvis Bay to be an integral part of Namibia. In the course of the present action of the Western countries South Africa has annexed Walvis Bay, which is an integral part of Namibia and its only seaport. In so doing South Africa most directly threatens the very foundations of the economic and political independence of Namibia, bringing its security into question for an indefinite period of time. We believe that the five Western countries, which, by undertaking their action have assumed a great responsibility, should not allow the racist régime of South Africa to negotiate from a position of force and *diktat*. Yugoslavia resolutely rejects any compromise to the detriment of the territorial integrity of Namibia.

129. South Africa intends to apply Security Council resolution 385 (1976) on free elections in Namibia in such a way as to enable it to exercise further control over that Territory, while liquidating SWAPO and the armed struggle of the Namibian people, which so far it has not been able to crush by armed force. South Africa intends to retain its military bases in Namibia and to annex Walvis Bay, to have its police control the elections and its colonial and racist administration the process that should lead the country to independence. It wants to reduce the role of the United Nations to the absolute minimum, that of an observer. This is liable to create in that Territory, where South Africa is doing its utmost to provoke violence and intertribal conflicts, a situation similar to the one that prevailed in the former Belgian Congo in the 1960s.

130. Bearing all this in mind, we deem it indispensable that in this decisive phase of the struggle of the Namibian people, all the Member States of the United Nations undertake decisive co-ordinated action leading to the urgent, unconditional and complete withdrawal of South Africa from Namibia, including the withdrawal of its military, political, paramilitary and other forces. In this sense, we feel that the draft declaration submitted to the General Assembly by the United Nations Council for Namibia [see A/S-9/7, annex] outlines the measures that should be taken as soon as possible.

131. Of the greatest importance in this respect are the measures that the Security Council, relying on the support of the General Assembly, should undertake as regards the urgent implementation of the decisions of the United Nations for the attainment of independence by Namibia and the application of appropriate sanctions against South Africa if the latter continues to oppose those decisions and delays their implementation.

132. Each Member State of the world Organization would contribute to the solution of the problem of Namibia if it respected the decisions of the General Assembly, the Security Council and the United Nations Council for Namibia, recognized SWAPO as the sole legitimate representative of the people of Namibia and prevented South Africa from recruiting mercenaries for use in Namibia. To the same end, the United Nations should reject the annexation of Walvis Bay and bring pressure to bear on South Africa to withdraw from that bay, which is an inseparable part of Namibia.

133. By engaging in the illegal exploitation of Namibia's natural resources, transnational corporations based in Western industrialized countries assist the racist régime. An immediate end should be put to that practice.

134. While undertaking the above measures it is necessary, in our opinion, to continue to exert efforts to reach a solution by means of negotiation. For that purpose, it is indispensable to make use of all possibilities and to take into account all proposals that are likely to facilitate such a solution and that are aimed at the attainment of independence by Namibia and the preservation of its territorial integrity.

135. The countries which have remained South Africa's partners bear a great responsibility with regard to the success of a negotiated settlement of the question of Namibia as they could exert added pressure on South Africa to withdraw from Namibia. Those countries should realize at long last that the economic and other interests of all the developed countries would be better served by agreement with a free and independent Namibia, on the basis of respect for the legitimate interests of the Namibian people, than by co-operation with South Africa, which protects those interests by its armed forces and its odious system of *apartheid* and racial discrimination. Common efforts should be exerted at this special session in order to define clearly the conditions that would enable Namibia to achieve independence as soon as possible, while at the same time paving the way for a normalization of the situation in southern Africa as a whole.

136. The elections provided for in Security Council resolution 385 (1976), to be held under conditions acceptable to SWAPO and under the effective supervision of the United Nations, should be a means of ensuring the exercise of the right of the people of Namibia to self-determination and should be conducive to the peaceful and agreed solution of the Namibian problem. Those elections should not be allowed to become a smoke-screen, seemingly democratic, but actually aimed at circumventing and hampering the accession of Namibia to independence and liquidating the liberation forces of Namibia, headed by SWAPO.

137. As the aim of a negotiated settlement can only be the independence of Namibia and the withdrawal of South Africa from that international Territory, South Africa, which occupies Namibia, on the one hand, and SWAPO, which is fighting for its liberation, on the other, cannot be treated in the same manner or subjected to equal pressure.

138. The presence and active involvement of United Nations forces during the period of transition, these forces being responsible also for maintaining law and order, should make possible a genuine transfer of power to the legal representatives of the Namibian people.

139. The international community cannot renounce all the means and methods of pressure used against the racist régime if the latter continues to defy it and postpones the independence of Namibia. Likewise, no one has the right, in this case, to demand of the people of Namibia and SWAPO that they renounce their armed national liberation struggle nor to demand of any Member State of the United Nations

that it renounce lending all possible assistance to that struggle and that national liberation movement.

140. Yugoslavia, together with the majority of States Members of the United Nations, is actively supporting Namibia's immediate accession to independence through the unconditional and complete withdrawal of South Africa from Namibia as a territorial entity. We consider that it is necessary to implement the numerous decisions of the General Assembly and the Security Council in order to solve the question of Namibia.

141. My country recognizes SWAPO as the genuine and sole legitimate representative of the people of Namibia and is lending all support and assistance to its armed struggle and its political and diplomatic efforts for a peaceful decolonization of Namibia and its accession to full independence. We shall support every solution that is acceptable to the people of Namibia and its representative, SWAPO, without whose participation no decisions concerning the fate of Namibia can be made. It should be clearly stated that SWAPO has shown a sufficient measure of flexibility and has made a fair number of concessions in the present negotiations. It is imperative that the racist régime should now adequately respond to such an attitude of SWAPO and withdraw from Namibia forthwith.

142. As a non-aligned country, Yugoslavia believes that the solution of the question of the independence of Namibia is of great importance to non-aligned countries. The final elimination of colonialism, racism and *apartheid* has been one of the main objectives of the movement of non-aligned countries from its inception. The non-aligned countries have always lent their full support to the struggle for freedom and independence of the Namibian people headed by SWAPO, considering the question of Namibia to be inseparably linked to the general problem of decolonization in southern Africa, where a decisive battle is being fought for the total elimination of the remaining strongholds of colonialism and racism.

143. The achievement of independence in Namibia is not only of vital importance to the total decolonization of southern Africa but at the same time constitutes a very important contribution to the relaxation of international tensions and the strengthening of peace and security in Africa and in the world. It is within this broad context of international relations that we view the significance of an urgent and positive solution of the Namibian question.

144. Guided by this conviction, we expect this special session to constitute an event of historical importance for the people of Namibia in its struggle to realize its noble aspirations to freedom and independence, and to provide an example of how the international community should solve acute international problems and eliminate focal points of crisis which threaten international peace and security.

145. Mr. MESTIRI (Tunisia) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President we of the Tunisian delegation are happy to see you presiding over this special session devoted to such an important problem and to a cause to which you and your country have contributed so much.

146. The General Assembly is meeting in special session at a time when the situation in southern Africa in general, and

in Namibia in particular, is undergoing serious developments which, unless they are countered in time, might in the very near future, perhaps, engulf the whole of the region in a racial confrontation the consequences of which will not necessarily be limited to that part of Africa.

147. Among the crises shaking the world today, that which brings the minority régimes of Mr. Smith and Mr. Vorster into conflict with the peoples of southern Africa continues to maintain a state of tension and confrontation dangerous for the establishment of sound international relations based on sincere respect for the right of all peoples to freedom, dignity and independence.

148. Quite apart from the intolerable suffering it inflicts on the valiant Namibian people, South Africa's unlawful occupation of Namibian territory continues, despite the claims of some, to constitute a challenge to the international community, a flagrant violation of the principles of the Charter and a constant threat to international peace and security. Even more, the interdependence of political phenomena in southern Africa resulting from the identical nature of the struggles of the peoples of Zimbabwe, Namibia and South Africa gives us a more profound perspective of the difficulties that await us—serious difficulties which call for urgent action in solidarity. Within this framework, the development of the situation in Namibia, whatever it may be, will not fail to have direct repercussions on the whole of southern Africa. The speedy independence of Namibia would rekindle hopes for a global peaceful solution. Perpetuation of the present situation would certainly not fail to increase that bitterness which generates dangerous violence.

149. For more than 10 years now, the General Assembly has been adopting a series of resolutions that lay down the framework and conditions for an effective solution of the problem. Recently the United Nations Council for Namibia and the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples adopted important recommendations which constitute essential elements in a final settlement of the conflict. Today, it is for the General Assembly in the special session to examine those recommendations and to take the measures made necessary by the deterioration of a situation which has lasted all too long.

150. The success of our action will depend to a large extent on our capacity to avoid ambiguity and misunderstandings and to place our efforts within the precise framework of the principles and objectives that were long ago defined by the international community. Our success will also depend on the political will that Member States demonstrate in order to go beyond temporary contingencies and the legal arguments and considerations of trade or strategy.

151. I do not think there is any need to go into the details of the position my country has taken on Namibia since 1956, which was the date of our independence and our admission to the United Nations. Situated at the extreme north-east of the continent, we immediately felt the cause of the people of South West Africa to be our own and one with which our long colonial struggle disposed us to identify ourselves.

152. I wish today to reaffirm the support and total solidarity of the people and Government of Tunisia with the people of Namibia which, led by SWAPO, is waging a brave struggle against the forces of South Africa occupying its territory in defiance of law and international legality.

153. The General Assembly has already repeatedly stated the essential principles of a peaceful settlement of the question of Namibia. Today more than ever before those principles, which remain valid, must constitute the basis of any action capable of restoring the rights of the Namibian people and bringing peace and security to a country that has suffered too much from repression and exploitation.

154. Those principles also represent the solemn commitment of the international community to supporting and aiding, within the United Nations framework, the complete and final liberation of Namibia from colonial domination. In this connexion, we should never lose sight of the special responsibility of the United Nations with regard to the Namibian problem. Today that responsibility can be neither evaded nor lessened.

155. The United Nations, the only legal authority with regard to Namibia, cannot—unless it wishes to see its prestige and credibility seriously impaired—renounce its responsibility before the establishment of a free and independent government in Namibia.

156. Since the Security Council adopted its resolution 385 (1976) several initiatives have been taken; all have sought a negotiated settlement to the conflict. Those attempts have sometimes aroused enthusiasm among some and scepticism among others. Nor did the latest of those initiatives fail to give rise to many well justified objections that represent the legitimate apprehension of the majority of us in supporting a process in which South Africa is using all manner of delaying tactics and making ambiguous statements. The attitude taken so far by the Pretoria régime has always strengthened fears that no serious change may take place because of its desire to maintain its hold directly or indirectly over Namibia. However, the Namibian people—of which SWAPO is the only genuine representative—has demonstrated great political maturity in agreeing to negotiate a peaceful settlement of the conflict. SWAPO has shown praiseworthy moderation and flexibility, which illustrate its sincere desire to do everything possible to avoid bloodshed and to achieve independence in an atmosphere of peace. Nevertheless, the white racist régime of South Africa has increased its provocations of every kind: police repression of SWAPO fighters, attempts to fragment the territory of Namibia into homelands, the unlawful decision to annex Walvis Bay, threats of a so-called internal settlement and other obstructive manoeuvres. Nevertheless, demonstrating great political courage, SWAPO refuses to yield to pessimism and is leaving open every opportunity for avoiding the worst. It is in that framework that we must take a decision with regard to recent developments in the situation.

157. Indeed, at a time when we are meeting in special session, the Security Council has before it a plan for a negotiated settlement submitted by its five Western members. Despite its shortcomings which are clear to us, that plan has not been entirely rejected by anyone; nor, indeed,

has it been entirely accepted by anyone. However, we think that the time has come for the Members of this Assembly not necessarily to take a final or premature decision on the plan but to express an opinion that might speed the efforts being made in various quarters—in other words, on the part of the five Western Powers and on that of SWAPO—for a peaceful accession of the Territory to genuine and complete independence.

158. We have said that, in our view, the plan has shortcomings; they fall into two categories. The first relate to the exact role of the United Nations and of the proposed assistance group. The system of administration proposed is certainly ingenious but the authority, in the final analysis, is not shared and it is clear that, in a crisis, the South African administrator-general to be proposed would have the upper hand—especially since it is specifically stated that the principal responsibility for the maintenance of public order during the transition period would rest with the existing police force.

159. The second type of shortcoming is more serious, because it disregards the spirit and letter of Security Council resolution 385 (1976), paragraph 9 of which requires recognition of the territorial integrity of Namibia. The case of Walvis Bay is not a typical one of a colonial base or enclave; it concerns the only port of the Territory, a port that provides an outlet without which the economic

viability of the Territory might be dangerously compromised and its independence directly threatened.

160. In its reply to the Western proposals, the South African Government has put its finger precisely on those sore points by insisting, on the one hand, that the role of its administrator-general remain wholly the basis of the administrative structure of the Territory and, on the other hand, that it has not been established that Walvis Bay belongs to Namibia. Therefore, we cannot talk about any unconditional acceptance. However, all doors have not been closed and we can glimpse a hope for a peaceful solution to a tragedy which has lasted for too long and has cost the brave Namibian people too much.

161. Further efforts can be made to reduce the deficiencies in the Western plan, especially with regard to Namibia's territorial integrity, if only by a clear and unanimous statement to the effect that Walvis Bay belongs to the Territory.

162. That is my delegation's view. In any event the last word will rest with the Namibian people, represented by SWAPO. Tunisia will respect and support in every instance—I repeat, in every instance—the position that SWAPO may take.

*The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.*

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

NINTH SPECIAL SESSION

Official Records



**6th  
PLENARY MEETING**

Wednesday, 26 April 1978,  
at 3.35 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Agenda item 7:  
Question of Namibia (*continued*)

*President: Mr. Lazar MOJSOV (Yugoslavia).*

AGENDA ITEM 7

*Question of Namibia (continued)*

1. Mr. ÅLGÅRD (Norway): This special session of the General Assembly on the question of Namibia convenes at a critical time for the peoples of southern Africa.

2. Shall the quest for peace and independence based on genuine majority rule in Namibia and Southern Rhodesia be met successfully or shall the last major efforts at achieving freedom in this part of the world end on a note of prolonged armed struggle, increased human suffering and internationalization of the conflict? That is the major question now confronting us.

3. One year ago the five Western members of the Security Council undertook a joint initiative in order to find an internationally acceptable solution to the question of Namibia in accordance with Security Council resolution 385 (1976). My Government welcomed that initiative and we continue to support it. In the view of my Government, the latest proposal by the five Western countries<sup>1</sup> is a good basis for a settlement as it reflects the aspirations and concerns embodied in Security Council resolution 385 (1976).

4. It is the firm belief of my Government that at this crucial stage no effort must be spared to keep momentum in the negotiating process. We support the idea that the Security Council should move quickly to ask the Secretary-General to appoint a United Nations special representative for Namibia. The United Nations has had and continues to have a very special responsibility in Namibia since the General Assembly decided to terminate South Africa's mandate in 1966 by adopting resolution 2145 (XXI). The United Nations must exercise its responsibility and demonstrate its capability to act decisively and independently at a time when the future peaceful development of the Territory and even the region as a whole may be at stake.

5. In this connexion, we should like to emphasize the importance of the various United Nations components envisaged in the proposed plan for a settlement. In our view, a strong United Nations presence in Namibia during

the transition period is a prerequisite for orderly and democratic elections where the fundamental rights of all citizens are fully respected. All United Nations Members must, therefore, shoulder their collective responsibilities to enable the United Nations to discharge itself of its important tasks in Namibia.

6. Security Council resolution 385 (1976) remains an essential and irrevocable political document of the United Nations on how to put an end to South Africa's continued illegal presence in Namibia. In this perspective, and this is also how I understand the proposal of the five Western countries, the South Africans are not called upon to demonstrate a grand conciliatory gesture over the question of Namibia. They are called upon to relinquish something which was never theirs in the first place.

7. South Africa's actions inside Namibia, while the negotiations have been under way, give rise to serious concern. Especially, we are deeply disturbed by reports that South Africa seems to be strengthening its military presence in Namibia. This policy can only be aimed at intimidating the Namibian people.

8. We find it also particularly deplorable that South Africa, in the midst of highly critical negotiations and in defiance of international public opinion, last year decided to annex the Namibian port of Walvis Bay. It is the view of my Government that Walvis Bay is an inviolable and integral part of Namibia, and this must be reaffirmed by the international community.

9. Despite such acts by the South African Government, we remain encouraged by the steadfast support of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), for a negotiated settlement in Namibia. We should like to welcome on this occasion SWAPO's stated readiness to participate in free, fair and democratic elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations and to abide by the results of such elections.

10. My Government has consistently supported the peoples of southern Africa in their struggle for independence and freedom. On behalf of my Government I take this opportunity to reiterate our pledge of continued moral, humanitarian and financial assistance to the people of Namibia.

11. If the present negotiations concerning the granting of independence to Namibia in accordance with Security Council resolution 385 (1976) are to succeed, a constructive and positive approach is needed from all the parties involved. South Africa's responsibilities and duties are laid down in that resolution, which was adopted unanimously on 30 January 1976.

<sup>1</sup> See S/12636.

12. In this respect my Government welcomes the reply of formal acceptance conveyed by the South African Government to the five Western countries yesterday in relation to their latest proposal, although the South African reply still leaves some questions unanswered. We trust nevertheless that this reply means that the South African Government has given up any intention of going ahead with an internal settlement in Namibia, and that it is willing to implement in good faith the proposal of the five Western countries in accordance with the provisions of resolution 385 (1976).

13. Should the South African authorities, contrary to our expectations, decide in the final analysis not to comply with their international obligations as laid down in resolution 385 (1976), the Council should take the lead in initiating a broad policy of political and economic isolation of South Africa, including the adoption of new mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter.

14. In the present situation we hope, however, that South Africa has abandoned the so-called Turnhalle programme for good. That programme, aimed at the dismemberment of Namibia on a tribal basis, would only perpetuate injustice and lead to further violence in Namibia. The fact that the five Western countries undertook their efforts a year ago was in itself a clear demonstration that the implementation of South Africa's Turnhalle programme in Namibia would bring neither peace nor justice to the troubled land of Namibia. In the opinion of my Government the situation is not different today. An internal settlement in Namibia, in contravention of the provisions of resolution 385 (1976), is not internationally acceptable.

15. At this special session, the General Assembly should make clear to all of us what the options are in Namibia. I believe that the people of Namibia are at a cross-roads. We must today renew our determination to persevere in our quest for a peaceful settlement in a territory for which the United Nations itself is legally responsible. I take this occasion, therefore, to call on all parties to grasp the opportunity at hand, which is based on a realistic and pragmatic appraisal of the situation, so that genuine independence can be arrived at peacefully in Namibia at an early date, it may be hoped by the end of this year. Complete freedom for the people of Namibia is long overdue. The nationalist aspirations of the liberation forces in Namibia cannot be ignored indefinitely. Colonial domination must be brought to an end in Namibia as it has been in other parts of Africa, Asia and Latin America.

16. Mr. MWALE (Zambia): Mr. President, it was under your distinguished presidency that the General Assembly decided at its thirty-second regular session to meet in a special session, at an appropriate time before the thirty-third regular session, to deal with the vexing question of Namibia. That decision was possible because of your personal commitment to the cause of the Namibian people, and because of the skill and wisdom with which you have presided over the General Assembly, not only during the consideration of the question of Namibia but also throughout the thirty-second regular session and the eighth special session just concluded. My delegation is therefore gratified that this special session on the question of Namibia is taking place under your presidency. Our total confidence in you gives us hope that this special session will be a decisive milestone in the struggle for the liberation of Namibia.

17. I am particularly pleased to pay a genuine tribute to you, Mr. President, in the aftermath of a most successful visit that you paid to my country only a few weeks ago. We had the greatest pleasure in welcoming you to Zambia and holding most fruitful discussions with you on important questions, including those concerning the liberation of southern Africa. The identity of views that was reflected in our discussions was once again a clear manifestation of the strong bonds of friendship between Yugoslavia and Zambia and our common commitment, within the framework of non-alignment, to the establishment of a new world based on justice, equality, peace and development.

18. I also wish to pay a tribute to our indefatigable Secretary-General, Mr. Kurt Waldheim, for his continued devotion to the cause of the Namibian people.

19. We are meeting here to discuss a distinctly unique case in the history of the United Nations and the role of the Organization in the decolonization process. Twelve years have now elapsed since the historic date of 27 October 1966 when the General Assembly adopted resolution 2145 (XXI) by which it terminated the Mandate of South Africa over Namibia and placed the country under the direct responsibility of the United Nations. Never before in its history had the United Nations assumed direct responsibility for a territory, and never before has a Member State, through its arrogance and intransigence, posed a greater challenge to the Organization. Not a single country in the world overtly recognizes South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia. Yet South Africa has defied the world and got away with it for more than 12 years. In fact, the history of South Africa's defiance predates the founding of the United Nations. This situation must not be allowed to continue.

20. The continued illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa and its attendant evils of racism, repression and exploitation, and indeed the failure of the United Nations to compel South Africa to withdraw in accordance with its numerous resolutions, have left the people of Namibia with no option but to resort to armed struggle to secure its national liberation. That struggle, spearheaded by the gallant freedom fighters of SWAPO, is ever intensifying. Because of the successes in that struggle, South Africa has now resorted to new tactics and manoeuvres intended to perpetuate its stranglehold on Namibia, while according a semblance of power to its puppets and stooges in Namibia under the so-called internal settlement formula, which in fact is a euphemism for its discredited policy of bantustanization. Clearly, these devilish designs of South Africa have the covert support of international imperialism.

21. The special session of the General Assembly is therefore taking place at a critical time in the struggle for the liberation of Namibia. The General Assembly acted wisely in deciding to meet in special session on the question of Namibia before the thirty-third regular session, for it is important that the United Nations, above all, with the rest of the international community continue to understand and keep in correct perspective the issues involved in the rapidly intensifying struggle in Namibia. As the armed struggle of the Namibian people continues to gain greater momentum so will the manoeuvres of South Africa to confuse the situation and to distort the purpose



of the struggle. The international community should therefore be on guard and maintain its vigilance against such diabolical designs.

22. In this regard the recent extraordinary session of the United Nations Council for Namibia held at Lusaka, which was preceded by missions of consultation sent by the Council to a number of countries, was significant and indeed timely. It was therefore a great honour for Zambia to act as host to the Council's extraordinary session. I take this opportunity to commend that Council for the serious and judicious manner in which it examined the issues involved in the continuing struggle for the liberation of Namibia. The 1978 Lusaka Declaration of the United Nations Council for Namibia [see A/S-9/4, para. 31] is certainly an important and historic document the significance of which only the enemies of the genuine liberation of Namibia could dispute or belittle. Apart from providing an objective analysis of the question of Namibia, the Council has clearly outlined the urgent issues to which the Assembly at this special session must address itself in view of the special responsibility of the United Nations for Namibia.

23. This special session provides us with an occasion solemnly to reaffirm the direct responsibility of the United Nations for Namibia. But the mere reaffirmation of United Nations responsibility is not enough. Perhaps even more important, the special session should provide an occasion for serious introspection by Member States with regard to their policies and practices vis-à-vis Namibia. We in Zambia, together with others, have always contended that some Member States have through their political and economic relations with South Africa in fact encouraged it in its continued illegal occupation of Namibia. The contradiction between such collaboration with the *apartheid* and racist régime of South Africa and the initiatives for seeking genuine change in Namibia must be resolved. We should collectively seriously consider and envisage the need to move from the era of resolutions to the era of practical action that will punish South Africa for its intransigence and thereby compel it to withdraw from Namibia. To this end, therefore, this special session must be the turning-point.

24. South Africa has no right whatsoever to persist in its illegal occupation of Namibia and absolutely no legitimate interest in the Territory. It is important therefore that we should not, as Members of the United Nations, entertain any attempt by South Africa to dictate conditions for its withdrawal from Namibia. For there can be no doubt that if South Africa were allowed to withdraw from Namibia on its own terms the Territory would not in any way accede to the genuine independence its people seek.

25. In seeking to perpetuate its illegal occupation and in its obsession with racism, minority rule and privilege South Africa has consistently used the device of dividing the Namibian people along ethnic or tribal lines. For this purpose the Pretoria régime has exported to Namibia its *apartheid* policy and its practices of bantustanization, on which Vorster and his clique thrive in South Africa itself. To this end, South Africa also sponsored the so-called Turnhalle Constitutional Conference on the future of Namibia attended by its hand-picked puppets and quislings.

Today South Africa is frantically seeking to concoct a so-called internal settlement in Namibia.

26. We in Zambia are acutely aware of the linkages of collaboration among the white-settler régimes in southern Africa. Those régimes have always colluded and co-ordinated their devious strategies to maintain and perpetuate themselves in power. It is therefore not by accident that we now have to reckon with the imminence of a so-called internal settlement in Namibia so soon after that in Southern Rhodesia. The enemy is one and the same; his objective is one and the same. As in Southern Rhodesia, an internal settlement in Namibia is designed to give a semblance of power to a puppet régime while leaving intact the structure of white-minority privilege and control. The aim of the racist minority régime is to extort international recognition and thereby legitimize its sham independence. Behind this façade, the black majority would, under the so-called internal settlement formula, continue to be exploited, abused, harassed, intimidated and humiliated.

27. In its preparations for an internal settlement in Namibia, South Africa has intensified its efforts to undermine SWAPO, the vanguard of the struggle of the Namibian people for genuine independence. Innocent Namibian patriots are increasingly the victims of dastardly acts at the hands of South African agents. They are daily subject to harassment, intimidation and humiliation. In particular, SWAPO militants are singled out for arbitrary arrests, torture, detention and imprisonment. The intention of South Africa is to destroy or at the very least to weaken SWAPO in order to guarantee the success of its devilish designs on Namibia. The statement delivered by the President of SWAPO before this Assembly last Monday [*1st meeting*] was indeed sobering in its details of intensified South African oppression and repression of the Namibian people.

28. Only last week, South Africa's so-called Administrator-General in Namibia assumed dictatorial powers to arrest and detain Namibians indefinitely on the pretext of any imaginary so-called threat to the Territory's security. This is the man who, since his appointment, has been falsely presented as committed to the repeal of racist legislation in Namibia. He has now been exposed for what he is: an agent of Vorster's régime planted in Namibia to round up, arrest and gaoil SWAPO members in order to pave the way for the so-called internal settlement.

29. My Government strongly supports the progressive forces of Namibia under the leadership of SWAPO in their opposition to the manoeuvres of South Africa in their Territory. As in the case of Zimbabwe, Zambia is categorically opposed to any so-called internal settlement in Namibia. We oppose it because we know that the present struggle is not intended merely to replace white faces by black faces in visible positions of power. We know that the struggle is even more importantly intended to dismantle the instruments of oppression, repression, exploitation and plunder, regardless of the colour of the faces of those seemingly in control. The very concept of a so-called internal settlement, whether in Namibia or Zimbabwe, is in fact racist, for it seeks to foster civil war among the black population. Thus, the present struggle remains a struggle against an oppressive system. No liberation movement

committed to genuine freedom and independence could lay down its arms simply because the oppressor had changed his colour.

30. I call upon this august Assembly to condemn and reject unequivocally moves by South Africa to concoct a so-called internal settlement in Namibia. The United Nations should declare in no uncertain terms that there can be no just and durable settlement in Namibia without the decisive participation and agreement of SWAPO, the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people. The special session should, moreover, solemnly declare that any so-called internal settlement in Namibia shall not be recognized by the United Nations and its Member States.

31. The racist régime of South Africa should also be condemned for its repeated acts of aggression against neighbouring African countries, in particular, Angola and my own country, Zambia. Those acts of aggression, committed from Namibian territory, are a desperate attempt by Vorster and his clique to weaken the SWAPO rearguard and thus undermine the liberation movement. That is a futile exercise, for it seeks the impossible.

32. More than ever before, there is need for the international community to render increased support to SWAPO as the vanguard of the struggle of the Namibian people for genuine national liberation and independence. Having already accorded due recognition to SWAPO as the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people, the United Nations should discourage and combat any attempt to undermine that liberation movement or reverse its successes. This hour before dawn is the most trying for the Namibian people. A lot of international forces are at work; some are genuine, others are not. We should therefore ensure that SWAPO plays a central and decisive role in any search for a genuine settlement in Namibia.

33. It is in that spirit that my Government has approached the initiative of five Western Member States to seek a negotiated settlement on Namibia. While recognizing the initiative of the Five to seek a negotiated settlement of the independence of Namibia, it is my Government's firm belief that any such settlement must be based on Security Council resolution 385 (1976) and all other relevant resolutions of the United Nations. We recognize further that what is at stake is to negotiate the modalities for the effective transfer of power from the oppressor to the oppressed. Really and truly, one cannot negotiate the inalienable right of a people to freedom and independence. On that basis, therefore, it is South Africa, the oppressor, which is under obligation to withdraw from Namibia. South Africa has no right whatsoever to take a negative position or to procrastinate and mislead in the negotiations.

34. The paradox of the negotiations which have taken place under the auspices of the five Western Member States is that SWAPO, and not South Africa, has made far-reaching and substantive concessions. South Africa has remained intransigent and inflexible and has not even demonstrated any good faith to enter seriously into meaningful negotiations. As a case in point, one only needs to recall the shameless walk-out of Mr. Botha, the South African Foreign Minister, from the negotiations held in New York last February and, indeed, his subsequent abusive and arrogant television interview.

35. Zambia continues to support the principle of negotiation. At the same time we contend that the exercise should be undertaken within a prescribed time frame. In the present circumstances, it ought to be emphasized that the onus is now on the five Western Member States to strengthen their resolve to compel South Africa to accept resolution 385 (1976) in its entirety, thus ensuring the withdrawal of South Africa from Namibia. South Africa is highly unlikely to have a voluntary change of heart; surgery will have to be performed. Needless to say, the Western States involved in the present exercise have tremendous leverage over South Africa, and they ought to continue to use it.

36. One hopes that the present exercise of negotiations initiated by the five Western Member States will not continue indefinitely, for its continuation as a process without positive results could create a false atmosphere of hope and expectation. In any case, we should recognize that negotiations can succeed only under the pressure of armed struggle. All States Members of the United Nations should therefore commit themselves to rendering increased and substantial material support to SWAPO to facilitate the prosecution of its armed liberation struggle. We must moreover ensure that the negotiations do not detract from the armed struggle and that they do not lead to neo-colonialism in Namibia.

37. We have taken note of the announcement by the Secretary of State for External Affairs of Canada [*3rd meeting*], acting as a spokesman of the five Western Member States, concerning the "acceptance" by South Africa of the Western plan on Namibia. In this regard, we wish to sound a note of warning that the qualified "acceptance" by South Africa should not be taken at its face value but should be studied and thoroughly assessed. In any case, even a categorical acceptance by South Africa would not be an end in itself, because much remains to be done.

38. The special session should seriously address itself to the need to preserve the territorial integrity of Namibia. South Africa must not be allowed to destroy the national unity and territorial integrity of Namibia. Its claim to Walvis Bay is not only an act of bad faith in the current negotiations but is also clear evidence of South Africa's territorial ambitions and expansionism. It must be categorically and resolutely rejected by the United Nations and all its Member States, for it is an attempt to deprive Namibia of its main port and vital economic life-line and thus to undermine the true independence of the Territory by making it dependent on South Africa for economic survival. Thus South Africa is still bent on the creation of a bantustan enclave in Namibia.

39. In this regard, and in order to facilitate matters, we call upon the five Western Member States, which have considerable influence over racist South Africa, to make a clear pronouncement to the effect that Walvis Bay is and should remain an integral part of Namibia in accordance with Security Council resolution 385 (1976), which upholds the principle of the territorial integrity of Namibia.

40. As we all know, one of the persistent criticisms levelled against the United Nations in many quarters is its

inability to take timely, meaningful and effective action to resolve global problems. Threats to international peace and security which could have been prevented in accordance with the Charter have often drifted into actual and unmanageable bloody conflicts. Today in southern Africa there is a rapidly escalating war situation. The task of the United Nations is therefore no longer that of preventing the outbreak of war in southern Africa but of shortening it through combined pressure to bring about the immediate realization of the objective for which the oppressed people have justifiably taken up arms. In other words, we should all be the allies of the liberation movement in its onslaught against the white racist minority régimes.

41. With regard to Namibia, the United Nations has a particular obligation to act, in view of its special responsibility for the Territory. History will judge the United Nations harshly if it continues to tolerate South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia or allows it to get away with some sham settlement designed to permit it to retain its control over the Territory by proxy. At this critical phase of the struggle for the liberation of Namibia, the United Nations should be SWAPO's reliable ally against South Africa. My Government believes that one credible way in which the United Nations could assist the people of Namibia under the leadership of SWAPO in their struggle against South African illegal occupation of their country would be by the immediate imposition of economic sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter. All pressure must be brought to bear on the Vorster régime to compel it to withdraw unconditionally from Namibia.

42. The history of the Security Council in respect of desirable punitive action against South Africa is not encouraging. Some permanent members of the Security Council have not hesitated to veto, for utopian interests or reasons, meaningful measures proposed to bring South Africa to heel, in spite of the fact that such measures have been advocated by the overwhelming majority of United Nations Member States. Such a practice must not be allowed to continue, for it only weakens the Security Council itself. In the view of my delegation, given the uniqueness of the question of Namibia, the General Assembly would be perfectly justified in invoking its special prerogatives and acting decisively, if the stalemate in the Security Council were to continue.

43. The right to self-determination and national independence, and fundamental human rights are too sacred to be sacrificed at the altar of national interest and expediency.

44. Finally, I wish to reiterate the commitment of my country to supporting the people of Namibia under the leadership of SWAPO in their just struggle for liberation and genuine national independence. Zambia will remain a dependable rearguard for them. We have made many sacrifices for the liberation not only of Namibia but of the rest of southern Africa. We shall continue to do so until that objective is realized, for we have a moral and international duty to support just causes.

45. In conclusion, it is the sincere hope of my Government that at this special session devoted to the problem of

the independence of Namibia, the General Assembly will fulfil its historic mission.

46. Mr. FLORIN (German Democratic Republic) (*interpretation from Russian*): Comrade President, at this ninth special session you have once again been elected to the high post of President of the General Assembly. I wish to congratulate you warmly and assure you of the total support of my delegation. We are sure that your diplomatic skills, your high qualifications and great experience will promote the success of this session.

47. For the second time now, a special session of the General Assembly is being devoted to the question of Namibia; this is entirely in keeping with the direct responsibility of the world Organization as the lawful Administering Authority of the Territory until its attainment of independence. It also points to the urgent need finally to take effective measures to help the people of Namibia exercise their right to self-determination and attain independence.

48. At the same time, we understand how closely interlinked are the liberation struggle of the people of Namibia and the aspirations of the peoples of Zimbabwe and South Africa to national and social liberation. The occupation policy of South Africa, which is the fundamental bastion of imperialism and colonialism in southern Africa, is the main obstacle to a solution of the problem of Namibia. In response to General Assembly and Security Council decisions, the racist régime has embarked on an intensification of terror. Indescribable suffering has been inflicted upon the people by the illegal administration, which does not even shrink from persecution, imprisonment and the murder of women and children. Thousands of people have been driven from their homes; tens of thousands of Africans have been herded into reservations.

49. At the present time in Namibia, an extraordinary situation prevails and wartime laws are in effect. The President of SWAPO, Sam Nujoma, whom I warmly welcome from this rostrum on behalf of the delegation of the German Democratic Republic, in his speech at this special session drew for us a most impressive picture of the complex, dangerous situation in Namibia: terror is being aroused by the feverish expansion of the military presence. The actions of the racists are characterized not by a troop evacuation as called for by Security Council resolution 385 (1976) but by an expansion of the army of the aggressor and of the military equipment of that army. The network of military bases on the Angolan and Zambian borders is being tightened; the territory of Namibia is being converted into a springboard for aggressive attacks on free African States Members of our Organization.

50. The stationing of South African troops in Namibia constitutes a constant threat to those States. Therefore, the demand for the total withdrawal of the occupation troops is of fundamental importance, both for Namibia itself and, indeed, for all the peoples of southern Africa.

51. What is particularly alarming and frightening is South Africa's ambition to acquire nuclear weapons. Only recently, as it happens, the *apartheid* régime decided to convert its uranium-enrichment installations into industrial

enterprises. It is no secret that it is that régime's desire systematically to use the Kalahari desert—that is, the territory of Namibia—for nuclear tests. Nevertheless, Western monopolies are continuing to co-operate with Pretoria in the nuclear field. In so doing they are assuming a heavy responsibility. Nuclear weapons in the hands of the racists would inordinately increase the danger for the whole African continent and would pose a threat to international peace and security.

52. What is needed are effective efforts by the United Nations to put an end to the shameful designs of the racists. Only a cessation of co-operation with South Africa in all fields and the imposition of economic sanctions will create a sound foundation for the implementation of the Security Council embargo on arms deliveries.

53. In contravention of the decisions of the United Nations, South Africa annexed Walvis Bay, an integral part of Namibia, with which, to use the words in the Declaration on the Liberation of Namibia, adopted at the International Conference in Support of the Peoples of Zimbabwe and Namibia, held at Maputo,<sup>2</sup> "it is inextricably linked by geographical, historical, economic, cultural and ethnic bonds". The United Nations has, as we know, condemned that act of aggression as illegal and invalid. The attempt to annex Walvis Bay, the only deep-water port linking Namibia to South Africa is clearly aimed at preventing the unconditional implementation of the independence of Namibia and its territorial integrity. It coincides with the practice of various colonial Powers, which have so often attempted to separate Walvis Bay from Namibia so as to have a bridge-head for the oppression and exploitation of the people of Namibia. Now again this bridge-head is likely to be used for the purpose of posing a military threat to independent African States and exerting pressure on them. The problem of Walvis Bay is too serious to be excluded from any sound solution of the problem of Namibia.

54. The racists have most shamelessly been using all means at their disposal to salvage their illegal position that has been condemned by the whole international community. They have adopted far-reaching measures to create in Namibia a neo-colonialist structure that would ensure the long-term interests of the imperialists. These include the bribery of tribal heads and other puppets. They include also the so-called Turnhalle Alliance, which arose from attempts on the part of South Africa to bantustanize Namibia. Such actions have been buttressed by artificially created and incited disturbances among the tribes. At the same time, their purpose is to discredit SWAPO at the international and national levels, as well as to raise obstacles to the immediate cessation of the illegal occupation of Namibia and the transfer of power to SWAPO.

55. In its political programme, SWAPO has set itself the goal of bringing about a total and genuine independence for Namibia in the political, economic, military, social and cultural fields and the creation of a democratic people's government. It has long been known that that organization has the support of the people of Namibia, and it is only

under its leadership that Namibia will be able to attain genuine independence and freedom. The Organization of African Unity and the United Nations recognize SWAPO as the sole legitimate representative of the people of Namibia. It is therefore necessary and urgent to do everything possible to offer support to SWAPO in order to bring about total compliance with the United Nations decisions on Namibia. This applies, in particular, to Security Council resolution 385 (1976).

56. In this connexion; among the fundamental issues involved which must be resolved are the withdrawal of all South African occupation troops and the dissolution of the organs of power of the former colonial masters, as well as the recognition of the territorial integrity and political unity of Namibia. In this sense, the United Nations should shoulder its responsibility for the administration of Namibia until its independence is established.

57. The United Nations Council for Namibia, the authorized organ of the United Nations, in co-operation with SWAPO, could set up a provisional government whose task would be the organization, without delay, of genuinely free elections. After the establishment of national independence for Namibia and the admission of a free and independent Namibia to membership into our international Organization, the United Nations could divest itself of this specific responsibility. Such a course would be in keeping with decisions of the United Nations. However, there are Members of the Organization who have been attempting repeatedly to disregard decisions that have been adopted and to undermine the responsibility of the United Nations regarding Namibia. Without any mandate from the United Nations, there are being circulated plans designed to preserve the old system of domination in its neo-colonialist form and to create a puppet régime; plans to allow the South African occupation troops to remain in Namibia, leaving intact the repressive police structure created by the racist régime which is responsible for the arrest, torture and murder of innumerable patriots, and authorizing the South African administrator general, that is, the Governor under the *apartheid* régime, who recently introduced into the Territory of Namibia a new law of terror relating to preventive arrests—something that has been notorious from the time of fascism—to put into effect preparations for so-called free and democratic elections so that the political and paramilitary organizations of the fascist racists, who pattern themselves, as we know, on the war criminals, Goering and Hitler, can go on committing their brutalities with impunity. I ask the Assembly, what kind of elections will they be that are to be held under such circumstances? What kind of elections can be free and democratic when they are conducted under the rifles of the racists, under the pressure of political power of fanatical fascists who continue to be given support from outside? Such a concept cannot find expression in a programme of the United Nations.

58. The President of SWAPO, Sam Nujoma, quite rightly stated at Lusaka that his organization was not prepared to participate

"in schemes engineered to undermine and destroy the victories and achievements that we have made over the long years of bitter struggle against colonial oppression and exploitation" [see A/S-9/4, p. 16].

<sup>2</sup> A/32/109/Rev.1-S/12344/Rev.1, annex V. For the printed text, see *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-second Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1977*.

59. The *apartheid* régime, supported by imperialism, should not be trusted. It should be resisted by every means and with all the power available to the liberation movement. Whatever régime may be imposed upon the people of Namibia by the illegal occupationists, that régime cannot be recognized by the world, just as the world cannot possibly recognize the puppet régime in Zimbabwe.

60. As for a peaceful settlement of the question of Namibia, such a settlement would become possible if all States Members of the Organization jointly exerted the necessary pressure on South Africa. Unfortunately, however, dominant circles among the Western Powers are not ready for that, and this is something that the *apartheid* régime is counting on.

61. For the United Nations, it is not the interests of the transnational monopolies which fear losing the sources of their enormous profits that should be the decisive factor. Namibia has a thousand miles of coastline on the south-western part of the African continent, with one of the biggest natural harbours in the southern Atlantic, Walvis Bay. It has large tracts of water, rich in fish resources, and inside the country there are large reserves of minerals—diamonds, lead, copper, uranium, zinc and tungsten. All these resources have been shamelessly plundered by the colonialists, in arrogant defiance of decisions of the United Nations—for instance, Decree No. 1 of the United Nations Council for Namibia.<sup>3</sup> An end must be put to this. The people of Namibia, in exercise of their right to self-determination, should also exercise their sovereign rights over their natural resources.

62. Our actions should be determined by the hopes of a people still oppressed today and by the universal interest in peace and security. What the delegation of the German Democratic Republic expects from the General Assembly at this ninth special session can be summed up as follows: reaffirmation of the right to self-determination, freedom and national independence of the people of Namibia; increased support for the struggle for liberation under the leadership of SWAPO, the sole lawful representative of the people of Namibia; total and immediate implementation of the United Nations decisions on Namibia, particularly, Security Council resolution 385 (1976); and the elimination of the dangerous threat to international peace and security posed by South Africa. These demands are entirely in keeping with the demands of the Conference of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity, meeting at Tripoli, and the United Nations Council for Namibia, during its session at Lusaka.

63. My delegation supports the draft declaration and programme of action presented by the United Nations Council for Namibia, which would have the General Assembly strongly urge the Security Council

“to take the most vigorous measures, including sanctions provided for under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, particularly comprehensive economic sanctions, an oil embargo and an arms embargo”.  
[A/S-9/7, annex, para. 35.]

<sup>3</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-ninth Session, Supplement No. 24A*, para. 84.

64. I should like to conclude my statement with the following words contained in a message in connexion with the International Anti-*Apartheid* Year by the General-Secretary of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany and the Chairman of the Council of State of the German Democratic Republic, Erich Honecker:

“It is the sacred and inviolable right of the peoples of the world to oppose aggression and to determine their own fate, and to do everything in their power in the struggle for their national and social liberation. Colonialism and racist barbarism must be rooted out once and for all.”

65. Mr. ALMEIDA BOSQUE (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): “To be Cuban is to be more than white, more than black. To be a man is to be more than Cuban, more than white, more than black”. That dictum of José Martí, the founder of our independence, inspired all the Cubans who fought, weapons in hand, for the freedom of our homeland during the last quarter of the past century. The Republic which emerged at the dawn of this century—subject as it was to foreign vassalage—experienced, however, among other evils, those of racial discrimination and the oppression of blacks. But Martí’s ideas remained alive in the hearts of Cubans. For decades the Cuban revolutionary movement struggled bravely to achieve true independence and, with it, the eradication of all the social ills imposed on us by decadent capitalism, including racism in all its forms and manifestations.

66. With their heroic attack on the Moncada Barracks precisely 25 years ago, when Cubans celebrated the centennial of Martí’s birth, the vanguard of our people, led by Fidel Castro, began the last stage of a revolutionary process which for a century united the best among all Cubans in the fight for freedom, regardless of the colour of their skin. Those were years of bitter struggle in which Cubans of different origins fought together, and in the crucible of common striving became for ever linked together in their identical sacrifice. That common effort was nourished by the blood shed together and eventually bore fruit, leading to the joys and efforts of socialist construction today.

67. Twenty-five years ago the supreme leader of our people, our Commander-in-Chief Fidel Castro, showed exemplary courage and dignity before the court which was to condemn him for that attack on the Moncada barracks. In his historic plea before that tribunal of tyranny, Comrade Fidel Castro set forth the programme of the young revolutionaries, their ideal of a truly free Cuba based on justice and full equality for all Cubans, which at the time was the heroic goal which called for prodigies of zeal and self-sacrifice and which today is a beautiful reality of which we are justly proud.

68. That is why the Government of Cuba accords high priority to the liberation of the enslaved peoples of southern Africa, to the elimination of colonialism and racism in Zimbabwe, Namibia and South Africa and to the creation of the conditions necessary for the population of that region to live in peace and freedom and enjoy their natural resources in societies based on justice and equality for all. That is why, in the face of the pretensions of those

who wished to obstruct the convening of this special session, we wanted to express our full support for the initiative which brings us together here, an initiative to which we responded with the sincere intention of contributing to its being a landmark in the long struggle of African peoples for independence and freedom.

69. Since the triumph of the Revolution, in January 1959, the Government of Cuba has always clearly and firmly stated its position regarding this problem. Our irrevocable international policy, based on the consistent implementation of revolutionary and internationalist principles, as well as the profound bonds of brotherhood uniting our people to the African peoples, make our determination to bring about the complete eradication of colonialism and racism in Africa and throughout the world a corner-stone of the conduct of the people and Government of Cuba. That is why we have always maintained with unwavering firmness in the United Nations and elsewhere our full support for the Namibian people's struggle for national independence, for full sovereignty over their own territory and for putting an end to the colonial and racist yoke imposed on them. In the fulfilment of these efforts we have always been prepared to co-operate with all the countries genuinely interested in the attainment of these noble objectives.

70. I should like today first of all to reiterate that this is still the position of the Government which I represent.

71. The question of Namibia has been receiving the attention of the General Assembly, of the Security Council and of other United Nations bodies over a long period. Dozens of resolutions have been adopted, hundreds of statements have been made here and innumerable hours have been spent in our deliberations on this subject. This sustained effort by our Organization is a reflection of the constant concern which the international community and, in particular, the people of Africa have shown regarding one of the colonial problems whose existence at this stage arouses the greatest indignation and the unanimous rejection of all the peoples of the world.

72. However, it is evident that the concrete results achieved thus far do not correspond to the gravity of the problem nor to its urgent solution. The racists in Pretoria have flouted what has been decided and reiterated here; they still occupy by force the soil of Namibia; they have imposed their despicable system of *apartheid* on its inhabitants; and they are still utilizing the Territory of Namibia as a base for constant provocations and acts of aggression against the People's Republic of Angola. Therefore, the South African presence in Namibia constitutes a threat to all the peoples of Africa and a constant source of international tension.

73. In effect, the protracted debate on the question of Namibia ended a long time ago. It is not necessary to recall that in June 1971 the International Court of Justice declared illegal the occupation of the Territory of Namibia by the racist régime of Pretoria. Neither is it necessary to recall that 11 years ago, at another special session, the General Assembly decided to set up the United Nations Council for Namibia and entrust it with the administration of that Territory until it attained full independence. Similarly, it is idle to point out that, in spite of all the

decisions and resolutions repeated year after year by all the appropriate bodies of the United Nations, the results thus far have only served to demonstrate the inability of the Organization to respond to the arrogant defiance of the gang in South Africa. There is no need to spell out the reasons for South Africa's stubbornness and the inability of the United Nations to overcome it. Everyone is aware that the relevant resolutions of the United Nations would have been implemented and the sufferings of the Namibian people would have ended a long time ago had South Africa not enjoyed the political, military, financial, economic and diplomatic support of the leading capitalist Powers. That support is exclusively responsible for having paralysed our Organization so far. It is that support alone that has enabled the South African régime to maintain its iniquitous system of exploitation, in spite of the unanimous condemnation and rejection of mankind.

74. Even today, when the headlong advance of the liberation movement has brought about the bankruptcy of the old Portuguese empire and brought nearer the hour of total liberation for all the African peoples, when the clamour of freedom is reaching the very borders of the racist and colonialist régimes of southern Africa, statesmen and diplomats of certain Western Powers—precisely those that bear the greatest historical responsibility for the existence and survival of the colonial system—are eagerly promoting all sorts of diplomatic manoeuvres with no other purpose than to gain time for the racists, spread confusion and deceit and try to perpetuate the domination and oppression of millions of Africans imposed by gangs of settlers who have made their very existence dependent upon the most inhuman exploitation and most backward and anachronistic political attitudes.

75. A review of the documents prepared by the Secretariat enables us to understand the reasons which account for the present situation in Namibia. The people of Namibia, which has been the victim of plundering and discrimination, inhabits a Territory blessed with bountiful natural resources, which have been and indeed still are the object of voracious exploitation by imperialist monopolies. These companies, representing mainly United States and British capital merged with South African capital, are the chief beneficiaries of the maintenance of colonial domination in Namibia and of the extension to its people of the wretched practice of *apartheid*. It is racism in its most infamous and repulsive form which makes it possible for the profits obtained by the monopolies in Namibia to attain such exceptionally high levels. It is racism, that monstrous excrescence of a clearly reactionary nature, which has made the Namibian masses the victims of an especially cruel form of exploitation, which not only denies them their national rights to independence and liberty but also day after day deprives all of them of the exercise of the most elementary rights, collective as well as individual.

76. The attitude of the main Western Powers with regard to the conditions in which the Namibian people and the peoples of southern Africa live is one of the most glaring examples of the fallacious and hypocritical nature of imperialist policy. Those who, while lacking any authority whatsoever, have feigned a concern for human rights, are precisely those who are mainly responsible for the fact that in Namibia, as in the rest of the still oppressed territories in

the southern tip of Africa, millions of human beings are daily denied the most elementary individual rights and are compelled to suffer under a régime of oppression, segregation and racial discrimination, which is the infamous legacy of the dark days in which Europeans brought to African shores the scourge of slavery.

77. But thanks to the victorious struggle of the peoples of the world, those times are receding into the past. We are living in a new era in which the imperialists, colonialists and racists are no longer in a position to impose their will upon the peoples of the world. This is, in fact, the era of socialism, of the end of colonial empires and of the victorious struggle of the peoples of the world to establish international relations based on equality and mutual respect. Hence our conviction that nothing and nobody will be able to prevent the complete emancipation of all the oppressed peoples in southern Africa. We have no doubt that all the imperialist schemes aimed at frustrating the victory of the liberation movements will fail.

78. By their heroic struggle and their unflinching attachment to the cause of independence and freedom and with the firm and militant solidarity of all progressive Governments and forces, the Namibian people, led by SWAPO, their sole and legitimate representative, will be able to surmount all the obstacles facing them today and will attain the full exercise of their national rights.

79. It is necessary for the United Nations, however, to fulfil its duties without hesitation with respect to this Territory, which the General Assembly placed under the responsibility of the Organization. On this occasion, the United Nations has the obligation to express in a precise manner its support of SWAPO and its demand that in any effort to settle the question of Namibia all the principles and decisions adopted to that effect and reaffirmed by the Assembly year after year be fully respected.

80. It is not possible to confuse the brutal and predatory occupier with the oppressed people and their genuine representative. The Assembly must therefore make it clear that, when concessions are called for, SWAPO and Vorster's régime cannot be placed on an equal footing. In terms of sheer justice, the Namibian people are entitled to all their rights and claims, whereas the South African occupiers can only withdraw unconditionally from the usurped Territory in response to the unanimous demand of this Organization.

81. The South African régime has no right to remain in any part whatsoever of a territory which does not belong to it and which it is occupying illegally and by force, in open defiance of the decisions of the United Nations and international law. No one, no Member of this Organization, least of all those States which have special obligations as members of the Security Council, has any right or authority to ignore the resolutions adopted by this Assembly, to invoke powers which no one has conferred upon it or capriciously to modify the decisions of the international community with regard to Namibia. If those States were really interested in settling the question of Namibia peacefully, they would know that the key to such a solution lies in their hands. It would suffice for them to stop supporting the Pretoria clique and compel it to abide

by the relevant resolutions of the United Nations. We must reject with the utmost firmness any attempt to legalize, directly or indirectly, the South African presence in Namibia or to ignore the opinions of SWAPO, the only entity authorized to speak on behalf of the people of that Territory.

82. The Assembly should reaffirm its support for the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Namibia. SWAPO has made every effort to achieve those goals. On more than one occasion it has given proof of its desire to seek a peaceful solution. Yet Vorster's régime and its allies have stubbornly persisted in ignoring the national rights of the Namibian people and are trying to perpetuate the present situation by the use of force. In these circumstances, SWAPO has the inalienable right to resort to all the means at its disposal, including armed struggle, and it is the duty of this Organization and of all its Members to assist it in any way required until the complete liberation of the entire Territory is achieved. It is necessary to demand the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of all South African troops and military personnel and the dismantling of their bases and installations, as well as their illegally established administration. The area comprising Walvis Bay is an inseparable part of the Namibian territory and the South African régime has no claim whatsoever to it. We consider that it is the inescapable duty of this Organization to reaffirm its position with regard to Walvis Bay. It is absolutely inadmissible for anyone to attempt to justify in any way the South African occupation of that portion of Namibian territory. The imposition of onerous conditions on the Territory and in regard to the sovereign rights of peoples subjected to colonialism constitutes a flagrant violation of the Charter adopted at San Francisco and of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV); it is a loathsome expression of the old colonial mentality whose anachronistic persistence can only call forth the most resolute and firm rejection. Our people have learned at first hand the grave consequences which such attitudes can have. Even today, a portion of our territory that we cannot renounce, Guantánamo Bay, remains illegally occupied by the United States of America against the express will of my people and Government, who have unanimously and unceasingly demanded its return and on this occasion I repeat that demand with equal firmness. It would be both unjust and intolerable for the United Nations to view passively the attempts to compel the Namibian people to acquiesce in the amputation of any part of its territory. It is the more so in the case of Walvis Bay, which has a fundamental economic and strategic importance for the future of independent Namibia.

83. The authorities in Pretoria, those hangmen who daily commit the worst crimes against the people of Africa, have pretended, with a cynicism bordering on utter shamelessness, to justify the presence of their troops in Namibia by using as a pretext the assistance that Cuba is giving as a token of its solidarity to the People's Republic of Angola. The rulers of some capitalist countries also have no qualms in advancing similar arguments.

84. In this connexion, I should like to reaffirm the position of the Cuban Government. The collaboration between Cuba and Angola, including military co-operation, is a matter which is the exclusive concern of the sovereign,

free and independent States of Angola and Cuba. This is a matter on which we do not have to negotiate with anyone and about which we owe no explanations whatsoever to any other State, least of all to those which are today and always have been the worst enemies of Africa.

85. Cuban military personnel went to Angola for the precise purpose of helping the Angolan fighters to face and defeat the South African racists. That personnel is collaborating with our Angolan brothers in order to strengthen their defences and therefore constitutes a guarantee against South African aggression and provocation. The racist butchers of Pretoria and their partners should remember that. What cannot be tolerated today is the continuance of the illegal occupation of Namibian territory. What should be demanded with the utmost energy is the withdrawal of South African troops from Namibia and the end of provocation and aggressive acts against African States.

86. The Assembly should demand an immediate end to the acts of repression against SWAPO militants and the patriotic Namibian people, that all laws of a racist and discriminatory character be abolished, that the return of all Namibians forced to leave their country be guaranteed and that political prisoners be released. In the present circumstances it is imperative that the international community redouble its efforts to ensure that the United Nations resolutions on Namibia are complied with and to contribute to speeding up the end of the South African occupation. In this endeavour the decisions adopted during the last session of the United Nations Council for Namibia, which we fully support, are a positive contribution.

87. To force South Africa to withdraw its troops, end its illegal presence in Namibia and recognize SWAPO as the sole legitimate representative of the people of that Territory constitutes an urgent task for those who truly respect the rights of the peoples of the world and wish to promote international peace and security. Only thus will it be possible to create conditions which will make possible the peaceful establishment of an independent Namibia. Until that happens, SWAPO is fully entitled to carry on its struggle by the means it deems appropriate, and this Organization and its Members have a duty to do everything possible to contribute to a rapid and successful culmination of its liberation struggle.

88. The people and Government of Cuba, true to the standards of an international conduct, who have consistently maintained these principles which they steadfastly defend in the face of threats, pressure and harassment, reaffirm their resolute support for SWAPO and the Namibian people in their just struggle against colonialism and racism. In their distant trenches, in the gaols of *apartheid*, in the factories, shanty-towns, mines and schools, and in courageous confrontation with the oppressors, our Namibian brothers are not alone; they are encouraged and supported by all those who defend the cause of justice and freedom throughout the world. To them we send a fraternal message of solidarity, convinced that, in spite of all the difficulties they face, in spite of all the manoeuvres of their enemies, and no matter how powerful those who today oppose their liberation may seem, their struggle cannot fail to meet with complete victory.

89. Mr. ZAITON (Malaysia): I wish first of all to say how pleased we are to have Mr. Lazar Mojsov presiding over this important special session of the General Assembly on the question of Namibia. Undoubtedly, we are now entering a very crucial stage of our deliberations in finding an early solution to the problem, and it is indeed fitting that this should be taking place under his distinguished presidency. My delegation is confident that under his wise and capable leadership we shall be able to make substantial progress in the search for a solution to the problem which faces us.

90. My delegation would like at the outset to express to the United Nations Council for Namibia our deep appreciation of its excellent preparation of the documents for this special session. Indeed, the draft declaration and programme of action on Namibia have set the tone for this special session. We are also appreciative of the work done by the Council at its meetings at Lusaka in March this year. My delegation would like to take this opportunity of affirming our whole-hearted support for the Lusaka Declaration of 23 March 1978 and also the consensus adopted by the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples on 13 April 1978 [see A/S-9/6, annex]. Both the Declaration and the consensus have brought into sharper focus the serious political and military situation in Namibia. The continued illegal occupation of Namibia by the South African régime, coupled with its acts of repression against the people of Namibia, has made it all the more urgent for the General Assembly at this special session to reaffirm the responsibility of the United Nations for bringing about the immediate termination of South Africa's illegal occupation and the early accession of the Territory to independence. It is also appropriate on this occasion to rally international support for the efforts of the United Nations Council for Namibia in the discharge of its Mandate as the administrator of that Territory.

91. The Lusaka Declaration and the consensus of the Special Committee have undoubtedly underlined the need for all Member States to act in concert to prevent the further deterioration of the situation caused by South Africa's intransigence and deliberate attempts to perpetuate its control of the Territory. Recent reports indicate only too clearly that South Africa continues shamelessly to amass military power in Namibia and viciously to resort to devious manoeuvres to cling to that Territory for the purpose of exploiting its rich resources. These unscrupulous acts deprive the people of Namibia of their fundamental rights, including their sovereign right to enjoy the wealth of their own natural resources.

92. The representative of SWAPO, in his statement before the General Assembly two days ago, referred to the military build-up by South Africa and said that the latter's political objective was to frustrate and suppress the aspirations of the people of Namibia so as to prevent them from achieving genuine and immediate independence. He also said that that build-up was designed to consolidate the régime's position so as to enable it to achieve its hegemonic ambitions in southern Africa.

93. We cannot be oblivious either of the other designs of the South African régime. Its massive militarization of



Namibia and its campaigns of terror and aggression against the Namibians are without doubt designed to prepare the ground for bringing about an internal settlement of the Namibian problem, not in the interest of the Namibians as envisaged in the relevant resolutions of the United Nations but solely in the interest of the South African régime. This strategem should be thoroughly exposed so that Member States may be properly alerted. Certainly, the General Assembly should not overlook the prospect of South Africa imposing an internal settlement in Namibia similar to that by the illegal racist régime in Rhodesia. This tactic has not been ruled out by the United Nations Council for Namibia and the Special Committee. The Lusaka Declaration has, in fact, drawn the attention of Member States and the rest of the international community to the objectives of the South African régime in intensifying its moves to bring about a so-called internal settlement in Namibia which is actually designed to give the semblance of power to a puppet régime.

94. My delegation is of the view that such a development would only bring about more tension and violence in the area with incalculable effects on international peace and security as a whole. We reject any settlement that is not arrived at in accordance with the resolutions of the General Assembly. We reject in particular the Turnhalle tribal talks, which in our view were intended to divide the people of Namibia along ethnic lines and to perpetuate white racist minority rule in the Territory in line with that obtaining in South Africa and in Rhodesia, which time and time again has been strongly condemned by the United Nations.

95. We have always followed developments in Namibia with serious concern, and we do realize the tremendous difficulties the United Nations Council for Namibia is facing in its determined effort to implement all resolutions on Namibia, including Security Council resolution 385 (1976). All these resolutions, embodying, as they do, world opinion, have not succeeded in persuading the intransigent racist South African régime to withdraw from Namibia. Indeed, they have been studiously ignored by South Africa. It thus appears that the process of freeing the people of Namibia from their colonial yoke continues to be more and more difficult every day.

96. The problem is also compounded by the proclamation of the Pretoria régime of 31 August 1977 that it was annexing Walvis Bay and making it a part of the Cape Province of South Africa. This act of South Africa, designed to dismember Namibia, is to be denounced in the strongest terms. My delegation continues to recognize Walvis Bay as an integral part of Namibia, and we totally reject the proclamation of the Pretoria régime.

97. Allow me also on this occasion to reiterate the position of my Government. We will continue to support Security Council resolution 385 (1976) as the basis for a solution of the Namibian problem. That resolution provides for free elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations to be held for the whole of Namibia as one political entity. My delegation is pleased to note in this regard the initiative of the five Western countries to work out an acceptable basis for the implementation of the provisions of that resolution. We commend the willingness of SWAPO to associate itself with this initiative, which is

intended to seek a peaceful solution of the problem. This is indeed a positive decision on their part, and we hope it will be matched, if not more than matched, by South Africa's firm and sincere commitment to enter seriously into meaningful negotiations for its withdrawal from Namibia. Any further intransigence and lack of good faith by that régime would only justify the intensification of the legitimate struggle of the people of Namibia under the leadership of SWAPO so that they can exercise their self-determination and achieve national independence in a united Namibia. The options open to SWAPO, which we recognize as the authentic representative of the people of Namibia, are frightening, and we fear that an intensified struggle would bring with it nothing but more violence and bloodshed.

98. It remains for me to say that we will continue to associate ourselves with and strongly support all United Nations efforts to end the illegal South African occupation of Namibia and to assist the people of Namibia to exercise their right of self-determination and to achieve independence. This special session certainly provides a last chance for South Africa to rethink its policies and to undertake urgent steps to comply with the United Nations resolutions. Otherwise it will be incumbent upon the United Nations to take the necessary appropriate action, including measures under Chapter VII of the Charter, to ensure its complete and unconditional withdrawal from Namibia. We hope South Africa will quickly respond to this call with sincerity and good faith and avert the dangers of a more serious conflagration in that part of the world.

99. Mr. FALL (Senegal) (*interpretation from French*): It gives me particular satisfaction to see this ninth special session, which the General Assembly is to devote to the problem of Namibia, opening under the presidency of Mr. Mojsov. Aware of the support which his country, Yugoslavia, has so resolutely given to liberation struggles in Africa in general and Namibia in particular, we are convinced that this session will justify the hopes placed in it.

100. This is the second time the United Nations has convened a special session of the General Assembly to debate the question of Namibia. This particular action on the part of the United Nations falls within the framework of the constant action it has undertaken for more than 25 years now to find a just solution to a situation of concern which arouses the anger and indignation of every Member of our Organization.

101. The important statements made at the opening of this session by the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, Ambassador Konie, and by the President of SWAPO, Mr. Sam Nujoma, set forth objectively the essential facts of the problem before us.

102. Since the General Assembly adopted resolution 1514 (XV) on decolonization, many peoples victims of colonial oppression have won their independence and today occupy their lawful place in the United Nations. Unfortunately the United Nations is still confronted with a case with regard to which 12 years ago it declared it bore full responsibility, when it conferred upon the Territory an international status that would be maintained until inde-

pendence. Indeed, it was in 1967 that the General Assembly, meeting in special session, agreed upon arrangements whereby the United Nations could discharge its responsibility to Namibia and help its people to achieve independence.

103. Since that date our Organization has, each year, reaffirmed its position without succeeding in conquering the arrogance of South Africa, which still continues with impunity to defy the international community.

104. In this regard, it should be stressed that if the General Assembly, in 1966, decided to take the administration of Namibia from South Africa it was not solely for the purpose of preparing the Namibian people for the exercise of their right to self-determination and independence but also to remove the country from the authority of the racist régime of Pretoria which had proved itself unable to discharge its responsibilities as the Administering Power and whose policy and means of carrying it out were always in contravention of the purposes and principles of the Charter. Moreover, a paradox that nevertheless remains a sad truth is that the United Nations, which has done so much to help the peoples under colonial domination to win their independence, in this particular case is showing itself to be powerless—which is, to say the least, troubling—in dealing with the only Territory in the world which has so far been placed under its authority. Senegal has always condemned the situation in Namibia and will continue to give its resolute and unswerving support to SWAPO, the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people, in its just struggle for national liberation.

105. The perpetuation of the colonialist régime of occupation in Namibia has left the Namibian people and its national liberation movement no other choice but that of armed struggle to assert its right to self-determination, independence and national sovereignty and to preserve the territorial integrity of its country. In this struggle the heroic people of Namibia have encountered the implacable brutality of the racists of Pretoria who have established in the country a reign of terror and oppression modelled after the most wretched methods of fascism. Police violence, torture and murder are systematically being used against all Namibian militant nationalists.

106. We believe that it is the duty of our Organization to give all necessary assistance to the Namibian people and, through it, to SWAPO to enable it to drive the occupation forces out of its territory. The illegal occupation of Namibia constitutes a threat to international peace and security. There can be no doubt that with the repeated acts of aggression that have been committed against the neighbouring States, there is the risk of the South African presence in Namibia creating a situation with incalculably dangerous consequences. We are convinced that the increasing militarization of South Africa, which is deliberately using Namibian territory to launch attacks against independent neighbouring African States—in particular Zambia and Angola—will serve only to make a veritable powder keg of that region.

107. The year 1978, for more than one reason, seems to be destined to become the year of positive international measures against the racist South African régime and, in

particular, against its attempt to perpetuate its illegal presence in Namibia. Indeed, today there are real objective possibilities of solving the essential problems confronting us in accordance with the interests of the Namibian people and the peoples of Africa as a whole. There now seems to be an international consensus about the need for Namibia to become independent.

108. Last year the European Economic Community changed its policy of co-operation with the South African Government, realizing that the time had come to do so, and prepared a code of conduct for European businesses operating in South Africa. The announcement of those measures was described as evidence of a clear-cut political will to work towards justice.

109. It was also last year that the five Western members of the Security Council entered into a series of negotiations with the parties to the conflict—SWAPO and South Africa—with a view to bringing about a negotiated settlement of the problem.

110. Senegal, faithful to its vocation, welcomes all constructive efforts, both individual and collective, undertaken by States Members of the United Nations to bring about an acceptable solution, consonant with the relevant resolutions of our Organization, of this question which poses a threat to international peace and security. Representatives will therefore understand that my delegation is able to consider the initiative of the Western countries, which bear a special responsibility towards the Namibian people, as one that merits our vigilant sympathy.

111. The solution of the Namibian problem calls for genuine and determined political will, without which no secure basis can be found for an internationally acceptable solution to the problem. We should like to believe that such a political will does exist, because history abounds with examples that demonstrate that there is no way of conquering a people determined to resist—and the determination of the Namibian people to free itself is undeniable.

112. Unfortunately, we must recognize that the announcement made on 18 April by the South African Administrator in Namibia regarding the entry into force of emergency legislation certainly does not give grounds for optimism. Indeed, that legislation, applicable under the law on the prevention of violence and intimidation, authorizes the police to detain for seven days, without any justification, anyone who is considered to be disturbing the peace in the country, with the possibility of prolonging that period of detention for as long as may be necessary.

113. My delegation continues to believe that the conditions for the self-determination of a united Namibia have been clearly set forth in Security Council resolution 385 (1976).

114. The political settlement of the Namibian problem calls for the withdrawal of South African armed forces from the territory of Namibia, for respect for the national unity and territorial integrity of the country, and for respect on the part of the South African Government for the sacred right of the Namibian people to decide on its own destiny.

115. In that regard, we deplore and condemn the adoption by South Africa of measures designed to compromise the territorial integrity and national unity of Namibia. We consider that all States should strive to dissuade South Africa from pursuing its attempts to detach Walvis Bay from Namibia as a whole.

116. There can be no doubt that the collusion of foreign economic interests is helping to assure the South African Government of the co-operation from which it derives its impunity. Therefore, we consider it more urgent than ever to call upon States which have economic, military and financial relations with South Africa to break them off and comply with the provisions of Decree No. 1 on the protection of the natural resources of Namibia, adopted by our Organization on the proposal of the United Nations Council for Namibia.

117. The continued exploitation of Namibian resources by foreign interests poses a serious threat to the prosperity of an independent Namibia. In this regard, it is time for the Security Council to adopt the effective measures provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter which alone can put an end to the economic aggression from which the Namibian people suffer.

118. On 5 January 1976, in opening the International Conference on Namibia and Human Rights at Dakar, President Senghor stated:

“The time has perhaps come for the international community to shoulder its responsibilities. Can it be possible that one of its members, by its everyday conduct, should contravene its purposes and principles without thereby itself calling into question the links between it and the Organization? The provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter were surely drafted precisely to prevent a State, by its conduct, from disturbing international public order. In the future, therefore, a clear-cut answer should be given to that question.”

Let us hope that this ninth special session will provide the positive reply that we expect to all those relevant questions.

119. The General Assembly does indeed today face serious responsibilities. The United Nations has set itself the task of leading the Namibian people to independence. Any delay in achieving this objective entails indescribable suffering for that people, which should never have been forced to make the terrible sacrifices which it is forced to endure today in order to recover its freedom. The Namibian question quite obviously raises the question of the very credibility of our Organization.

120. For its part, Senegal continues to reaffirm the total responsibility of the United Nations for Namibia and reiterates its total compliance with decisions of the United Nations Council for Namibia, the legal Administering Authority of that Territory.

121. We consider it imperative that the international community intensify its support for the efforts being made by the Council to promote the legitimate aspirations of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence in a united Namibia.

122. Mr. ALLADAYE (Benin) (*interpretation from French*): The delegation of the People's Republic of Benin is particularly pleased to see the work of this special session of the United Nations General Assembly, devoted to the question of Namibia, accomplished under the presidency of an eminent representative of a country which is a close friend of ours, one which, in the non-aligned movement, has always made an outstanding contribution, to the establishment of genuine peace in the world, and, in particular, to the liberation of those countries still under colonial domination. We have no doubt that Ambassador Mojsov's great skill and his qualities as an able diplomat will help make this session a landmark in the painful history of the decolonization of Africa, of which the international community has finally become aware.

123. The sole question on the agenda of this special session of the General Assembly, the “Question of Namibia”, is closely linked to the potentially explosive general situation in southern Africa, which has long been of deep concern to my country, the People's Republic of Benin. That is why, as we participate in the General Assembly debate on this important question of Namibia, my country will once again discharge its militant and revolutionary duty to make a modest contribution in clear and precise terms, although our words may not necessarily please some representatives in this hall.

124. Indeed, no one is unaware of the fact that the infamous, odious Calvary imposed on the peaceful people of Namibia throughout its history is closely linked to the existence of the colonial, fascist and inhuman South African régime. And can one speak of the Pretoria régime without referring to its creators and real masters, the financial oligarchies and the countries which support, arm and move it to action? In fact, there is no reason why some, here, should pretend to be offended when we denounce their criminal and barbaric attitude and their full responsibility for the inhuman acts which are an offence to the conscience of all peoples that truly cherish peace and justice.

125. Ever since the days of the League of Nations, the international community has concerned itself with the thorny question of Namibia. Hence, the question is not new, and one may even fear that its habitual discussion may have dulled the urgency of the problem and rendered it a marginal issue, which has been discussed here by all, who vote on many resolutions that we know will not be implemented because they have been blocked and sabotaged by certain countries, well known to us. As a result of these debates, more than a 100 resolutions have been adopted by the General Assembly of our Organization—resolutions which, to say the least, have not done much to help the valiant people of Namibia to free itself from racist South African oppression. Similarly, the 16-odd resolutions adopted by the Security Council have certainly not prevented—far from it—the Western Powers who participated in their drafting, from continuing to give massive support to the racist régime of Vorster.

126. Finally, the four advisory opinions and rulings of the International Court of Justice also have failed to put an end to the attitude of the gentlemen in Pretoria—an attitude which is the more arrogant and aggressive because it is

overtly supported by Powers friendly to the champions of the inhuman policy of *apartheid*.

127. Thus, all those resolutions and advisory opinions have been but pious wishes, steadfastly repeated year after year in the pretence of solving the Namibian problem, when actually the net result has been but to lull the vigilance of the international community and ease the guilty consciences of those who fiercely plunder the resources of Namibia. It is because no proposed solution has assured the genuine safeguarding of the legitimate interests of the courageous Namibian people that they have been obliged to launch a liberation struggle, the success of which on all fronts is today causing great consternation at high levels in certain Western Powers. Indeed, for the past two years we have been witnessing frantic diplomatic activity among them which has produced an abundance of plans for a "peaceful settlement".

128. Thus, while the international community is trying at various Conferences, such as the Maputo and Lagos Conferences in 1977, to find ways and means to bring a favourable solution to the distressing situation in southern Africa, others are stepping up their diversionary tactics by daily heaping up all manner of plans for a so-called negotiated settlement. But no one has ever been taken in by these manoeuvres on the part of international imperialism, which actually are aimed at safeguarding its own interests now threatened more than ever since the victory of the freedom-fighters is inevitable and imminent. But the important fact is—and we proclaim it to all those promoters of plans—as long as people think only of setting up a puppet régime in Namibia devoted to Vorster and his masters, a régime dedicated to strengthening the policies of *apartheid* and bantustanization, all talks must inevitably fail.

129. Then what is the point of this special session? What can we say here that has not already been said and repeated? Was it really necessary to have a special session to discuss a question that has been a hardy perennial on the General Assembly's agenda ever since 1946?

130. If the General Assembly at this special session is to confine its work to the adoption of more resolutions to be added to the already impressive number of pious wishes expressed by the General Assembly for more than 30 years, it goes without saying that the disappointment of those who still believe in the capacity of the United Nations to maintain international peace and security will match the hopes that they once held of seeing this session move at last towards the total liberation of Africa.

131. If nothing were to be said at this session about the unholy alliance between the racist régime in South Africa and the Western Powers in their efforts to perpetuate South African domination over Namibia, then it would be clear that once again our efforts here will have been in vain.

132. If, finally, the Assembly at this session were unable forthrightly and with real determination to bring about a settlement of all the problems standing in the way of a peaceful settlement of the Namibian question, then we should have proved our powerlessness to implement the objectives of our Charter; and I am sure that you will agree with me that this would, indeed, be a distressing situation.

133. The People's Republic of Benin, with its optimism and faith in the future, believes that we can take up this challenge and meet our historic responsibilities and that this session towards which all eyes in Africa are turned, will make a decisive step towards complete liberation of the continent. But if that is to happen, then we must express here a sincere desire to put an end to Mr. Vorster's repeated attacks on international peace and security in that part of the continent. We say that the Western Powers which have created and indeed support that odious régime must prove that they are genuinely desirous of putting an end, once and for all, to that régime's manoeuvres, plots and acts of aggression against the courageous people of Namibia and the other peoples of the area. They must cease to consolidate South Africa's military build-up and, by all means necessary, bring about the unconditional withdrawal from Namibian territory of all South African forces. They must clearly reaffirm the territorial integrity of Namibia and make Mr. Vorster understand that the international community will never tolerate the annexation of Walvis Bay, which constitutes, in the opinion of all States Members of the United Nations, an integral part of Namibian territory and which cannot be the subject of any bargaining. Finally, they must vigorously denounce and combat sincerely the policy of *apartheid* and of bantustanization which the racist administration in Pretoria is trying to impose on Namibia. Once all this has been done, in particular, the immediate withdrawal of South African troops from the territory of Namibia, the conditions for genuine negotiations with SWAPO, the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people, will have been created.

134. In the course of this session we must seek to establish the political will required for any form of action to bring about genuine peace in Namibia and in southern Africa. If this will, which no one will fail to affirm in the statements made in this hall, is real and ready to be turned into action, and if the solidarity with the liberation movements is not just a hypocritical attitude aimed solely at lulling world public opinion, then perhaps there can be negotiations leading to a peaceful settlement of the question of Namibia. But as long as attempts at deceit are made to safeguard selfish interests dishonestly acquired, then armed struggle will continue to be the sole means that the Namibian people have to achieve respect for their rights to self-determination, independence and national sovereignty.

135. However that may be, the People's Republic of Benin is, and indeed always will be, prepared to lend its sincere and active support to any settlement approved by SWAPO, the sole authentic representative of the courageous people of Namibia. We are all the more prepared to provide that support because on 26 October 1972, the Beninese people's democratic revolution entered into a firm commitment to stand firmly by the peoples of Africa in fighting for the complete liberation of our continent.

136. The week of solidarity with peoples and countries struggling for their independence, organized at Cotonou and celebrated from 9 to 16 January 1978, in which a large number of foreign delegations participated, had as its sole purpose to assure the courageous fighters of Namibia, Zimbabwe and South Africa that the causes for which they were fighting were those which the entire international

community should support and that their victory—a victory in which we strongly believe—would be not only a victory of all fighting Africa but also a proof of the ability of the international community to establish peace and to guarantee security for all peoples.

137. My delegation would like to repeat its confidence in the complete liberation of our continent. We remain convinced that that liberation can be brought about through a negotiated settlement with SWAPO, the sole authentic representative of the people of Namibia, on the basis of the relevant resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council on the question of Namibia and, in particular, on the basis of resolution 385 (1976) which calls for the unconditional withdrawal of South African troops from the Territory of Namibia, the release of all political prisoners, the return to their country of all Namibian political leaders in exile in neighbouring African countries; and the holding of free elections on the basis of universal suffrage under the supervision of the United Nations.

138. So, the conditions for a peaceful settlement are known; but we say and repeat loudly that while it may be up to the fascist régime of South Africa to put an end to the traditional duplicity of its policy towards Namibia, it is also up to the Western Powers, who created and now support that abominable régime in its arrogance towards the international community, to give practical effect without ulterior motives to their professed wish to see a settlement, in the interests of the Namibian people, of the question of former South West Africa.

139. In conclusion, we should not want this special session to be just one more conference; we want it to contribute to the reaffirmation of the conditions needed for a negotiated settlement and to establish the political will required for the creation of those conditions. Otherwise, we very much fear that the Namibian people, under the leadership of SWAPO, may well have no choice but to continue to fight and to make the great sacrifices required of them in order fully and finally to free themselves of foreign domination.

140. Mr. HOLLAI (Hungary): It is regrettable to note that, more than 17 years after the adoption of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), of historical significance, the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples has remained an unfulfilled promise for the Namibian people.

141. The Hungarian people has deep sympathy for and strong solidarity with the oppressed people of Namibia, and it may count upon the support of our people in its just struggle against the racist régime of South Africa. This was emphasized again in a joint communiqué issued on 15 April on the occasion of the visit to Hungary of Colonel Roger Joseph Felli, Commissioner for Foreign Affairs of Ghana, on the invitation of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Hungary. The two Ministers reaffirmed that SWAPO was the sole legitimate representative of the Namibian people. They also emphasized the importance of an independence for Namibia acceptable to SWAPO and stated as well that they favoured the full, consistent implementation of the United Nations resolutions concerning Namibia, in their entirety.

142. My country has always supported the United Nations resolutions against the South African *apartheid* régime and on behalf of the Namibian people. This was true of the resolution establishing the United Nations Council for South West Africa, with the tasks, among others, of administering the Territory until independence, taking all necessary measures for the maintenance of law and order in the Territory, and transferring all powers to the people of Namibia.

143. It is not the Council that can be blamed for the fact that these provisions have not been fulfilled and that the situation in Namibia has further deteriorated. The primary responsibility for the continuing occupation of Namibia rests upon the leading Western countries, which are using all means to support South Africa. In defiance of repeated demands by the General Assembly and the Security Council, they continue to lavish massive nuclear, military, economic, financial, diplomatic and political support, ignoring the increasing condemnation and protests by world public opinion. They help the racist régime to gain the necessary means in order to continue its illegal occupation of Namibia and to perpetuate its domination over the Namibian people. They create an atmosphere of terror and intimidation throughout the country by employing tactics aimed at destroying the national unity and territorial integrity of Namibia and stifling the genuine aspirations of its people.

144. The United Nations has been acting consistently on behalf of the oppressed people of Namibia to isolate the racist régime. One of the most important steps taken since the beginning of this struggle has been the adoption by the Security Council of resolution 418 (1977) which, under Chapter VII of the Charter, prohibits the sale or any transfer of arms and related materials to the racist régime and any co-operation with South Africa in the manufacture or development of nuclear weapons. However, the recent documents of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* dealing with the collaboration with South Africa show that the leading imperialist countries members of NATO are completely ignoring these provisions and not implementing them.

145. By now, all the parties involved or interested in the shameful maintenance of colonial oppression in Namibia have begun to realize that the days of their domination are numbered. That is one of the reasons why they have begun new manoeuvres.

146. Since the beginning of 1976 South Africa has sought to mislead world public opinion by stressing the importance of the so-called constitutional conference as a step in determining the future of the Territory. From the outset the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity have denounced the conference as a manoeuvre by South Africa to fragment the Territory, perpetuate white minority rule and maintain control over the country. Now, when the white minority régime in southern Rhodesia has set in motion its so-called internal settlement, there is a real danger that the South Africans will try to follow that example to give a new impetus to the so-called constitutional conference. In our view, the General Assembly should reject this or any other similar plan.

147. South Africa is trying to keep one of the most important parts of Namibia, the area of Walvis Bay. In our opinion, at this ninth special session, the General Assembly should reaffirm the territorial integrity of the whole of Namibia.

148. Lately, irrefutable evidence from inside Namibia has shown that South Africa has over the last few months embarked on a reinforcement of its already large army in Namibia, in preparation for a major confrontation with the liberation forces led by SWAPO. This recent development has proved once again that any settlement outside the United Nations, without the total implementation of the relevant United Nations resolutions, without the participation of the United Nations Council for Namibia and the most important bodies of the United Nations, is unacceptable. The General Assembly has declared on several occasions that Namibia is a direct responsibility of the United Nations and has entrusted that Council with exercising internal and external administrative authority over the Territory until independence. In our view, that should be reaffirmed in the ninth special session.

149. My delegation supports the idea contained in the draft declaration and programme for action submitted by the United Nations Council for Namibia that requires the Security Council to apply—in addition to the existing resolution 418 (1977) covering the military field—the strongest possible measures in the entire economic area, including the sanctions provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter. In our view, the declaration and programme of action give a correct assessment of the situation in Namibia and provide the proper programme of action.

150. As far as the prospects for achieving peace and a real peaceful solution are concerned, up till now it has been SWAPO that has made far-reaching and substantive concessions to facilitate the negotiating process. On the other hand, South Africa has refused to enter into serious, meaningful negotiations for its withdrawal from Namibia. In this context, South Africa's recent readiness to accept the proposal for settlement presented by the five Western members of the Security Council leaves serious doubts concerning the real intentions of the *apartheid* régime. We are not certain that this step will bring real independence for the people of Namibia closer to achievement. Moreover, we believe that unless effective political, economic and diplomatic pressures are brought to bear on South Africa, there remains no way for the Namibian people to attain freedom but through armed struggle.

151. The Government of the Hungarian People's Republic, inspired by the firm convictions of my people, continues to give all possible support to the oppressed people of Namibia fighting for its independence, under the leadership of SWAPO. We are convinced that the circles obsessed by the ideology of racial superiority will not be able much longer to prevent the people of Namibia from exercising their rights, leading to real independence in the near future. We are equally convinced that the independence of Namibia will be one of the most important steps towards ensuring peace and security in the southern part of Africa.

152. Mr. BALETA (Albania) (*interpretation from French*): The problem of Namibia, which the General

Assembly is now considering, has for many years been a source of serious concern to the Namibian people, as well as to fraternal African peoples, all freedom-loving peoples and progressive opinion in the world.

153. Thanks to the struggle which the African peoples have waged for national liberation, thanks to the efforts which they have made to defend their national interests and consolidate their national independence and sovereignty, major changes have taken place on the African continent. Colonialism and neo-colonialism, the old and the new imperialism and the racist régimes in Africa have suffered crushing defeats as a result of the struggle of the African peoples.

154. However, a tense situation still persists in various parts of Africa. Many African peoples continue to suffer the evil consequences of colonial domination, of neo-colonial oppression, of racial discrimination and *apartheid* and of the policy of aggression and interference in internal affairs which the two imperialist super-Powers practise in Africa.

155. Namibia is one of the most striking examples of such a situation. The people of that country continue to be subjected to all the sufferings and miseries of the cruel domination of the South African racist régime. That régime stubbornly persists in perpetuating its illegal occupation of Namibia, pursuing a policy of barbarous oppression and *apartheid* against the Namibian people. The racist Pretoria régime tramples underfoot the sovereign rights of the Namibian people and at the same time challenges all freedom-loving peoples and progressive opinion in the world, which support the just struggle of the Namibian people and demand the restoration of their national rights immediately.

156. The situation and the turn of events in Namibia and the whole region of southern Africa show clearly that the racists of South Africa do not have the least intention of giving up their colonial domination in Namibia and that they are thinking only of intensifying their acts of aggression, terror and massacres in order to crush the national liberation struggle being waged by the Namibian people, led by SWAPO. It is with that same goal that the racists of South Africa also continue to intensify their manoeuvres and intrigues seeking by all means to mislead public opinion and force the Namibian people to lay down their arms.

157. The most recent events prove once again that the fascist Vorster régime is making great efforts to strengthen its military forces in Namibia and to step up its war operations against the Namibian freedom fighters and the civilian population. Furthermore, the South African racists are sparing no effort, with the assistance of the imperialist Powers, to engage in dangerous plots designed to shake the will to fight of the Namibian people, to break its national unity by fomenting disputes among Namibians, by fragmenting Namibia through the system of bantustanization and by openly laying claim to certain parts of Namibian territory, as in the case of Walvis Bay.

158. There is hardly any need to dwell on the barbaric and criminal acts and the treacherous manoeuvres of the South

African racists in order to prove what their goals are in Namibia, but we cannot pass over a very simple and obvious question: How is it possible for the Vorster régime to continue so stubbornly its occupation of and colonial policy in Namibia? How does it dare with such extreme arrogance to deny to the Namibian people the right to become independent and establish itself as a free sovereign State with its territorial integrity? One must wonder also why the racist régime of South Africa still dares to defy the just claims of the Namibian people, the will of progressive peoples and public opinion throughout the world.

159. It goes without saying that the South African racists could not alone without aid and assistance continue to pursue their criminal policy against the Namibian people. It is quite clear, in the light of indisputable facts, that the racist régimes in southern Africa have based their policy of genocide and *apartheid* against the peoples of Azania, Namibia and Zimbabwe, and their acts of aggression against African peoples, on the continued support and assistance in all forms of the imperialist Powers, primarily the American imperialists.

160. The imperialist Powers are employing every means, from very close and intense economic, military and political ties with the racist régimes to diplomatic manoeuvres, to save those régimes. In so doing, the imperialist Powers—primarily the United States of America—are seeking to serve their own interests and to promote their aggressive, neo-colonialist policies in southern Africa and throughout the African continent. It is for this simple reason that the imperialist Powers are sparing no effort to maintain the racist régimes in power for as long as possible and encouraging the barbarous acts and the ambitions of South Africa with regard to Namibia. The imperialist Powers are interested in preventing at all costs the collapse of the racist Pretoria régime in South Africa because that would be a great loss to them and would strike a heavy blow at their neo-colonialist policy, and their intention to continue to plunder the natural wealth of Namibia and other countries of the region.

161. It should be noted, moreover, that the South African racists have benefited and are still benefiting from the complicated situation created in southern Africa by the fierce rivalry of the two imperialist super-Powers, the United States of America and the Soviet Union, to the detriment of the national liberation struggle and the rights of African peoples. The South African racists feel more at ease when the African peoples are confronted with numerous difficult situations as a result of the ever-growing interference and rivalry of the two imperialist super-Powers, which, as we know, are intensifying their efforts to establish their hegemony and to share zones of influence in Africa by meddling more and more openly in the internal affairs of many African countries, by promoting tensions and conflicts among various countries, and by aggravating the disputes and difficulties inherited by Africa after the long colonial domination.

162. The American imperialists, who are the main protectors of the racist régimes in Africa, are pretending that they are seeking a reasonable and acceptable solution to the problem of Namibia. Under that pretext they are sending their emissaries to southern Africa, one after the other, and

making much misleading ado to lull the vigilance of the Namibian people and impose on them a settlement which is seriously prejudicial to their rights and legitimate interests but to the advantage of the racist régime of Pretoria.

163. The Soviet social-imperialists, for their part, are styling themselves champions of the defence of the rights of the peoples of Namibia and Zimbabwe, claiming to have no concern other than to support the liberation movements of those peoples. But, in fact, their sole concern is to take advantage of the circumstances in order to stab the national liberation movements in the back and to penetrate—politically and militarily—into the regions of southern Africa, to create bridgeheads there and to consolidate their position as a partner of the United States of America in the game of dividing the country into zones of influence.

164. The people of Namibia know already, from their own experience, that freedom and independence do not come as a gift. To attain their national aspirations they have made their choice. They have embarked, arms in hand, on the fight against their oppressors. The armed struggle which they wage under the leadership of SWAPO is the certain road that will lead them to victory and bring to naught the plans of the racists of South Africa, imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism.

165. It is precisely to head off the Namibian people from this path that the United States of America and other imperialist Powers are feverishly seeking to give the false impression that the problem of Namibia may soon be solved by other means, thanks to their diplomatic schemes and on the basis of the proposals and plans that they have elaborated and put forward. In fact, the enemies of the Namibian people, through the solution they are trying to impose on it, are seeking to buy the real solution to the problem of Namibia, to undermine the national liberation movement within the country and to satisfy their own cupidity and the claims of the Vorster régime.

166. The plan of the five Western Powers, which claims to offer a settlement of the Namibian problem acceptable to the international community, is but another link in the chain of plots hatched so far against the freedom and independence of the Namibian people, and has as its main objective to force that people to accept compromises detrimental to their rights, and to compel them to make concessions to their enemies. The fact that the imperialist Powers are claiming that the problem of Namibia can be solved only by a settlement acceptable to the international community very clearly reveals their true intentions. They seek to propagate the idea that it is necessary to satisfy the racist régime of South Africa and the imperialist Powers, thus justifying the violation of the rights of the Namibian people. This plan is just another attempt to come to the aid of the racist régime and to gain time for the preparation of new attacks and plots against the Namibian people's struggle.

167. But we already have sufficient evidence to know where they lead—plans of this kind prepared by the imperialist Powers, and their manoeuvres and so-called mediation in the search for the solution of problems such as the Namibian problem. We could not have a better example than the so-called internal solution which the Smith régime

has just proclaimed in southern Rhodesia. That plot against the people of Zimbabwe and their liberation movement was made out of whole cloth after a long series of intrigues by the imperialist Powers. The internal solution conspiracy in Southern Rhodesia proves beyond question the sinister nature of the efforts now being made by the Pretoria racists and their imperialist patrons to repeat the same game in Namibia. But the people of Namibia, like the people of Zimbabwe, have not fought and are not fighting to let themselves be manipulated by their enemies and to accept internal solutions or settlements directed against them by them.

168. The Namibian people are fighting, arms in hand, for a true solution to the Namibian problem, for their genuine freedom and independence, for national dignity, for sovereignty and for the territorial integrity of their country.

169. The Albanian people and their Government firmly support the just cause of the Namibian people, their armed struggle for national liberation and their efforts to throw off the domination of the racist régime of South Africa. We condemn with indignation the occupation of Namibia by the racist régime of South Africa, the policy of *apartheid*, the violence and massacres that régime is carrying out in Namibia, and its intention to deny the Namibian people the right to live free and independent. We condemn also the plans and intrigues of the imperialist Powers, which are designed to stifle the national liberation struggle of the Namibian people and to perpetuate racist domination in Namibia.

170. The Albanian people are convinced that the Namibian people, persisting in their armed struggle for national liberation, will surely win the final victory over the racists of South Africa and will thwart the plots and intrigues of their enemies.

171. Mr. PAPOULIAS (Greece): It gives my delegation great pleasure to see Mr. Mojsov, a prominent representative of neighbouring and friendly Yugoslavia, preside again over the General Assembly, this time at its ninth special session devoted to the question of Namibia. We are fully confident that his wide experience and profound knowledge of the United Nations will contribute once more in guiding effectively our work on such an important question.

172. I also wish to take this opportunity to express our appreciation for the work carried out by the United Nations Council for Namibia in the preparation of very useful documentation which focuses so effectively on the various aspects of the problem of Namibia to be discussed by the ninth special session of the General Assembly.

173. Greece has been among the very first countries to support in the most faithful and consistent manner the principle of self-determination of peoples in accordance with the Charter and the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly. Consequently, we have from the outset supported the assumption of direct responsibility for the international Territory of Namibia by the United Nations and the effective implementation of the United Nations resolutions regarding the inalienable right of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence.

174. In the process, we have also supported the establishment of the United Nations Council for Namibia to administer the international Territory until its accession to independence, and we wish to join in the praise that has been expressed during this session for the excellent way in which the Council has carried out its mandate.

175. It is deplorable that after so many years and efforts, our Organization has not yet witnessed the accession of the people of Namibia to independence because of the continued violation by South Africa of the principles of the Charter and its defiance of the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. The illegal occupation of Namibia by a foreign colonial Power and the oppression and suffering inflicted upon its people are an affront not only to the will of the United Nations but also to any notion of international order and justice. Further, we strongly condemn any attempt at extending to Namibia the policies of bantustanization and of *apartheid* or any other policies whose aim is to keep the indigenous population under colonialist régimes and practices. Such policies, which are bound to fail, would serve only to endanger the prospect for a peaceful settlement of the problem and threaten peace and security in the area, with the wider implications involved.

176. In the present context of the discussion, I wish to reiterate the unqualified support for Security Council resolution 385 (1976) which we voiced during previous sessions of the General Assembly, as well as at the International Conference in Support of the Peoples of Zimbabwe and Namibia, held at Maputo in May 1977. We stand by our position in favour of the immediate transfer of power and transition to majority rule in Namibia and the accession of the international Territory to genuine independence by a democratic process under United Nations auspices and supervision, that would at the same time ensure Namibia's territorial integrity and sovereignty over its natural resources.

177. It is self-evident that conditions of full freedom should be guaranteed for the holding of elections in the Territory by the release of all prisoners and the adoption of such measures as will preclude any attempt at intimidation. It goes without saying that this process cannot be based on ethnic considerations but must be based on the participation of all political forces, among which SWAPO plays a leading role.

178. We feel that, in the search for a peaceful solution of the problem, the proposals worked out by the five Western States members of the Security Council and presented to South Africa and SWAPO offer a valuable opportunity for arriving at a negotiated settlement in accordance with resolution 385 (1976) and through its implementation.

179. The infallible clock of history has struck the hour when South Africa must give full proof of the sincerity of its intention to co-operate in ensuring the accession of Namibia to independence without further delay. We trust that the General Assembly at its ninth special session will act with a sense of urgency in order to ensure freedom and independence for Namibia. If it succeeds in this aim, the session not only will have served the cause of the Namibian people but also will have contributed to the promotion of international peace and security.



180. Mr. ROLON ANAYA (Bolivia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should like to address my first words to our President, Mr. Mojsov, whose term of office covering three consecutive sessions will be remembered in our Organization as one of the most intensive and fruitful of recent years. His intelligence, wisdom and experience, as well as the fact that he represents a country and a Government so closely linked to mine and to the work of the United Nations, made it not only easy but also an honour and a pleasure for my delegation to discharge the duty entrusted to it by the Latin American Group of proposing Mr. Mojsov as President of the previous special session. His confirmation in that important position this time, when the very delicate and urgent problem of Namibia is being dealt with, is further proof of the general recognition and admiration of his talents and profound knowledge of the most burning issues entrusted to our Organization by the international community.

181. To the merits of Yugoslavia already described by my colleagues here—Yugoslavia, a country of recent and great achievements—I should like to add that of a strong national sentiment, free from any form of dependence or influence. Yugoslavia certainly has the merit of having developed its own national character and has given evidence of the historical truth that the choice of freedom for the peoples does not mean simply a change in the world centres of domination. True freedom means the ending of all overt or covert means of subjugating countries; genuine freedom means being truly free of the classic economic colonialist dependence, but it also means being free from any ideological, political and cultural dependence.

182. We have followed with interest all the statements made in the debate at this ninth special session of the General Assembly. Bolivia is definitely on the side of all the peoples who are struggling for independence, self-determination and the maintenance of the principle of territorial integrity. We are against any form of overt or covert subjugation and that so-called underdevelopment the true cause of which is dependence. Hence we welcome the progressive manner in which all peoples have agreed to support Namibia along the lines indicated by the United Nations itself through the Council for Namibia.

183. The freedom of one people affects the freedom of all the peoples of the world. The United Nations is acting in accordance with its principles and its great responsibilities, and the time that we are devoting to this ninth special session of the General Assembly is being well used, for at least two basic reasons, in our view: first, because we cannot remain indifferent to new forms of a colonialism which continues to act in our world in defiance of civilization and of mankind; and secondly, because the cause of the principle of territorial integrity is vital to Bolivia, one of the countries most affected by the economic and territorial plundering that was in the past the hateful order of the day and which in the future must be not merely redressed but ended once and for all.

184. Violations of territory and colonialist attacks can no longer be justified in any way, but they continue to occur. The sad and brutal doctrine of might is right continues to be practised. We are thus greatly encouraged by the reaction of all peoples to the subjugation of a nation such

as Namibia, whose cause is our cause, as is that of all men and peoples in the world, whose path should henceforth be illuminated by the light of freedom.

185. The Bolivian delegation reiterates once again its expression of solidarity with the countries which still suffer the evils of colonialism, and its firm determination to contribute so far as it is able to putting an end to them.

186. Since the adoption of the historic resolution 1514 (XV), the process of decolonization has become part of the history of the United Nations. Eighteen years have passed since then and none the less the people of Namibia continue to be under subjugation, domination and foreign exploitation in open violation of the right to self-determination and the provisions of the Charter.

187. Later, through resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966, South Africa's Mandate over Namibia was terminated as a solemn ratification of the prevailing desire of the peoples of the world, more especially among the free nations represented in our Organization, which thus decisively and irrevocably assumed responsibility for accelerating the process of liberating the oppressed peoples. Five years later, in 1971, the International Court of Justice reaffirmed and gave legal validity to the decision of the General Assembly.

188. The problem of Namibia has dragged on since then with no alternative to the violence unleashed by the forces of repression against the people's revolt. The situation, which in recent years has taken a dramatic turn and which more than once has aroused the feelings of the peoples because of the ruthless actions of the Pretoria Government, has now become untenable.

189. While this slow process has been going on, which makes it seem that time has stopped for Namibia and that nothing has changed in the world, many peoples have attained freedom and today occupy their rightful places in the international community as free countries, masters of their destiny.

190. The maturity gained by peoples of the third world in their undaunted struggle to free themselves completely from the fetters that reduce them to dependency upon colonialist Powers shows us that there can be no valid justification for the Namibian situation to remain static. Hence the singular importance of this second special session of the General Assembly devoted to this issue. This places us at an all-important cross-roads. Either the fundamental objective of a free Namibia will be achieved in full respect for and full compliance with the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council—that is, through peaceful negotiations—or a people will be left to pursue an armed struggle and hence we shall be abandoning our responsibilities.

191. A negotiated solution would not imply any abandonment of the African majority nor any renunciation of the full attainment of freedom without delaying tactics, without hesitation, without any other type of concession, such as, for example, yielding maritime access to Walvis Bay, or any other type of territorial fragmentation.

192. Bolivia, the South American country that has suffered the most injury to its territory and which now has no sovereign access to the sea, cannot accept such an eventuality. We recognize the sustained efforts made by some Western Powers in trying to create the necessary conditions for a negotiated solution, the essential key to which would be participation by SWAPO in negotiations, in keeping with the general consensus of Africa. We also recognize that the Security Council has tried to foster such a negotiated solution and has therefore welcomed with interest the initiative of the five Western Powers that are members of the Security Council. Its reception of that initiative should be taken into account, especially since the Security Council has already had an unfavourable experience in connexion with the so-called internal agreement for Zimbabwe.

193. As it has stated on previous occasions in the Security Council, my delegation feels that for an agreement of this type to be effective, the basic condition is that it not be a half-way solution, because the objective is to achieve a government that is fully representative of the people, and not to arrive at a partial solution imposed in a pseudo-democracy, which in fact would amount to outright foreign totalitarianism. The participation of SWAPO is clearly necessary because it represents the most effective and persuasive means of action of the people of Namibia with the co-operation of the front-line countries.

194. SWAPO's position has been reiterated several times in this debate. It has accepted some of the measures which, together with the complete withdrawal of Pretoria's illegal forces, would make possible a satisfactory and gradual transition to normality. This would facilitate the task and would permit the emergence in the near future of a free and sovereign Namibia.

195. Just as we feel that the patriots who have been forced to resort to armed struggle can in no way be absent from the negotiations, similarly, we should like to reiterate our conviction that we should not fail carefully to analyse and study any concession that would not mean defeatist renunciation. In other words, we should divest ourselves of any prejudices that might hinder the adoption of a correct approach to present reality. But that does not mean engaging in deceptive manoeuvres which when brought to light would only make the differences more acute and deepen the distrust and resentment now separating the parties to the issue.

196. The advantages of a voluntarily negotiated agreement are well known to all. It would undoubtedly strengthen the authority of the legitimate government that is to emerge if the present system of the provision of goods and services could be retained, so that nothing would be destroyed that might be useful for the speediest normalization of the economy and administration of Namibia. This does not in any way mean acceptance of the establishment of a puppet government or any manoeuvre which might covertly perpetuate the evils of the past.

197. In this connexion we wish to mention the essential role conferred upon the United Nations Council for Namibia. The fact that it has been omitted from the plan of the five Western members of the Security Council has been noted. We are sure that this will be corrected. In expressing our solidarity with the United Nations Council for Namibia we should like to acknowledge also its unshakable determination and loyalty. That determination and that loyalty are admirably and outstandingly represented in its President, Ms. Gwendoline C. Konie, who has excellently interpreted the profound nationalist ideals of African women.

198. We should like to express our agreement with the working paper submitted by the Council entitled "Declaration on Namibia and Programme of Action in Support of Self-determination and National Independence for Namibia" [see A/S-9/7] and we would only suggest that it be suitably simplified, since the text is at present repetitive and too long. Finally, we wish to express our concern at the apparent contradiction between its pacifist objective and its support for armed struggle, although in this case the latter is justified for two reasons: first, by foreign occupation and depredation and secondly, by a people's search for freedom. None the less, the pacifist spirit of the negotiated agreement, according to the terms of paragraph 17, would seem to invalidate inappropriate support for armed action, which is the means but not the objective of the dramatic process of self-determination for Namibia.

199. It is becoming ever more difficult in our present world to get peoples to accept such outmoded paradoxes as seeking freedom through dependence, establishing democracy through totalitarianism or achieving peace through war.

*The meeting rose at 6.40 p.m.*



CONTENTS

Agenda item 7:  
Question of Namibia (*continued*)

*President: Mr. Lazar MOJSOV (Yugoslavia).*

AGENDA ITEM 7

Question of Namibia (*continued*)

1. Mr. JAROSZEK (Poland): Mr. President, the Polish delegation is gratified to see you presiding over the General Assembly again at its second special session this year. Your country's contribution to the decolonization process and to the cause of a free Namibia stands out as an additional factor in the appropriateness of your re-election to the highest office in the world Organization. We trust that under your experienced and able presidency, the ninth special session of the General Assembly will make an important contribution to the final solution of the pressing problem of Namibian independence.

2. I also wish to take this opportunity to welcome to our midst in particular the chairmen of the delegations of African States. We extend our special greetings and assurances of full solidarity and support to the delegation of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people, headed by its President, Mr. Sam Nujoma. We address our warm welcome also to the members and the officers of the United Nations Council for Namibia, the legal Administering Authority for Namibia until independence and the policy-making organ of the United Nations in respect of Namibia.

3. The ninth special session of the General Assembly has been convened to consider the persistent refusal of South Africa to withdraw from Namibia and its manoeuvres to consolidate its illegal occupation of the Territory in violation of all the pertinent resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. Indeed, there can hardly be graver crimes than those that a Member of the United Nations could commit than those that have led to the convening of this session.

4. Namibia represents a unique case in international relations, as it is the only Territory for which the United Nations has assumed direct responsibility, by terminating South Africa's mandate more than 11 years ago.

5. The current session of the General Assembly has been convened at a crucial stage in the situation in southern Africa, at a time when the struggle conducted by the peoples of Namibia and Zimbabwe against white supremacy

and rule has acquired new dimensions and received a fresh impetus. In recent years the general relationship of forces in southern Africa has changed in favour of the national liberation forces. Since the accession to independence of several new African States, among them and in particular Angola and Mozambique, the position of the racist régimes has been considerably weakened. Owing to the unprecedented progress of the decolonization process in the past two decades a qualitatively new situation has evolved in and around southern Africa. This proved possible and, indeed, historically unavoidable thanks to the efforts of the progressive parts of the world led by the countries of the socialist community, which were the first to demonstrate enough political wisdom, determination and consistency to prepare the epoch-making Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples [*General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV)*].

6. The anti-colonial alliance between the socialist and the non-aligned world has emerged as one of the most decisive external factors in the victories of the national liberation movements on the African continent and outside it. The world of colonialism has thus shrunk immensely. What has been left has made itself distinctly conspicuous against the backdrop of positive trends in international relations in recent years, as a lingering remnant of the evils of the past, endangering international peace and security on both the regional and the global plane. This is precisely why the problem of Namibia has ceased to be purely a decolonization issue.

7. Poland has come to this special session as an ardent advocate of immediate and unconditional independence for the brave and great people of Namibia. This position of ours is not new. Our history of relations with other lands has no legacy of colonial dealings. In fact, it has always been based on the time-honoured and well established Polish tradition of struggle "for your freedom and ours", which is so much a part of our country's history.

8. Over the past 30 years, during which the United Nations has dealt with the problem, we have lent our unreserved support to the cause of the liberation of Namibia in accordance with the inalienable right of its people to freedom and independence. Our stand has always been consistent with the fundamental position of the Polish People's Republic of support for and solidarity with the peoples fighting for their freedom and the elimination of the last vestiges of colonialism, since it is inherent in the very principles of our socialist ideology deriving from our own historical experiences. It is in this same spirit that Poland has for long been active in the United Nations decolonization effort, including our membership in 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, at present, in the United Nations Council for Namibia. The same considerations guided the very successful visit to Poland a few months ago of a delegation of SWAPO, led by its President, Mr. Sam Nujoma. We are sure that the results of that visit will further strengthen the co-operation and solidarity between the peoples of Poland and Namibia.

9. The perennial problem of Namibia has been the subject of close to 20 resolutions of the Security Council and more than 100 resolutions of the General Assembly. Since the adoption of General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) in 1966, under the terms of which the United Nations put an end to South Africa's Mandate in Namibia, the Pretoria régime has not heeded in the slightest its obligations under that resolution. Mass arrests, killings, detentions and other forms of repression against the indigenous population of Namibia, particularly against members of SWAPO, have been the order of the day for too many years under *apartheid* domination. Indeed, the oppressive methods, similar to those of Nazism, which sound so familiar to us in Poland, have for too long haunted millions of South Africans and Namibians. It is therefore high time to tolerate no longer the policy of brutal repression and intimidation of the Namibian people.

10. Recent years have brought new manifestations of the illegal South African presence in Namibia. In an attempt to divide the people of the Territory and to deceive world public opinion, a so-called Turnhalle constitutional conference was organized with a view to imposing a puppet government on the people of Namibia. Manoeuvres to undermine its integrity and unity found new reflection in the illegal decision to annex Walvis Bay, so rightly termed by Mr. Sam Nujoma "a most provocative act of aggression calculated to provide racist South Africa with leverage to undermine Namibia's future sovereignty".<sup>1</sup> Attempts continue to impose a neo-colonial solution upon Namibia.

11. Over the last few months the South African régime has further reinforced its already huge military forces in the Territory in preparation for a major confrontation with SWAPO. South African troops are deployed throughout Namibia in a network of military bases equipped with sophisticated weapons including tanks, armoured cars and fighter-bombers. From its bases in Namibia the South African régime has launched armed attacks against neighbouring independent African States, in particular against Angola and Zambia.

12. Lately, a totally new dimension has been added to South Africa's occupation of the Territory. There is every evidence that the occupying régime has considerably advanced its development of nuclear weapons, using for that purpose the nuclear testing site and installations in Namibia's Kalahari Desert. It goes without saying that this dangerous development constitutes a serious threat not only to the Namibian people and its close neighbours but virtually to all of Africa. Once the Pretoria régime has nuclear weapons at its disposal it will create the most direct threat to the security of African States and it will greatly escalate the instability and tension in the south of Africa

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-second Session, Plenary Meetings*, 35th meeting, para. 64.

and intensify the nuclear threat on a global scale. Leading representatives of the régime are already openly boasting that in defence of their policies they are ready to use all means at their disposal and point out that South Africa has not signed the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

13. A particularly revealing aspect of the nuclear character of South Africa's policies stems from the fact that the nuclear shield for *apartheid* has its distinct ingredients of Western origin. Names of companies of NATO countries figure prominently on the list of suppliers of equipment for South Africa's nuclear installations now under construction or expansion. This is how some conceive of the General Assembly resolutions on the denuclearization of Africa and of the implementation of the solemn Declaration thereon adopted by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity.

14. The entire fabric of the Namibian problem is greatly affected by the continued material support and uninterrupted co-operation the Pretoria régime receives from the big monopolies of a number of Western Powers in open defiance of numerous United Nations resolutions. Were it not for their support, there would have been no vetoes in the Security Council on resolutions against South Africa's policies; were it not for their protective actions, the illegal occupation of Namibia would have ceased long ago. Thus, the situation in and around Namibia is, on the one hand, the result of the policies of the racist régime of South Africa and, on the other, a consequence of the support it receives in various forms, including arms deliveries, from its protectors, often on the pretext of an invented and non-existent "communist threat".

15. Any genuine effort on the question of Namibia must therefore serve the indivisible purpose of an immediate, final and unconditional solution of the problem. The crux of the matter is not formal independence under a *de facto* perpetuation of Namibia's colonial exploitation but complete decolonization of the Territory. Can it really be inspired or effectively assisted by those who not so long ago still opposed decolonization, who declined to vote in favour of the 1960 Declaration on decolonization and today are trying to take credit for that historic process on an equal footing with its most sincere and unhesitant proponents? Can it really be effected by those who pretend they are extending a helping hand to Namibia while with the other hand they are shaking hands with the oppressive régime for the sake of their post-colonial vested interests?

16. In the opinion of the Polish delegation, the solution of the explosive situation in Namibia lies in the implementation of the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. In their light certain basic conditions must be met in order to advance the cause of self-determination and genuine independence of the Namibian people. Paramount among them are the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of all South African military and police forces from Namibia and the immediate and the effective transfer of power to the genuine representative of the Namibian people, SWAPO.

17. We do hope that at the ninth special session, the General Assembly will prove that it is able to take decisive

action against Namibia's illegal occupation, that it will further mobilize the international community to increase its pressure on South Africa and that it will strengthen international support for and assistance to SWAPO in its efforts to fulfil the legitimate aspirations of the Namibian people. The programme outlined in the Lusaka Declaration adopted by the United Nations Council for Namibia in 1978 fully conforms to those objectives and offers the only feasible settlement of the problem, for unless effective political, economic and diplomatic pressure is demonstrably brought to bear on South Africa, no process of negotiation will succeed. In order to eliminate the threat to international peace and security created by South Africa it is imperative that the Security Council decide to apply vis-à-vis the Pretoria régime the strongest measures, including the sanctions provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter. In this regard, my delegation fully supports the concrete proposals submitted by the Council for Namibia in the draft declaration and programme of action [*See A/S-9/7, annex*]—namely, the imposition of comprehensive economic sanctions, an oil embargo as well as an arms embargo, including an embargo on nuclear co-operation.

18. For our part, we shall continue to render our total support and assistance to SWAPO. Both now and upon Namibia's accession to independence, we shall continue to help training its cadres which will be enhancing its economic, social and cultural development. We are looking forward to establishing close relations of friendship and co-operation with the future independent Namibia in the interests of both our countries and peoples.

19. Faithful as it is to the noble cause of the Namibian people, Poland stands ready to co-operate fully in bringing Namibia without delay into the family of free and independent nations.

20. Mr. LEPRETTE (France) (*interpretation from French*): The French delegation would first of all like to pay a tribute to our President, Mr. Mojsov, for the indefatigable energy that he has displayed in preparing for this session, his efforts to lead our work to a successful conclusion and the authority with which he has conducted our proceedings.

21. My delegation has listened attentively to the speakers, including a Prime Minister and several Foreign Ministers, who have set forth in this hall with great breadth of vision the positions of their Governments. My delegation understands and shares the feelings of impatience underlying the statements of many of them. The United Nations is, as we know, examining the question of Namibia and has been doing so for 30 years now. Nevertheless, since March 1977 the five Western Powers members of the Security Council, including my own country, have embarked on patient action to define and establish the elements for an internationally acceptable solution of the Namibian question in accordance with Security Council resolution 385 (1976).

22. The proposal that we arrived at, after so many months of negotiations with all the interested parties, were made public and distributed in a Security Council document on 10 April 1978.<sup>2</sup> That document with which all representa-

tives have been able to familiarize themselves, represents the result of long efforts at consultation and agreement. It is not a haphazard piece of work; it satisfies the requirements that have been recalled here and naturally nothing that was possible has been overlooked. It has the merit of establishing realistically the point at which a complex of antagonistic forces and positions can meet and balance out and it is important to reconcile those forces in order that they may cease to conflict to the detriment of the Namibian population

23. Some people will, of course, be raising questions about certain aspects of our plan; they will be challenging some of its premises and underlining its inadequacies. It seems to me, however, that what we should do is evaluate this effort as a whole and render a political judgement on the objective pursued.

24. Before recalling the guiding principles which underlie it, I should like to say something about the spirit that dominates it. The essential point of our proposal is, as it were, to give the floor to the Namibian people so that they can express their will through free and controlled elections, supervised by the United Nations. Permit me to stress on this occasion that a proposal to hold free elections was put forward for the first time by the delegation of France in the course of a debate in the Security Council in June 1975 in the following unequivocal terms:

“... one of the most appropriate means to attain [the independence of Namibia with respect for its territorial integrity] lies in the organization, under international supervision, of general elections throughout the Territory on the basis of universal suffrage.”<sup>3</sup>

25. That choice is not without significance; it entails political consequences. It gives direction to the efforts that we are making to achieve a lasting and just solution of that problem. In calling on the people of that country to express itself and in respecting its views, it is necessary to ensure conditions of equity in the campaign and the voting. That is the justification for our recourse to a substantial United Nations presence, both civilian and military.

26. No intervention from any source should be allowed to affect the free expression of the will of the people. But that approach also means that no group, no political movement—no matter how important—should have an *a priori* privileged position. The South African presence in Namibia has no legal basis. None of us denies that; but we must also concede that a transfer of power—since it means the withdrawal of a *de facto* presence—must provide for practical arrangements with those who replace them, if only provisionally, in administering the Territory.

27. Our wish to see progress in that matter and our preference for the diplomatic method implies that in our opinion the United Nations has to remain seized of the question of Namibia. In our plan the United Nations has a primary role to play in the political process as a whole. United Nations intervention can provide for SWAPO the assurances that it seeks and that would enable it without

<sup>2</sup> See S/12636.

<sup>3</sup> See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirtieth Year, 1824th meeting.*

reservations to play the constructive part that it should be playing, in the national interests of Namibia.

28. Having thus explained the true significance of our plan, permit me now to say something about its guiding principles.

29. The purpose of our proposals, as I have already stressed, is to enable Namibia to become independent under conditions acceptable to the Namibian people, and hence to the international community. With that in mind we have laid stress on three essential elements: democratic elections, the withdrawal and neutralization of the South African presence, and the guarantee of United Nations control over the whole operation. I should like to say something about those three essential elements.

30. First, the necessary conditions for organizing free elections are ensured by a number of clear-cut provisions. Before the beginning of the electoral campaign, the special representative of the Secretary-General, a post whose establishment we suggest in our proposal, should satisfy himself of the fairness and regularity of all the electoral procedures. Discriminatory or restrictive laws and regulations would be repealed, political prisoners would be freed and refugees readmitted to Namibia without fear of harassment. I should add that the role of the special representative would not be limited to responding to the plans of the administrator general. What is provided for, in effect, is that the Special Representative should be able himself to make proposals on any aspect of the political process.

31. To protect the electoral process from any interference or intimidation, the proposal of the five Powers provides for the total cessation of all acts of hostility and the withdrawal and neutralization of the South African presence. All South African troops would be withdrawn from the Territory before the beginning of the political campaign—with the exception of a contingent limited to 1,500 men, which would be stationed at one or two bases and under United Nations control.

32. Responsibility for the maintenance of public order would be entrusted to the existing police force, but this would be placed under the general supervision of the special representative of the Secretary-General, whose duty it would be to ensure their proper conduct and impartiality.

33. As to the day-to-day administration of the Territory, administration arrangements would continue to come under the supervision of the administrator general, but the United Nations special representative would have to be satisfied with any measures liable to affect the political process, at any level, before they could enter into force.

34. The clarifications I have just given highlight very well the third essential aspect of our proposal, namely, the subjection of the whole political process that we envisage to the guarantee offered by the various means of control exercised on the spot by the United Nations. In order to exercise his responsibilities, the special representative would have at his disposal a staff, both civilian and military, able to carry out the necessary tasks. The Secretary-General, as is customary for our Organization in this kind of operation,

would himself determine, after consultations with the interested parties, the number of staff needed, in the light of operational requirements and also of the financial and personal implications of his recommendations. Our proposals make it clear that the Governments of the five Powers, as members of the Security Council, will support the decisions to be taken by the Secretary-General in this regard. This point is of no small importance if we bear in mind the magnitude of our contribution to the functioning of the United Nations.

35. At this stage of our thinking, and at a time when many speeches have already been heard on this subject, we may wonder about the significance that should be attached to our work. The importance which the international community and our Organization attach to an internationally acceptable solution to the Namibian question has been demonstrated by the decision taken last autumn to hold a special session of the General Assembly. This has been confirmed by the scope and seriousness of the debate which began last Monday. It would be even better confirmed if the conclusion of our work were to include a determination of what can be done in the short term and did not close the door against the implementation of the proposals the principles of which I have just set forth. Our Assembly is a much needed forum; it defines guidelines and enunciates general principles; its support, therefore, is most valuable for those who are negotiating. On the basis of Security Council resolution 385 (1976), unanimously adopted, I would remind you, in January 1976, the five Western Powers put forward the proposals that have recently been submitted to the members of the Council, and on this point there can be no fundamental differences of objective between the General Assembly and the Security Council: both are seeking the same goals and aspire to the same Charter ideals. Therefore, let us in our work not throw away the chances for a realistic solution and let us think of the Security Council, which has the heavy task of proposing settlements that will be viable because they are lasting and applicable.

36. Our Organization is what the Member States make of it, and each of us has a share in that responsibility.

37. We note with satisfaction that the Government of South Africa has just accepted the five-Power settlement plan. We hope that this constructive attitude will open the way to the achievement of the objective pursued by the international community for many years now. I would remind you, in this regard, that that plan forms a whole, and we cannot separate or distort any of its elements. In this connexion, I unreservedly endorse what was said yesterday by the Permanent Representative of the Federal Republic of Germany [*5th meeting*] on behalf of the five Powers.

38. In conclusion, my delegation wishes to issue an urgent appeal to all those striving in good faith to find ways and means of enabling Namibia to become independent in freedom and to take its place, as soon as possible, as a full Member of our Organization. We cannot relax our efforts to see that reason and the search for peace prevail over the continuance of violence or the perpetuation of a reprehensible and politically unacceptable situation.

39. Mr. MARTYNENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*interpretation from Russian*): Mr. President, the delegation of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic would like, first of all, to congratulate you on your unanimous election to preside over the General Assembly at its ninth special session on the question of Namibia. We wish you success in this important and responsible post, and express our conviction that the convening of this special session will prove to be a step forward in United Nations efforts towards the ultimate elimination of the last vestiges of colonialism in southern Africa and towards the total implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples adopted on the initiative of the Soviet Union and other States.

40. The convening of this special session on Namibia, an item which has been on the agenda of the United Nations from almost the very first days of its existence, shows, in the view of the delegation of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, how great is the concern of the overwhelming majority of States Members of the United Nations at the extremely serious situation which has arisen in that Territory, for the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa represents a genuine threat to peace and security, both in the African continent and throughout the world. At the same time, the convening of this special session shows convincingly that the improvement in international relations and the strengthening of international security which have occurred in the world under the influence of détente have roused and activated the forces of peace and progress and the struggle for the total elimination of all the hotbeds of colonialism and racism, in the interest of all peoples who aspire to national independence.

41. The holding of this special session also demonstrates the aspiration of the overwhelming majority of Member States of this international Organization to put an end to the naked aggression of the racist régime of Vorster against the people of Namibia so as to eliminate one of the last remaining vestiges of colonialism and racism.

42. We have repeatedly asked ourselves why, given the clear-cut aspiration of the overwhelming majority of Member States to put an end to that shameful phenomenon of our times—colonialism—the people of Namibia still continue to suffer under the shackles of slavery. The major reason for this situation lies in the stubborn refusal of the South African racist régime to carry out the will of the international community and to meet the lawful demands of the Namibian people for freedom and independence.

43. Another reason lies in the assistance and support which is being given to that régime by the Western Powers, primarily, certain members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). Those countries, instead of exerting pressure on South Africa to compel it to comply with United Nations decisions, are continuing to do everything they can to strengthen the South African racist régime militarily and economically, and are providing it with broad political and diplomatic support.

44. American banks alone have given South Africa loans totalling \$853 million. Numerous American monopolies have been maintaining relations with their partners in South Africa. Monopolies of other Western countries have equally

close ties with the South African racist régime. Vast sums of Western capital are pouring into South Africa and are yielding fabulous profits to the monopolies. It is well known, for example, that 80 per cent of the profits from the exploitation of the natural resources of Namibia goes to the West. Naturally, therefore, the monopolists are not at all attracted to the prospect of losing their vast investments and being deprived of their fabulous profits as a result of the liberation of Namibia.

45. The close links between the military, political and economic interests of the South African régime and certain foreign circles also provide a kind of screen behind which Pretoria can take refuge. Sheltered behind this screen, South African rulers are arming themselves intensively. According to the Western press, over the last four years the expenditures of South Africa for military purposes have grown by 250 per cent and amounted in 1977 to almost \$2 billion. The racists are also stepping up their military potential in the illegally occupied Territory of Namibia. The strength of the South African troops now exceeds 50,000 men. There is a constant expansion of the network of South African military bases situated in the direct vicinity of the borders of neighbouring independent African States from which the racists are constantly threatening those States. Namibia has, in essence, been converted into a springboard for attacking neighbouring countries, and that is precisely the purpose of the illegal annexation by Pretoria of Walvis Bay, which is an integral part of the Territory of Namibia.

46. It is precisely certain Western countries which have helped South Africa to create a military industry that is now working at full capacity. As the South African racists themselves acknowledge, over the last 10 years the expenditures of South Africa for armaments have increased 15-fold and amounts to 979 million rand, as a result of which the production of ammunition, arms, aircraft, electronic equipment and so forth in South Africa has reached a level now enables South Africa to export these modern arms and military equipment to other countries.

47. What is particularly alarming to the international community are the facts concerning the co-operation of certain Western countries with South Africa in the nuclear field. In the plans for manufacturing nuclear weapons in South Africa, an important place is occupied by the Territory of Namibia. It is quite obvious that the manufacture of nuclear weapons in South Africa would pose a direct threat to the security of African countries, would further imperil the stability of the whole of Africa and increase the danger of nuclear war for the whole of mankind.

48. Because of entirely comprehensible circumstances and reasons, the mass media in the West do not take the risk of publicizing too widely this continuing co-operation. At the same time, the media are attempting to represent the diplomatic manoeuvres undertaken by the West as being, as it were, a kind of panacea for all the ills afflicting southern Africa. However, it has long been obvious to everyone what lies behind the widely advertised initiative of the Western Powers.

49. As was recently written in the London paper, *Africa*, the coming to power of progressive governments in Mo-

Zimbabwe and Angola and the scope of the national liberation movement in Zimbabwe, Namibia and South Africa itself have made it necessary for the Western countries to make an agonized reappraisal of their political policy and sharply to step up their diplomatic, political and military actions so as to prevent in the future a loss of control over such an economically, strategically and otherwise important part of the world as is the Territory of Namibia and the whole of southern Africa.

50. In a recent statement made in the United States Congress, one of the members of the House of Representatives put forward a number of facts which largely explain the reason for the extraordinary interest of Western countries in preserving control over that part of the world. According to that data, the territory of South Africa contains 64 per cent of the world's reserves of vanadium, 83 per cent of the chromium reserves, 86 per cent of those of the platinum group of metals, 49 per cent of the world's reserves of gold and so on. If the West were to lose control of the south of Africa, this congressman went on to assert, it would deal a death blow to the economy of the whole of the Western world. To this can be added that the United States alone imports from South Africa 98 per cent of the cobalt it uses, 99 per cent of its manganese, 91 per cent of its chromium, 80 per cent of its platinum and 36 per cent of its vanadium.

51. Thus, the co-operation of the West with the racist régime of South Africa is the reason why that régime not only permits itself arrogantly to disregard the demands of such a representative and authoritative international organization as the United Nations but also strives to strengthen its position in Namibia.

52. There has been a very dangerous expansion of the military presence of South African troops. If we were to add to this the considerable police force, which is almost indistinguishable from military contingents, then the situation becomes even more alarming. South African police and troops have established a system of repression and terror against the Namibian people. Intimidation, arrests, trials, torture and executions have now become everyday events in Namibia today. In that Territory the most brutal and Draconian laws borrowed from fascism are in effect.

53. An emergency situation has been declared in Namibia. However, nothing has broken or can break the will of the valorous people of Namibia to struggle for freedom under the leadership of SWAPO, which is the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people.

54. From this rostrum, points have been made by the five Western Powers with regard to a so-called peaceful settlement in Namibia. The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR does not want to go into an analysis of those points. I would simply remind the representatives that, as stressed by our delegation speaking at the thirty-second session of the General Assembly on the question of Namibia [*38th meeting*], no one, of course, denies the possibility of resolving the problem of Namibia by peaceful means but only on the understanding that such a solution conform to the basic interests of the indigenous population of Namibia. But we cannot fail to point out that the present circumstances for arriving at a peaceful settlement have taken an

even worse turn than those that originally prevailed. It is becoming clear that what are being made here are attempts to resolve the fate of the Namibian people by circumventing the decisions of the United Nations and of the Organization of African Unity. They also ignore important provisions of Security Council resolution 385 (1976), which has so often been mentioned here, and aim to reduce the independence of Namibia to a mere piece of fiction, thus preserving the economic and strategic interests of the West in that area of southern Africa.

55. The reply of South Africa on 25 April to the proposal of the five Powers once again convinces us of that fact. It is not surprising, therefore, that all the rounds of the talks on this question and the pressure to which SWAPO and the front-line States have been subjected have inevitably produced a deadlock. We are convinced that the people of Namibia will not allow themselves to be misled by the mirage of an "independence" granted by South Africa.

56. As was pointed out in one of the recent interviews given by the President of SWAPO, Sam Nujoma,

"The United States, Britain, the Federal Republic of Germany, France and Canada have recently stepped up their efforts in order—as they assert—to settle the problem of Namibia by peaceful means. By their words they support the national liberation movement of our people, but in actual fact they continue to give the racist régime of Pretoria economic, military and other kinds of aid. With their support, the plan for the creation in Namibia of a puppet conference made up of 11 so-called independent bantustans is being carried out. In practical terms, this would enable the racists of South Africa to preserve control over Namibia and the foreign monopolists to go on plundering our people."

57. The delegation of our country is firmly convinced that the present session on Namibia should become an important turning point in the struggle of the Namibian people and of the world community for a cessation of the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa and the attainment by the courageous people of Namibia of genuine independence.

58. Like the overwhelming majority of States Members of the United Nations, the Ukrainian SSR is firmly convinced that a just solution of the Namibian problem is possible only if all fundamental principles formulated in the decisions of the Security Council and of the General Assembly are fully and unswervingly implemented.

59. This means, first and foremost, the immediate and unconditional withdrawal from the whole Territory of Namibia, including Walvis Bay, of all South African contingents of armed forces, police, military and civilian administration personnel and also the dismantling of all military and paramilitary groups. Complete power in the Territory of Namibia should be handed over as soon as possible, to the Namibian people headed by SWAPO, which is recognized by the Organization of African Unity (OAU) as their sole and authentic representative.

60. If the South African régime persists in its policy of colonial and racist oppression of the Namibian people, no



one has the right to demand that the patriots of Namibia should call a halt to their armed struggle for liberation. If it does persist, it is the direct duty of the United Nations not only fully to impose an embargo on arms deliveries to South Africa but also immediately to introduce binding sanctions in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter against the Pretoria régime, and this would include the cessation of loans, investments and economic links.

61. The General Assembly at this present special session should take effective measures immediately to call a halt to the illegal occupation of Namibia by the South African racist régime and to transfer all power in that country to the authentic representatives of the Namibian people, the patriotic forces headed by SWAPO.

62. The delegation of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic is convinced that it would have been possible long since to welcome in this hall the representatives of a new State Member of the United Nations, a free Namibia, if certain countries had renounced their policy of appeasement of the butchers of the Namibian people and had supported the decision for the application of sanctions, at the time when such sanctions were first proposed. We are, however, also convinced that the Namibian people will be victorious in their struggle for independence. The inevitable victory of the patriots of Namibia is guaranteed not only by the just character of that struggle, but also by the broadly based solidarity with which they have met—and with which, we are sure, then will continue to meet—from all progressive, genuinely democratic forces in the world. We are firmly convinced, too, that the day is near when, as a result of the struggle of the patriots of Namibia, Zimbabwe and South Africa, supported by their true friends throughout the world, these last bastions of colonialism and racism on African soil will collapse and new full-fledged members will take their place in the ranks of the United Nations.

63. The elimination of the hotbeds of colonialism will be an important contribution to the process of improvement of the international climate, the deepening and strengthening of détente and, in the final analysis, the achievement of the fundamental goal of the United Nations: the maintenance and strengthening of international peace and security.

64. Mr. ZAÏMI (Morocco) (*interpretation from French*): I should like first to perform the pleasant duty of extending my delegation's congratulations to you, Mr. President. The Assembly has shown its confidence in you by entrusting to you once again the direction of its work during the eighth and ninth special sessions. In fact, we should be congratulating ourselves at seeing you residing over our debates and placing your long and solid experience at the service of the international community as it deals with major concerns. In view of the excellent way in which you guided the work of the thirty-second session of the Assembly, and the diligence and effectiveness with which you led the discussions at the eighth special session—a session which I regard as exemplary, indeed ideal, because of its brevity and its concrete results—there can be no doubt that this ninth special session, on Namibia, has an extremely good chance of producing a final settlement of a problem that has been with us only too long.

65. Why does there have to be a special session on Namibia? In my delegation's opinion, such a special session is the expression of the mixed feelings of the international community at the present time: feelings of hope and disquiet, of flexibility and intransigence. We are, indeed, at a decisive turning point in the history of this African territory which has been for far too long the victim of shameful exploitation, with all the injustices and misfortunes that entails. We feel that the real meaning of history is now beginning to appear on the horizon. At the same time, however, we are well aware of the enormous difficulties still to be overcome.

66. At this turning point in the process of the deliverance of the people and Territory of Namibia, we must recall the guiding principles laid down in decisions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. We must never forget that South Africa's presence in Namibia, whether civilian or military, is illegal. One would have to be very broadminded and demonstrate praiseworthy flexibility even to think of regarding South Africa as a genuine party to this question. Moreover, we must constantly bear in mind the fact that SWAPO is the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people and of its aspirations.

67. The relentless struggle that SWAPO has had to wage for the liberation of Namibia and the achievement of an independent Namibian State, as well as SWAPO's political maturity and its keen awareness of its historic responsibility, make it clear that there can be no true and lasting settlement of the Namibian problem without SWAPO—and, still less, against it.

68. At this decisive stage in the history of the question of Namibia, our primary duty is to avoid playing with words. We must not label independence something which is not independence. A similar remark may be made in connexion with the words: free elections, supervision or control.

69. I should like to take this opportunity to state how highly we value the continuing efforts of the Western members of the Security Council to make a useful contribution in overcoming the impasse relating to the Namibian problem. We are aware that those efforts have been based on Security Council resolution 385 (1976). We are aware also of the awkward position in which these countries have found themselves whenever they have had to attempt to reconcile the irreconcilable to safeguard their interests while at the same time acting in accordance with international legality and in accordance with their knowledge of the historical developments taking place in Africa and the third world as a whole.

70. We continue to believe also that the Western countries have a very strong hand and that they have room in which to manoeuvre which enables them to exert more useful pressure to induce the Pretoria Government to accept the obvious.

71. We must not ignore the existence of the United Nations Council for Namibia. The Council is, in fact, the depositary of the sovereignty of the Namibian people. The fact that, because of the intransigence and obstinacy of the racist Government of South Africa, that Council has not been able to exercise its prerogatives on the international

territory of Namibia does not take anything away from its legal status, which has been recognized by the international community as a whole. Consequently, the role of supervision and control entrusted to the United Nations cannot be contemplated without the participation of the Council for Namibia. To do so would mean that the United Nations was turning its back on its own decisions, to please South Africa.

72. Another obscure point that requires clarification relates to Namibia's territorial integrity. I am referring to the question of Walvis Bay. My delegation maintains that this question cannot be subject to any bargaining. In that respect we firmly and resolutely support the SWAPO position. The international community, as represented by the General Assembly, has the duty to reaffirm solemnly that the port of Walvis Bay is an integral part of Namibian territory. In this connexion we still feel that the plot against the national unity, the territorial integrity and the economic potential of Namibia and the representative character of its liberation movement has not been abandoned.

73. Indeed, the South African racist régime, which is illegally occupying the Territory of Namibia, intends to maintain a significant part of its armed forces in the Territory even after independence. It is counting on the setting up of a questionable régime which would allow it to perpetuate its military and economic control over the Territory and to keep Walvis Bay forever outside Namibian sovereignty. This is clearly a manoeuvre to undermine any chance of a genuine process of liberation of the Territory. It is also a clear threat to strangle the economy of the young future State, even before it actually emerges.

74. Certain voices are whispering timidly that Walvis Bay poses a complex problem from the legal standpoint which might well call for a solution of a purely political character, one that might possibly be arrived at between South Africa and the Government of an independent Namibia through negotiations. We believe that that kind of approach would create more legal difficulties than it would resolve. For, if consultations do not include Walvis Bay or if they take place in the presence of occupying forces having no intention of evacuating the Territory-- which would not fail to distort the results in favour of the occupier--a new legal argument will be handed to South Africa with the blessing of the international community. That is why, I repeat, there is an overriding need solemnly to reassert that Walvis Bay comes under Namibian sovereignty. That is also why there is an overriding need for the immediate withdrawal of South African forces from this area as part of the process leading to the emergence of the independent Namibian State.

75. We are of course well aware that the path to the total and final liberation of the international territory of Namibia remains difficult and arduous. Bad faith and ulterior motives will always prevail in the attitude and behaviour of South Africa. That racist minority régime knows that genuine independence for Namibia and Zimbabwe will surely sound the death knell of its very existence and lay bare its racist and illegal nature. It is therefore imperative for the international community to redouble its efforts and to exercise increasingly every form

of pressure consistent with international morality and the spirit and the letter of the Charter. The international community as a whole must persevere in its salutary action to put an end to this flagrant injustice, especially since everyone today is well aware of the cause and effect relationship between the situation in southern Africa and the maintenance of international peace and security.

76. Our obligation, at once moral and political, is to reaffirm, but above all to put into daily practice in the behaviour of our Governments, the principles and decisions adopted by our international Organization. We must maintain our total support for the struggle of the Namibian people and we must apply, against the usurping régime of South Africa, appropriate sanctions deriving from the implementation of the relevant provisions of the United Nations Charter.

77. In this connexion we believe that the Lusaka Declaration and the draft declaration and programme of action prepared by the United Nations Council for Namibia, as well as the consensus adopted by the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples constitute a most valuable basis for the decisions which our Assembly will be adopting on this subject.

78. We should like to believe that the international community, having decided to hold a special session devoted to the question of Namibia and to combine its efforts with a view to arriving at the long-awaited settlement, is more than ever determined to make this special session the final stage towards the realization of the legitimate aspirations of the Namibian people and the decisive step towards strengthening the chances of peace and stability in southern Africa.

79. Mr. DENNIS (Liberia): Mr. President, it is for me a great pleasure to see you presiding over this ninth special session of the General Assembly devoted to the important question of Namibia. Your distinguished performance as President of the thirty-second session of the Assembly assures us that you will give competent guidance to our deliberations.

80. To our able Secretary-General, we express the highest commendation for his selfless and indefatigable efforts in the interest of world peace and security.

81. I should like also to extend our sincere congratulations and appreciation to Her Excellency, Ambassador Gwendoline Konie, President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, for the excellent manner in which she has been conducting the affairs of the Council, especially its plenary session held recently at Lusaka

82. In the same vein, we commend all those who have contributed to the work of the Council, particularly the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia, Mr. Martti Ahtisaari, for his untiring efforts in executing the mandate given him by this Assembly to hasten the independence of Namibia.

83. Liberia has always manifested serious concern about the plight of oppressed peoples everywhere, and its histori-

cal involvement in the struggle for Namibia's independence is well known. My Government's commitment to this cause remains unswerving and unreserved. Our respect for the sanctity and inviolability of the principles of freedom, justice, equality, human dignity and territorial integrity is as reverent today as in 1960, when, together with Ethiopia, Liberia instituted legal proceedings in the International Court of Justice against South Africa's illegal administration of the Territory.

84. For over three decades the United Nations has been grappling with the vexing problem of Namibia. And yet today, after such a protracted period, this body has been reconvened again in a special session in the search for a peaceful transition to independence for the people of Namibia.

85. The special responsibility of this Organization to the Namibian people emanates from the fact that the land of their fathers, the only heritage to which they are entitled in the enjoyment of freedom, justice and equality was, with the acquiescence of a world body of the same magnitude and authority as the United Nations, given to an Administering Power as a sacred trust. The betrayal of that trust is too well known and the history of Namibia is replete with incidents of mass atrocities, of flagrant denials of fundamental rights, of brutal oppression and repression.

86. It is not silence or inaction on the part of the United Nations which has caused the Namibia question to persist. But it would appear that, for the most part, the action taken has been limited to verbal pronouncements. The United Nations has unequivocally expressed itself on this question and issued demands upon demands to the South African Government, in scores of resolutions adopted by this Assembly and the Security Council, as well as opinions handed down by the International Court of Justice, to terminate its administration of the Territory.

87. Despite these measures the situation in Namibia has deteriorated. South Africa's intransigence and obduracy have taken more unpalatable forms and its arrogance has assumed a most uncompromising character. In open defiance of this world body, the Pretoria régime persists in its military build-up in Namibia through the shipment of large quantities of tanks and ammunition, the construction of army barracks and increased military personnel. Today, we understand South Africa has embarked upon the development of nuclear weapons—all of which are designed to maintain its illegal control over the Territory and to prevent the oppressed Namibian people from attaining self-determination, freedom and independence.

88. The evidence abounds in summary arrests, detention, imprisonment and murder of innocent blacks in Namibia by the South African authorities. The heinous policy of bantustanization, the outgrowth of *apartheid*, is institutionalized in Namibia. Rather than conform to Security Council resolution 385 (1976) which calls for the transfer of power to the majority in Namibia through free, fair and democratic elections under United Nations supervision and control, South Africa has intensified preparations to implement a so-called internal settlement as a subterfuge to impose a puppet government upon the Namibian people.

89. My Government has always held the view that the genuine independence of Namibia would require the fulfilment of certain fundamental conditions. First—and there is consensus on this point—that South Africa's complete withdrawal from the territory is a *sine qua non* for independence. Its mandate having been terminated, the racist régime has no basis for closing its despotic tentacles around Namibia.

90. Secondly, any formula for independence must accord to SWAPO a distinction commensurate with its role as the legitimate liberation movement of the Territory. For it is SWAPO that continues to wage an heroic struggle against the forces of oppression; it is SWAPO that has awakened the consciousness of the Namibian people to the injustices and indignities daily inflicted upon them; it is SWAPO which continues to arouse world public opinion to the degrading and dehumanizing character of *apartheid* practised in Namibia. Indeed, SWAPO is deserving not only of our highest commendation but also of our unreserved moral, political, diplomatic and material support.

91. Thirdly, any formula for a settlement must uncompromisingly respect the territorial integrity of Namibia and consider independence for the whole of the Territory as a unitary State.

92. Fourthly, this world body, being the sole authority responsible for administering the Territory, through the United Nations Council for Namibia, must exercise full control, supervise the transfer of power and ensure free, fair and democratic elections.

93. It is within this framework that we are to assess the progress thus far made.

94. My Government has followed with keen interest the initiatives commenced in March 1977 by the five Western Powers to devise an internationally acceptable formula for the self-determination and independence of Namibia. It is because Liberia would prefer to see Namibia accede to nationhood through peaceful means that we have welcomed the initiatives of the five Western Powers so long as they were being conducted within the framework of resolution 385 (1976).

95. After one year of what must have been very intensive negotiations on Namibia's independence, proposals have emerged from the group of five which were elaborated upon by the Secretary of State for External Affairs of Canada in his address to this Assembly [*3rd meeting*]. We were also informed by this same source that South Africa has accepted the terms of the proposal. Given the deceptive, capricious and callous nature of the Pretoria régime, my delegation reserves for now its comments on that decision. For we have noted that it is the tendency of the Pretoria régime to misconstrue, distort and misinterpret merely to suit its own needs and fancies, causing what may be worth-while efforts to appear as skilful manoeuvres.

96. Be that as it may, we find wisdom in the proverb that "a journey of a thousand miles must begin with a first step". The members of the group of five therefore deserve our appreciation and commendation for the efforts they have exerted over the past months culminating in the

proposals which by any yardstick of measurement constitute a significant step forward in the direction of Namibia's independence.

97. It is the opinion of my delegation that the proposals, on the whole, provide a reasonable basis for further negotiations on the independence of Namibia. That is to say we cannot, in good faith, accept the proposals as conclusive or non-negotiable as presented by the Secretary of State for External Affairs of Canada. This is so because we have observed in the five-nation proposal an omission so germane as to warrant special attention. The document intentionally and purposely evades the difficult but crucial issue of Walvis Bay, submitting it as a subject of discussion between the South African Government and the government to be elected of Namibia. It is thereby implicitly suggested that the rights of Namibia's territorial integrity must rest on the benevolence of South Africa.

98. We insist that Walvis Bay is an integral part of Namibia. It has been administered as one entity with Namibia by the racist régime since 1922 and it is so recognized by this Assembly and the OAU.

99. Perhaps of greater weight in the case of Walvis Bay is its relatively unique factors, being an isolated enclave within the territory of Namibia, remote from South Africa, and integrally linked with Namibia by reason of its geographical position, and by its history, culture and traditions. Since it was wrong and immoral to colonize, no territory acquired by this process can be legally and morally justified

100. Our position is that efforts should continue apace to foil vile attempts by the racist régime to divide, dissect, fragment and dismember the Territory. Indeed, the importance of Walvis Bay to an independent Namibia cannot be over-emphasized. We maintain that the stability, economic viability, indeed the survival, of an independent Namibia would be seriously jeopardized if a port so vital as Walvis Bay were detached.

101. Since its inception in 1945, the United Nations has been baffled by the Namibian question. Despite the combined strength and concerted efforts of its Member States, it has still not succeeded in releasing Namibia from the bondage of racist oppression. Is it prudent to expect that a government elected in Namibia will be able to wrest Walvis Bay from the clutches of South Africa? Is it fair, is it just to assign to the Namibian people, who have suffered so many vicissitudes, the onerous task of bargaining still with South Africa even after their attainment of nationhood?

102. We do not believe so. It is the considered opinion of my delegation that the elected government of Namibia, preoccupied as it will be with the consolidation of its hard won independence and the task of national reconstruction and development, should not be saddled with the additional burden of negotiating the status of Walvis Bay with a régime whose character of obstinacy is so well known. Thus, while expressing its sincere appreciation to the five Western Powers for the progress achieved, my Government wishes to appeal to them to forge ahead with their initiatives so that a more wholesome and comprehensive

settlement may be speedily reached inclusive of the Walvis Bay question. In the meantime, we appeal to the five Western Powers to make public a declaration that Walvis Bay is an integral part of the territory of Namibia and to give assurances that they will support the people of Namibia in maintaining their territorial integrity.

103. My Government, as a member of the United Nations Council for Namibia, will continue to lend its fullest support to the cause of the attainment of independence by Namibia, which could be advanced by this Assembly's endorsement of the Lusaka Declaration on Namibia submitted by that Council.

104. While we encourage the peaceful resolution of the Namibian question, we shall continue to support SWAPO in the intensification of the armed struggle. And should South Africa persist in its intransigence, this Assembly should emphasize to the Security Council the urgent need to apply the most decisive measures, including economic sanctions as provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter, to end forthwith its illegal occupation of the Territory.

105. We urge the Members of this Organization, in particular the five Western Powers, to continue to manifest that political will which alone can ensure the universalization of those principles enshrined in the Charter for the betterment of all mankind. It is our hope that at this decisive stage, the General Assembly will respond more positively to the challenging issues of the liberation of Namibia.

106. Mr. WAIYAKI (Kenya): Mr. President, may I congratulate you on your election as President of the General Assembly at its ninth special session. Your own record as President of the thirty-second session of the General Assembly and last week as President of the eighth special session of the General Assembly has shown you to be skilful and competent. Our two countries maintain very cordial and fruitful relations, and we are delighted to see you continue as our President for this session as well.

107. I also wish to take this opportunity to congratulate the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, Miss Gwendoline Konie, not only on her election to that important post but for the valuable work the Council has done under her leadership in preparing for this special session.

108. The decision of the General Assembly at its thirty-second session to hold this special session devoted entirely to Namibia was not lightly taken. It was made in recognition of the importance the United Nations attaches to the continuing problem of Namibia. It was made after the General Assembly had discussed this question in each of its sessions from the beginning.

109. It may not be necessary to go over the unhappy period of history during which the General Assembly and the Security Council, as well as other relevant organs of this Organization, have worked to bring the problem of Namibia to a successful conclusion as this is well documented. It is, however, a matter of great frustration and the source of a large measure of shame that the Organization has not been able to deal effectively with the source of the problem—the

source of the problem being, of course, the racist régime in Pretoria, which holds Namibia hostage as part of its all-pervading crime against humanity, namely, *apartheid*. But its ruthless grip, severe and determined though it is, has not meant the end of the world for the gallant Namibians.

110. Despite the defiance that South Africa has shown of the United Nations and all the frustrations that, as a result, have accumulated over 30 years, there is no doubt at all that the exploitation and oppression which the people of Namibia have suffered at the hands of South Africa are nearing their end. Until a year or so ago the words "never", "not in your lifetime", "not in 1,000 years", were being arrogantly used by the two remaining racist régimes in southern Africa in relation to the liberation of Namibia, Southern Rhodesia and South Africa itself. However, the determined struggle of the African forces for liberation has brought to an end the contemptuous arrogance of those leaders and, despite the bravado normally expected of frightened and bankrupt leadership, no one doubts that the whole of Africa, including Namibia and Southern Rhodia, will be free.

111. Indeed the forces that have sustained those racist régimes in southern Africa are so certain of the crumbling nature of the structures that those racist régimes have created, that lately they have been looking for ways to propagate the bogy of the invincibility of the régimes because one of them is working to produce nuclear weapons. Those nuclear weapons are meant to terrorize the free African States into not giving support to the hostage and enslaved peoples of South Africa and Namibia. All these frantic activities to equip the illegitimate régime in Pretoria, which is already armed to the teeth, will in the end prove useless and entirely vain. The peoples of South Africa and Namibia will continue to struggle for their inalienable right to freedom until it is won.

112. South African racists remember that barely two years ago the forces of their racist régime were routed when they carried out an act of unprovoked criminal aggression in Angola. Now, in desperation, the illegal rulers want to turn to the ultimate weapon to put the fear of God into the African and his helpers. So let it be said here that we are just not impressed. The racist structures must go in order to end the slavery to which they subject the African people and leave us to build a society which will give the peoples of South Africa and Namibia, regardless of race, colour, creed or sex, an opportunity to live in a humane society. Any other kind of structure that the racist régimes may want to build in that part of the continent is bound to bring misery and unnecessary destruction of human life and property.

113. The United Nations has reached the stage for decisive action to eliminate the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa. The programme laid down in Security Council resolution 385 (1976) still remains to be implemented. It is quite clear that, while South Africa maintains its position of defiance, it has nevertheless taken certain steps in consultation with its allies and supporters which call for attention and comment.

114. We have said on many occasions that without the support and encouragement in various forms from some

Members of this Organization with strong exploitative interests in Namibia and South Africa, the Pretoria régime would have complied long ago with the decisions of this Organization that it must quit Namibia and dismantle its *apartheid* structures both in South Africa and in Namibia. We have now been presented with proposals on the modalities of South Africa's withdrawal from the illegal occupation of Namibia worked out by the five Western members of the Security Council and circulated in document S/12636 of 10 April 1978.

115. We have taken note also of the communiqué read out to this Assembly by the Secretary of State for External Affairs of Canada, Mr. Jamieson, on behalf of the five Western members of the Security Council, in explanation of the said proposals. We note also the statement by the representative of the people of Namibia and leader of SWAPO, Mr. Sam Nujoma [*1st meeting*], that his organization will be making its reaction to those proposals known.

116. We have also seen from a press release that the racist régime of South Africa has accepted those proposals, and it is easy to recognize why. Since the General Assembly is no party to any of these activities it may not be necessary to make comprehensive comments on them, as that responsibility rests with the parties concerned, but it is essential that we point out the obvious shortcomings of those proposals.

117. It is quite evident that South Africa accepts them because they entirely exclude Walvis Bay, which we regard as an integral part of Namibia. To cite contradictory history of the colonization of that part of Namibia to justify South Africa's stranglehold on Namibia's gateway to the sea or to seek to maintain a military base at the door of Namibia on flimsy grounds would be unacceptable. In its reply to the five Western members of the Security Council, South Africa lays great emphasis on the point that the issue of Walvis Bay is not included in the proposals.

118. The maintenance of the forces of the illegal occupying régime within Namibia during the period of the proposed transition clearly creates a danger which cannot be ignored. The police force and the other so-called ethnic forces, all trained and indoctrinated with the racist practices of *apartheid*, will clearly be in a position to affect the political process and to influence the outcome of elections. They will dance to the tunes of their master's voice, namely, that of the racist régime in South Africa. It will be necessary for the parties to these proposals to make their views known on such crucial issues. South Africa lays stress on its view that before there is any reduction in its forces there should be a complete cessation of hostilities. They want to be able to hold SWAPO adherents to ransom.

119. These proposals and arrangements have been worked out by the five Western members of the Security Council with the declared intention of finding a solution to a problem that has faced this Organization for many years. Good intentions should be demonstrated by good actions. These countries must exert further pressure on South Africa with regard to these views. South Africa must leave to the United Nations the supervision and control of the political process leading up to the elections. That respon-

sibility devolves upon this body if we are to accept that the elections will be fair and free and that there will be no rigging. SWAPO cannot be expected to accept their outcome unless it is satisfied that no manipulation has taken place. The armed forces of South Africa must be withdrawn from Namibian territory.

120. My country has no serious reason to doubt the good intentions of the Five, though their proposals are, of course, born out of their own economic and global interests. But it is a sad commentary that if the kind of effort that has been put into this exercise had been made by them all along from the very beginning within the framework of the United Nations, Namibia would have been free many years ago. Let me say, nevertheless, that even worthy efforts like these calculated to circumvent the machinery of the United Nations can only do harm to the effectiveness of the Organization not merely now but in the future. We have already pointed out the unwise and dangerous tendency of certain Members of this Organization either to circumvent it or to undermine it while at crucial times they try to use it as a rubber stamp. We believe this to be unwise and dangerous to the Organization's effectiveness.

121. Having made these comments, we only need to state that Kenya will support every effort of the United Nations calculated to rid Namibia of the scourge of the racist régime of South Africa. We support the intensified armed struggle of the people of Namibia spearheaded by its authentic leaders in SWAPO, and we shall contribute whatever is within our capabilities towards that struggle until Namibia is free. We shall reject totally any internal settlement that may be attempted by South Africa.

122. During the present session, the General Assembly should adopt a programme of action that will quickly bring to an end the shameful and illegitimate occupation of Namibia by the racist régime. This programme should include a call on the Security Council to adopt appropriate measures under Chapter VII of the Charter to compel South Africa to evacuate Namibia. Additionally, sufficient resources should be made available to the people of Namibia to support their struggle against the illegal occupation of their territory by South Africa.

123. We salute SWAPO for its courageous struggle and guarantee it our continued support. Long live the gallant people of Namibia.

124. My delegation therefore stands ready to support all measures adopted by this Assembly leading towards swift independence for an intact Namibia. We look forward to welcoming it here as a new and proud member.

125. Mr. AKE (Ivory Coast) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, the delegation of the Ivory Coast takes pleasure in seeing you presiding over the General Assembly at this special session devoted to the question of Namibia. We should like once again to assure you of our total co-operation.

126. The question of Namibia is today at a critical stage where the slightest wrong step and any intransigence can hold up a settlement, but where practical decisions can in

fact accelerate the process and enable the Namibian people to become independent very soon.

127. The United Nations is thus at a cross-roads. So the question is whether we should at this session content ourselves with reaffirming our usual positions on the Namibian problem or rather abandon that attitude so as to examine, realistically and with a high sense of our responsibilities towards an oppressed people, ways and means of rapidly and securely attaining our common objective.

128. For our part, we believe that the time has passed for recriminations and condemnations and that it is now time to reflect calmly on what should actually be done to achieve, without too much conflict and without sacrificing the fundamental principles of our action, the total independence of Namibia respecting its unity and territorial integrity.

129. The Ivory Coast believes that this session gives us an opportunity to see where our efforts have led us and to undertake an objective evaluation of the various initiatives, in particular, the peaceful settlement plan proposed by the five Western Powers of the Security Council in an attempt to find a solution to the problem of Namibia.

130. For almost 30 years the United Nations has made praiseworthy efforts to prevail upon the South African Government to favour the harmonious and peaceful progress of Namibia and to enable its people to decide their own destiny in total freedom. It came up against a categorical refusal on the part of South Africa which left the international Organization, on the one hand, no choice but to assume direct responsibility for the administration of the Territory until independence, and SWAPO, on the other hand, no choice but to intensify, with the assistance of peace-loving peoples, its heroic struggle to bring about the liberation of its people.

131. Twelve years have now elapsed and Namibia is not yet independent. And this because South Africa—in spite of the relevant advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice rendered on 21 June 1971 declaring its presence in Namibia illegal and putting it under the obligation immediately to withdraw from the Territory—is still maintaining that presence against all resistance with impunity, oppressing the Namibian people, pursuing its odious policy of *apartheid* and bantustans and attempting to impose an internal settlement which will ensure its ultimate control over the Territory and its vast resources.

132. The hopes born in 1972 and 1973 following the historic series of meetings of the Security Council in Africa and the contacts established with the South African Government to resolve peacefully the question of Namibia vanished very quickly in the face of procrastination, stubbornness and further refusal by Pretoria to accept the principles for a settlement laid down by the Security Council, particularly in its resolutions 309 (1972) of 4 February 1972, 319 (1972) of 1 August 1972 and 323 (1972) of 6 December 1972, which called upon the Secretary-General of the United Nations, *inter alia*, to study, in co-operation with the interested parties, the conditions which would enable the Namibian people to exercise freely and in strict respect of the principle of the

equality of men their right to self-determination and independence.

133. The South African Government's acceptance in 1974 of the principle of self-determination for the Namibian people gave rise to new hopes which were quickly dashed because the principle was not conceived—in the view of the Pretoria Government—within the framework of the universally acknowledged acceptance by the international community which would have enabled the Namibian people as a whole to determine freely its own future, but in an interpretation that inevitably would have led to the disintegration of Namibia, the bantustanization of the Territory and the creation of a mosaic of tiny tribal States. That was obviously unacceptable.

134. The independence of the former African Territories under Portuguese administration made apparent to the Powers which had the most consistent relations with South Africa the need to act rapidly to prevail on that country to seek an arrangement with the United Nations to lead Namibia to independence on the basis of Security Council resolution 385 (1976), which was adopted unanimously on 30 January 1976.

135. Thus, to the efforts, necessarily limited, made by the United Nations to maintain international pressure on South Africa to prevail upon it to withdraw from the Territory which it was illegally occupying, to the vast sacrifices made by the Namibian people which are waging a heroic struggle under SWAPO leadership to oblige South Africa to recognize their right to self-determination and genuine independence—to all that should be added the initiative, now one year old, of the five Western Powers members of the Security Council which are attempting from their side to find ways and means of giving practical effect to the provisions of Security Council resolution 385 (1976), that would enable the people of Namibia to determine their own future, by means of free elections under the aegis and control of the United Nations, with every guarantee for security, objectivity and impartiality.

136. Of all the African territories that were under administration, Namibia is the only one which has not yet attained independence. It is natural, therefore, for the Ivory Coast to give its unreserved support to that fraternal people which has been ravaged and ridiculed so much and to assure it of its fraternal solidarity.

137. It is therefore with much interest that we listened to the statement made in this debate by Sam Nujoma, President of SWAPO, in which he outlined for us so poignantly the tragedy of his people. He displayed here, as on so many other occasions, realism and moderation which are the measure of his political maturity and his sense of responsibility towards his people, for whom he has quite rightly asked the United Nations to take concrete measures to accelerate the effective implementation of the decisions and resolutions of the United Nations on Namibia, in particular Security Council resolution 385 (1976).

138. The General Assembly and the international community should give a favourable and positive response to the anguished appeal of the Namibian people issued by the President of SWAPO. They should continue their efforts

and maintain their pressure on South Africa to hasten Namibia's liberation.

139. The General Assembly should, in particular, reaffirm its responsibility towards Namibia and its determination to shoulder that responsibility right up until the Territory attains its independence, the inalienable right of the Namibian people to self-determination and national independence, the legitimacy of the national liberation struggle being waged by that people under the leadership of SWAPO and its total support for that struggle. It should also reaffirm most categorically that Walvis Bay is an integral part of Namibia and that it is determined to oppose any manoeuvres designed to detach it from that Territory. The General Assembly should also mobilize international public opinion to continue to support its efforts until Namibia is completely independent.

140. The Declaration on Namibia and the programme of action for the self-determination and independence of Namibia submitted by the United Nations Council for Namibia following the special session it held at Lusaka, Zambia, which contain those ideas certainly deserve our attention and should, supplemented by the observations and suggestions of various parties, be adopted at the conclusion of our work. However, in adopting those resolutions would we have entirely responded to what was expected of us at this session? Would those resolutions have brought us any closer to our target?

141. For our part, we fear that some of the ideas that they contain are not easily applied, since we know from experience that they are unacceptable to various parties and not very effective in the view of others. But whatever we may think of them, we feel—and in this we assuredly share the concerns of their authors—that we should go further and give proof of our political realism without in any way abandoning our positions of principle.

142. We have a saying in our country which goes: "... a twisted road has never been known to twist the limbs of those who walk on it." The solution produced by the United Nations Council for Namibia—which we accept—would be ideal if South Africa itself accepted it and agreed to comply with it and withdraw from Namibian territory, and if those who had the resources to do so agreed to take effective measures to facilitate its implementation. But we must note that none of those parties is in a position to do that, and we do not see how we can make them.

143. Political realism consists not solely in doing what is desirable but also in trying to do what is possible. And at this crucial phase in Namibia's history, we really feel that the possible should prevail over the desirable. What is essential for us is to achieve the total decolonization of Namibia. To do so, we believe, it would be wise for us to choose the course of the possible. That course has been laid down for us by the initiative of the five Powers which we have followed with interest, and its only objective, as was so well stated by the Canadian Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, speaking on behalf of those Powers, was to provide "a practical means of implementing resolution 385 (1976) and, therefore, bringing about the independence of Namibia in an internationally acceptable manner and in the very near future." [*3rd meeting, para. 103.*]

144. The Security Council, by unanimously adopting resolution 385 (1976), for the first time explicitly proposed a procedure for Namibia's accession to independence under the direct responsibility of the United Nations. Further, it demanded that South Africa urgently make a solemn declaration accepting the provisions of that resolution and undertaking to recognize the territorial integrity and unity of Namibia as a nation.

145. South Africa not only did not deign to respond to that invitation but sought through the Turnhalle Conference to impose an internal settlement unacceptable in all respects to the international community. To this very day a start has not been made on implementing resolution 385 (1976)—for obvious reasons that we all know.

146. For a year, under the pressure of events and international public opinion, the five Western members of the Security Council have been undertaking intensive and praiseworthy efforts to bring about, on the basis of that resolution, a practical solution to the problem of Namibia that would be internationally acceptable, by acting as intermediaries between SWAPO and the South African Government so as to overcome certain difficulties inherent in the objective situation prevailing in the Territory which constitute quite a serious obstacle to the implementation of resolution 385 (1976).

147. The five-Power settlement plan does identify the essential elements of that resolution, particularly the organization of free elections throughout Namibia, which is to be considered as a single political entity, under the supervision and control of the United Nations. It also contains practical provisions on measures to be taken to avoid the negative effects of the presence of forces of any of the parties on the population, in order to ensure the effective participation of all Namibians in the electoral process and to guarantee a United Nations presence throughout the transition period.

148. Of course, there are points requiring negotiation—points to be refined or clarified—such as those concerning the future of Walvis Bay, which the United Nations recognizes as an integral part of Namibia, and on which the five-Power plan is silent. The question of Walvis Bay remains vital for Namibia. It might perhaps be useful, in this respect, if assurances were given to the international community, and to SWAPO in particular, by the five Powers in order to guarantee respect for the unity and territorial integrity of Namibia. Doubtless, it would also be important to clarify even further certain points which might give rise to reservations on one side or the other, particularly with regard to the effective role of the United Nations in this whole process, and the authority of the special representative of the Secretary-General concerning the maintenance of order and security, and indeed the question of residual South African forces. Consultations will certainly be useful and necessary, but they should not be allowed to call into question the plan itself, which we consider as one capable of breaking the deadlock in the question of Namibia which has existed since 1966.

149. Efforts will have to be made on all sides, but what the international community must ensure is the political will of the parties directly concerned to accept the process

advocated by the United Nations for the transfer of power to the authentic and elected representatives of the Namibian people, and to implement the settlement plan in good faith, once agreement has been attained upon it.

150. The South African Government should first of all solemnly declare its willingness to do that and must undertake to accept the transfer of power to the Namibian people, with the assistance of the United Nations, to respect the conditions for and the results of the contemplated elections to enable the Territory to become independent before the end of this year, to abandon any ambition to maintain itself on all or part of the Namibian Territory and to refrain from any act liable to make even worse the situation inside the Territory, and to put an immediate end to the state of emergency, to acts of intimidation and to arrests and imprisonments. Its declaration of 25 April 1978, even if it remains somewhat ambiguous is nevertheless categorical on one point: acceptance of the Western plan, with all its implicit consequences. We believe that this response is encouraging and should open the way to its implementation.

151. As for SWAPO, the Ivory Coast wishes to voice its pleasure at the new spirit of open understanding, and sense of responsibility which it has displayed, and which make it possible for us to foresee the possibility of a solution to the problem of Namibia in keeping with the legitimate aspirations of the Namibian people and with the principles which the United Nations has always championed. We are comforted by its flexibility and by its readiness to pursue consultations and dialogue so that the settlement process can get under way in clear-cut conditions. We believe it in the interests of peace that this attitude of SWAPO's should be perfectly perceived and understood if we want to avoid certain pitfalls which might arise subsequently.

152. The Namibian nationalists should have no qualms about accepting a plan for the peaceful settlement of the problem, simply out of a concern to minimize the sufferings of their people and to open up for them prospects more in keeping with their yearning for freedom, dignity and independence.

153. How can we fail to recall what was said on 1 April 1978 in Lagos, Nigeria, by Jimmy Carter, President of the United States:

“The hour is late, for both Rhodesia and Namibia. The interested parties must make a choice: they can opt for agreement, and their representatives will be remembered as clear-sighted and courageous men, founders of new nations born in peace; or they can persist in a rigid attitude which will involve further political complications and new conflicts, and will provoke new bloodshed and delay the realization of their hopes.”

154. If, then, the Western plan, so carefully prepared with the participation of all the interested parties, can, despite its shortcomings, weaknesses and certain imprecisions, enable us to reach our objective—which is and remains the independence of Namibia as soon as possible, under conditions defined by the United Nations—we should, without relaxing our vigilance or renouncing our positions of principle, trust the authors of the plan and support them



in their efforts to facilitate the implementation of Security Council resolution 385 (1976), which remains for us the basis for a final settlement of the question of Namibia.

155. Our Assembly should act fruitfully in the interests of the Namibian people and of peace in Africa by measuring up to its responsibilities. We should like to hope that at the conclusion of our work we shall not be able to be reproached for having held up in any way the independence of Namibia or for having let slip a chance to achieve a final peaceful solution to the question of Namibia in accordance with our conditions and having left the way open to South Africa to apply its internal settlement plan which it has not entirely abandoned.

156. For the Ivory Coast, a country of tolerance and dialogue, the conference table is preferable to the battlefield; constructive negotiation prevails over destructive violence and pragmatism over dogmatism. The great and proud people of Namibia, like all other peoples on earth, deserves to recover rapidly and totally its dignity and freedom.

157. In our wish and determination to help it, it is important that we should be able to make proper use of what our hearts and reason dictate. Let us see to it that this session contributes to the advent of an era of freedom, justice and peace for the people of Namibia.

158. Mr. KANTE (Mali) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, may I offer you the friendly congratulations of my delegation on your election to preside over the General Assembly at its ninth special session, devoted to the Namibian tragedy. Through you, it is your native Yugoslavia, which has played a leading role in asserting third world interests, that has been honoured. I cannot but be delighted and gratified that this is so, particularly since my country, Mali, has fruitful and friendly relations with Yugoslavia, based on mutual respect and the safeguarding of mutually advantageous interests. The mastery with which you presided over the debates of the thirty-second regular session of the General Assembly is the guarantee of the success of our work at this special session.

159. Because of the extension of the inhuman policy of racial segregation to South West Africa, the General Assembly, in its resolution 2145 (XXI) put an end to the Mandate of the Government of South Africa over that Territory and placed it directly under its own responsibility. The adoption of that important decision was directly followed by the convening, at the Headquarters of our Organization, of the fifth special session to consider the question of South West Africa.

160. We recall in that connexion resolution 2248 (S-V) which created the United Nations Council for South West Africa (Namibia) entrusted with the administration of the international Territory and of enacting the laws, decrees and regulations necessary for that administration until such time as free and democratic elections on the basis of universal suffrage could be organized and a Constituent Assembly established.

161. Eleven years have passed since then, and the least that can be said today is that Pretoria calmly continues its

illegal occupation of the international territory of Namibia. Our Organization has not been indifferent, however, to the fate of the people there who have been subjected to all kinds of suffering, harassment, humiliation and unrestrained exploitation. The relevant decisions of the Security Council, many resolutions of the General Assembly and the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of 21 June 1971 have eloquently expressed the will and determination of the great majority of the Members of this Organization to ensure the fulfilment of the legitimate aspirations of the courageous people of Namibia.

162. The fact that we are today holding another special session on the question reveals the uneasiness within our Organization as a result of the resistance and reluctance with which it is meeting in the application of its resolutions and decisions on the subject.

163. The racist Government of South Africa continues to disregard our resolutions and will go on doing so as long as it enjoys the incomprehensible sympathy of its traditional allies. It is no secret to anyone that tens—not to say hundreds—of billions of dollars are invested annually in banking and commercial transactions in South Africa by the Powers of the NATO bloc. Thanks to them and in accordance with its preposterous doctrine regarding strategic boundaries, South Africa is today one of the greatest military Powers in the world. South Africa has just carried out—with the assistance of those Powers of course—its first nuclear test in the Kalahari Desert, a colonial territory under United Nations trusteeship.

164. The continued illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa constitutes in itself a serious threat to international peace and security. The repeated acts of aggression of that State against neighbouring independent States, such as Zambia and Angola, can only confirm this conviction. Emboldened by its impunity, the racist régime in Pretoria relentlessly pursues its repression against the people of Namibia. Men, women, children and even old people are daily being arrested, tortured, arbitrarily detained and summarily executed.

165. The extension of the horrible policy of *apartheid* to Namibia has meant the introduction into the Territory of repressive and discriminatory legislation aimed at stifling any movement of resistance against the criminal policy of racial segregation. Dealing, as we must, with a régime that denies elementary human rights and that refuses to act in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the United Nations, we can but endorse what SWAPO has proclaimed, namely, that the liberation of Namibia can be attained only by the intensification of the national liberation struggle.

166. The strengthening of the armed struggle by the fighters of SWAPO, their constant victories over the racist forces of occupation, the constraints of international pressure and the isolation in which the racist régime of Pretoria has found itself following the independence of Angola and Mozambique have inevitably weakened the sinister defence system of white power. And that is why, for some time now, South Africa has been resorting to veritable conjuring tricks to perpetuate its control over Namibia.

167. The Turnhalle masquerade, which was short-lived, and the recent appointment of an administrator-general in Namibia are the latest devices to which South Africa has resorted in order to deceive international public opinion. These latest attempts to impose an iniquitous internal settlement on Namibia, a United Nations Trust Territory over which South Africa has no right, have ended in total failure.

168. The question of Namibia is, in effect, a problem of decolonization. A settlement there requires a political solution—in other words, the free exercise by the sovereign people of Namibia of their right to self-determination and independence with respect for the territorial integrity of Namibia in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) and the relevant decisions of the Security Council. Only the United Nations can guarantee the impartiality of such consultations of the people, and in order that free elections may be held in Namibia supervised and controlled by the United Nations with respect for the provisions of Security Council resolution 385 (1976), the South African armed forces and administration of occupation must first of all be completely withdrawn from the Territory. In the carrying out of the process of decolonization, SWAPO's status as the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people, recognized as such by the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity, must not be forgotten. That liberation movement, which enjoys observer status in both those international organizations, is the representative most qualified to participate in the negotiations for a peaceful settlement of the Namibian problem.

169. From press reports, my delegation has just learned of the acceptance by the racist régime of South Africa, on 25 April, of the proposals of the contact group set up by the five Western Powers, members of the Security Council, as circulated in document S/12636. At this stage and until we secure more information on the subject, we shall refrain from passing any kind of judgement. SWAPO should do that, for it represents the higher interests of the Namibian people.

170. My delegation for its part notes that, finally, the Western allies of the racist régime in Pretoria have at last recognized, with us, that the continued occupation of Namibia by the South African administration is illegal and constitutes a serious threat to international peace and security. However, if our Organization or specifically the General Assembly at its ninth special session, for which we are gathered here, were to deal with those proposals, then certain ambiguities therein noted would have to be removed, to wit:

171. First, that the fact that Walvis Bay belongs to Namibia has been deliberately side-stepped. However, resolution 385 (1976) of the Security Council considers Namibia as a single political entity.

172. Secondly, there is confusion about the role that will be assigned to the special representative of the Secretary-

General of the United Nations and to the United Nations transition assistance group in the maintenance of order in the Territory before and during the general elections, on the one hand, and in the control and supervision of the consultations, on the other.

173. Thirdly, the practical ways and means for dismantling and neutralizing the tribal armies and the commandos of white farmers, organized with the prospect of putting into effect the iniquitous Turnhalle internal settlement, are not clear.

174. Furthermore, the geographical location of the residual South African armed forces must be reconsidered.

175. The infernal machine of repression, namely, the South African police, which has hounded and murdered the SWAPO militants, and continues to harass them today, is in our opinion disqualified from assuming the responsibility for maintaining order in Namibia during the transitional period.

176. Moreover, the United Nations Council for Namibia, the only body that has been given legal authority by our Organization to administer the Territory until its accession to independence, must assume its responsibilities in the process of the decolonization of the Territory. The OAU, which has worked so hard to decolonize Africa, must also be fully associated with this undertaking.

177. Thus, it is on the basis of the clarification that will be made on the foregoing points that our Organization will be able to take a stand on the proposals of the Five and then to contribute to the implementation of the process which should lead Namibia to true independence, with respect for its territorial integrity and in accordance with the well-known General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) and Security Council resolution 385 (1976). Any other course would inevitably lead to mere token independence, with all the upheavals and sanguinary tribal and racial confrontations that that would entail, and this could endanger peace and security in the entire region.

178. In these final hours of the history of the struggle of the heroic Namibian people, the Government and delegation of Mali wish to pay a tribute to the SWAPO freedom-fighters for their courage and patriotism. We pledge to them our total militant solidarity in the determined and stubborn struggle they are waging against white power, for the liberation of their country. They will not lack our moral, political and material support until the day of their final victory.

179. Today, when victory is at hand, we must remain more vigilant than ever. The struggle continues and SWAPO and the United Nations will emerge victorious.

*The meeting rose at 1.25 p.m.*



CONTENTS

Agenda item 7:

Question of Namibia (*continued*)

*President: Mr. Lazar MOJSOV (Yugoslavia).*

AGENDA ITEM 7

Question of Namibia (*continued*)

1. Mr. DIALLO (Guinea) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, it is a signal honour for our delegation to express to you on behalf of the State Party of Guinea and its Secretary-General President Ahmed Sékou Touré our warmest congratulations on your brilliant election as President of the General Assembly for this important session devoted to the question of Namibia. Because of your fruitful experience as an enlightened statesman and the constancy of your country in defending the rights of colonized peoples and working for universal peace and security, we believe that once again you will lead us to a conclusion of our work that will measure up to the expectations of our peoples.

2. We are grateful to the United Nations Council for Namibia for the excellent report which, once again, fully enlightens us on the explosive situation prevailing in Namibia.

3. If I may, I shall also once again express to the Secretary-General, Mr. Kurt Waldheim, our profound satisfaction at the unflinching political acumen with which he guides our Organization closer to its objectives of democratic and social progress and peace and security for all.

4. The State Party and the Government of Guinea attach particular importance to this special session of the General Assembly on Namibia. We are all the more interested in it, since what is at issue is the freedom of a people, a problem linked to the liberty of all peoples and to peace in Africa and the rest of the world. Indeed, as you know, the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity (OAU) have been dealing with this question for almost a quarter of a century. The relevant resolutions adopted successively since 1960 by the General Assembly and Security Council reflect the importance which the entire international community attaches to the liberation of all peoples, the *sine qua non* for genuine peace.

5. Yesterday we voted on the principle of the right to independence; today it is a matter of offering without delay genuine, active solidarity to peoples struggling to recover that independence and including within our community a new independent State, Namibia. All nations must join in

this endeavour regardless of their economic and social systems. Because of the courageous struggle the Namibian people has been compelled to wage under the guidance of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the international community has been led to give it increasing support while acknowledging the territorial integrity of Namibia, recognizing SWAPO as the sole authentic representative of its people and bringing various kinds of pressure to bear on South Africa, which has colonized the Namibian people, oppressing and dividing it, and which is striving to retain its hold on Namibia in defiance of all the resolutions and in contravention of all the principles of dignity and humanity. South Africa today says that it is prepared to accept the independence of Namibia. But its acceptance is surrounded with conditions which remove any meaning from Namibian independence and unity. It has withdrawn a part of the territory of Namibia, Walvis Bay. It is in military occupation of the territory and denies the Namibian people any self-government.

6. For all those reasons our Organization must uphold the principles of the Charter and act along the lines of the relevant resolutions and decisions already taken. We take the liberty of repeating that the problem of Namibia is of concern to the entire international community without exception, and we hope that, once again as in 1960, we shall take unanimous decisions for the immediate independence of Namibia by effectively supporting SWAPO.

7. The situation existing today with regard to the independence of still dependent peoples, including that of Namibia, which is the subject of the ninth special session of the General Assembly, resembles precisely the situation which obtained in 1960 at the time of the adoption of resolution 1514 (XV) containing the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. May I therefore be allowed to recall here the statement made by President Ahmed Sékou Touré from this rostrum, and to re-read parts of the historic appeal he addressed to the Assembly at the 903rd meeting in his statement on agenda item 8 of the fifteenth regular session of the General Assembly on 13 October 1960:

"3. I was to have left by air at 8 o'clock this morning, but I decided to cancel my departure, because I am now the only African or Asian Head of State left in New York. I am sure that if our friend and doyen Mr. Nehru, President Nasser, President Nkrumah or any other African or Asian Head of State were here, he would feel it his duty to do as I am doing, and to intervene in the debate which began yesterday in order to change its direction and to eliminate the negative factions which were beginning to reduce its importance in the eyes of the peoples of Asia and Africa, and indeed of the whole world.

“4. Every age has its own imperatives. The fundamental imperative of our age is respect for the freedom of all peoples and the establishment of world peace, for the progressive development of all nations. That is impossible without a spirit of understanding between great Powers and small, between peoples, races and religions. It is impossible without the coexistence of all peoples of the world. We know that there are problems on which everyone may speak as he wishes, according to his own temperament; but there are other problems which cannot be considered as personal problems, and still less as problems related to the existence of this or that system or bloc. Such problems concern the very foundations of a life of dignity for every human being, whatever political or economic system he may choose and whatever his religion, colour or nationality.

“5. There can be no doubt that the problem of freedom is the greatest problem in the world. No people and no thinking person can think that freedom is divisible or that it belongs to a single people, race or religion.

“6. The debate we began yesterday concerns the decision the United Nations must make, on behalf of all mankind, not to grant the right of self-determination, but to recognize self-determination as the inalienable and natural right of all communities. Although I was not present at yesterday’s meeting, I was able to follow your debate, thanks to the technical progress which has given us television. I was very relieved—as I am sure all representatives were—when I heard one speaker after another, in spite of the differences in their philosophies and in their attitudes towards certain economic and political facts, agree on the great importance of the subject under discussion and proclaim their wish to take part in the debate, on behalf of their peoples and Governments. I felt that fundamentally there was no difference of opinion with regard to the USSR amendment [A/L.312/Rev.1] before the Assembly. There was in fact unanimity. The only disagreement concerned form and procedure.

“... ”

“10. We do not think there can be any disagreement about such a vital problem. The Asian and African countries feel that it is mainly their responsibility to ask the Assembly to think of the welfare and future of their peoples, whether they speak or not, and every one knows what is in their minds . . .

“11. Although some may be in a greater hurry than others, we all agree that there is a trend towards the independence of all nations and that decolonization is an essential and irreversible movement. As decolonization is inevitable, it is surely better that the process should be carried out with support and understanding, thus helping to build a better world, instead of feeding the fires of discontent which may lead to conflict and all its familiar consequences; mount up casualty lists, hatred, growing lack of understanding and the deepening of the historical abyss.

“... ”

“13. What would be the historical, moral and political meaning of any understanding which the colonial Powers

have shown towards certain peoples represented here, if those Powers were to refuse to adopt this draft designed to extend to other colonial peoples the same dignity and freedom? Such a contradiction would take away any credit which the colonial nations might have acquired by the positive aspect of their actions. This positive aspect certainly exists. We are fighting colonialism; you are fighting it; we want it to disappear and so do you. Every phenomenon has a positive and a negative aspect. We know that never in history has any white, yellow or black people had to ask to be colonized by another people. Colonization is therefore against nature. Certainly there are economic and cultural interests. But independent nations—all of which are interdependent—co-operate more closely with one another than a colony with its metropolitan country.

“14. Free Africa has therefore become a field for fair competition in efforts to promote its development and the co-operation of its different peoples, on the basis of mutual advantage. All constitutions of the world, whether they can be described as colonialist, liberal or revolutionary, call for respect for human and democratic freedoms. But how can we ensure respect for the freedoms of the individual when the people to which he belongs is denied the freedom to govern itself?

“15. The colonial Powers will understand that they have reached a historic turning point and that they must take this course not merely for the sake of form, so that world opinion cannot say that they have shown themselves to be champions of colonialism, but with all their hearts, in the conviction that only freedom can build and that nothing can be built except in freedom.

“... ”

“20. This is why I hope that Members of the United Nations will heed the appeal I have made in all humility on behalf of all Asian and African delegations. I appeal to all those who have been free for centuries and I ask them to give us their active and committed support, so that the amendment may be unanimously adopted, and so that the African peoples and all others may fully understand the historical value of the United Nations.”

8. That appeal, made by President Ahmed Sékou Touré in 1960, when it was a matter of recognizing the right to independence of colonial peoples, is still valid today with respect to the decisions to be taken by our community for the independence of Namibia. That is why, in conclusion, we would simply propose that all Members of the United Nations, regardless of their political, economic or social systems, fully support the following plan: first, recognition of SWAPO as the sole representative of the Namibian people; secondly, total independence for Namibia; thirdly, respect for the territorial integrity of Namibia (Walvis Bay being an integral part of Namibia); fourthly, withdrawal of South African troops; fifthly, release of all prisoners; sixthly, free return of all Namibians to their country; seventhly, free elections under United Nations control; and eighthly, increased assistance by the international community to the Namibian people.

9. Our delegation, in lending its unconditional support, in all fields, to the Namibian people, expresses the hope that

the international community may adopt these proposals and thus take another step in the safeguarding of international peace and security.

10. Mr. PUNTSAGNOROV (Mongolia) (*interpretation from Russian*): Mr. President, May I first congratulate you, a worthy representative of the friendly State of Yugoslavia, on being elected President of the General Assembly for its ninth special session, and at the same time voice our conviction that we will, under your skilful and experienced guidance, be able successfully to fulfil our task.

11. The fact that a special session of the General Assembly has been convened to deal with the question of Namibia clearly testifies to the resolve of the international community to take effective steps to support the people of Namibia, who are waging a valiant struggle against colonial and racist repression and to regain their liberty and independence.

12. The Mongolian delegation wishes to extend a warm welcome to the representatives of the national liberation movement of Namibia, SWAPO, headed by Mr. Sam Nujoma, who are participating in the work of the present session, and at the same time wish them and, through them, the entire Namibian people every success in their struggle for a just cause.

13. Notwithstanding all the efforts that have been made by the United Nations for a long time to solve the question of Namibia, the situation in that country remains a critical one and quite legitimately causes concern among the peoples of the world. The racist South African régime, heedless of the numerous resolutions and decisions adopted by the Security Council and General Assembly and despite the demand of world public opinion, is not only continuing its illegal occupation of Namibia but is even extending its inhuman policy of *apartheid* to that territory.

14. In view of the growing national liberation movement in Namibia the racist régime is attempting to divide the indigenous population of the country along ethnic lines and isolate SWAPO while, at the same time, creating puppet administrations. It was precisely for that purpose that the handful of puppets met at Turnhalle and the so-called internal settlement for Namibia was plotted.

15. At the same time, the rulers in Pretoria are feverishly stepping up their policy of terrorism and repression against the patriots—as was particularly shown by the facts quoted by Mr. Sam Nujoma in his statement at this special session [*1st meeting*].

16. Serious concern has been caused to world public opinion by the growing militarization of South Africa and the increase in the number of its troops in Namibia. It is quite obvious that these military preparations are aimed at the suppression of the national liberation movement of Namibia and at the undertaking of direct aggression against the neighbouring African States. The creation of a tremendous military potential in South Africa and particularly the endeavours of the racists to acquire nuclear weapons have made the situation in southern Africa and Namibia extremely dangerous for world peace and security. A further challenge, which has been thrown out by the racists

to the Namibian people and the international community, is the attempt made by the Pretoria régime to annex the only deep-water port in Namibia, Walvis Bay. We consider it essential for the United Nations to take decisive steps to put an end to Pretoria's encroachments on the territorial integrity of Namibia.

17. If the racist and fascist régime of South Africa until now has presented an open challenge to the United Nations and to world public opinion, it is only because of the assistance and support which is given to the racists by certain leading Western Powers, particularly a number of States members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. As is known, these countries and their transnational monopolies, in an attempt to perpetuate their domination over southern Africa, are continuing to strengthen the racist régime of Pretoria, both militarily and economically, and are doing everything to thwart the cause of national independence of the Namibian people. According to press communications, half of all Western investments in Africa are made in South Africa. United States investment in South Africa accounts for 40 per cent of all American investments in Africa and amounts to \$1.5 billion. These and other data quite clearly show that it is precisely the Western Powers and their transnational monopolies, together with the racists of Pretoria, that are the accomplices in the ruthless exploitation of the indigenous population South Africa and Namibia. Furthermore, leading Western Powers are giving large-scale military assistance to the racist régime in South Africa. In this connexion, we share the concern that has been expressed regarding the co-operation of certain Western Powers with the racists in the nuclear field.

18. The Mongolian delegation considers it necessary for the international community to take effective steps to deny the racists access to nuclear weapons. In this context, we should like to express our support for the provision contained in the draft declaration on Namibia which “strongly deprecates any collaboration with South Africa in the development of nuclear weapons that could enable it to intimidate neighbouring African States and thus perpetuate its colonialist and racist régime in Namibia”. [*see A/S-9/7, annex, para. 9*]

19. The Mongolian delegation considers that as far as the United Nations is concerned the time is now ripe to undertake decisive action in Namibia that might encourage radical action in Africa in favour of the national liberation movement. It is essential strictly to translate into life the resolutions and decisions of the United Nations on the question of Namibia, and, in particular, Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 418 (1977). It is the duty of the United Nations to bring about an immediate end to the occupation by the troops of the Pretoria régime, as laid down in various resolutions, and to create conditions leading to unconditional independence for the people of Namibia. The international community should step up its assistance and support of the national liberation movement of Namibia, represented by SWAPO, which is recognized by the OAU and the United Nations as the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people.

20. Our delegation would like to express its support for the draft declaration and programme of action for Namibia

[*ibid.*, annex] that have been presented by the United Nations Council for Namibia to the General Assembly for consideration at its present session. We should like to emphasize the importance of the paragraphs in those documents which express support for the liberation struggle of the people of Namibia, under the leadership of SWAPO, and the paragraph in which the Security Council is requested to take the most effective steps against South Africa, including the sanctions that are provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter. It is quite obvious that any attempt to settle the problem of Namibia to the advantage of the racists and of their protectors to the detriment of the vital interests of the Namibian people is destined to fail.

21. In view of all that I have just said, the Mongolian People's Republic attaches particular importance to the present special session of the General Assembly, whose purpose it is to expedite the liberation of Namibia and thus to promote the final removal of the last bastions of colonialism and racism in the African continent and to bring about the full implementation of the historic United Nations Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

22. The delegation of the Mongolian People's Republic considers that the speedy granting of independence to Namibia will undoubtedly have a positive impact on the international climate and will help to widen and deepen further the process of détente. The Mongolian People's Republic has always favoured and will continue to favour support to the national liberation struggle of the people of Namibia. In the joint Mongolian-Indian communiqué recently published in connexion with the official friendly visit to India of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Mongolian People's Republic, the firm determination was expressed on the part of both Governments and peoples to give moral, political and material support to the peoples of Zimbabwe, Namibia and South Africa in their struggle against colonialism, racial discrimination and *apartheid*. Our delegation is convinced that the time will soon come when the people of Namibia will, once and for all, throw off the fetters of colonial and racist oppression and raise the triumphant banner of national independence and liberty.

23. Mr. AL-HADDAD (Yemen) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Mr. President, it is a great pleasure for our delegation to see you presiding over the General Assembly at this very important special session. The trust that has been placed in you by this Assembly not only constitutes recognition of your outstanding qualities but also reflects the prestige enjoyed by your country, Yugoslavia, which plays a leading role in the non-aligned movement and supports the liberation struggles and the struggles of those peoples fighting against colonialism in all its forms and manifestations. It is for that reason that your presiding over this important session of the General Assembly is an important factor which will guarantee the success of its work.

24. The maintenance of the colonialist régime in its most odious manifestations in southern Africa 32 years after this Organization was created and 17 years after the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples is damaging to the reputation of our Organization and impairs its positive role. However, the fact that this special session of the General Assembly has been convened

especially to deal with the problem of Namibia is a positive step of particular significance since it shows the value that the United Nations attaches to the elimination of ancient colonialist régimes, which are incompatible with the morality of the present-day world.

25. Before we go into the details of the matter, it must be recognized that among the reasons that have made it impossible for the United Nations to implement its resolutions and put an end to colonialism in southern Africa, the persecution of the Namibian people by the Pretoria régime and the plundering of its resources, is one that stems from serious failings on the part of certain States Members of our Organization which maintain very close relations with the racist minority régime of South Africa, and which should be exerting pressure on the Vorster régime in order to force it to abide by the will of the international community, since the United Nations is, in the final analysis, but the concrete manifestation of the unanimous will of its Member States.

26. The General Assembly, after consultations with the International Court of Justice at The Hague, more than 11 years ago adopted resolution 2145 (XXI), which revoked the Mandate of South Africa over Namibia, a Territory which would now be under the direct responsibility of the United Nations until it attained independence. However, South Africa refused to abide by that resolution in spite of its membership in the United Nations. The colonialist nature of the Pretoria régime has revealed its real designs which are to maintain its domination and attempt to plunder the resources of Namibia in co-operation with the international monopolies, notwithstanding that resolution and other resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council.

27. The United Nations had never before been confronted with such flagrant challenges by its Members as those posed by the Pretoria régime and the Zionist régime in occupied Palestine. There is a clear contradiction between the principles of the United Nations and the principles of racism—an ideology practised by the racist régime in Pretoria and the régime in Tel Aviv and which is totally incompatible with the aims of the United Nations.

28. The continuing occupation of Namibia by the Government of South Africa, the plundering of its resources and the practice of racial discrimination against African land-owners constitute a flagrant violation not only of United Nations resolutions and of the principles of international law, but also a violation of fundamental human rights as laid down in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and of international conventions recognized in our civilization.

29. We have noted that with the intensification of the struggle of the people of Namibia under SWAPO, the sole legitimate representative of the Namibian people, against foreign occupation and when international pressure against the Pretoria régime is stepped up, in an attempt to induce it to abandon its colonialist designs, the Vorster régime devises new ways of pursuing its hegemony over the Namibian people.

30. Recently, the South African régime has tried to divide up the Territory into tribal political entities. That is its

policy of bantustanization, the purpose of which is to violate Namibia's territorial integrity. The Pretoria régime has adopted the policy of divide and rule. At the same time, it is trying to rid itself of certain nationalists through intimidation, long prison terms and murder. It is also attempting to weaken the nationalist forces by encouraging the creation of tribal armies which it arms and trains so as to turn them into pliant tools in the hands of the racist authorities. The colonial régime in South Africa is now trying to legitimize its continued occupation of Namibia.

31. The unilateral declaration on 31 August by the Government of South Africa that Walvis Bay, an integral part of Namibian territory, is to be annexed is another violation of Namibia's territorial integrity and is another challenge to the will of the international community. It is also in contradiction with the Maputo Declaration on the liberation of Namibia.

32. We welcome the international efforts to find a peaceful solution to the problem of Namibia. We would, however, reiterate that any solution must necessarily be based on the relevant United Nations resolutions, particularly, Security Council resolution 385 (1976), adopted unanimously on 30 January 1976. That is the only proper basis for any negotiations aimed at reaching a genuine settlement of the Namibian problem. Such a settlement must ensure above all the withdrawal of the South African forces occupying Namibia at present and the cessation of the acts of aggression which have been perpetrated by the Pretoria régime against neighbouring independent African countries and which have been repeatedly condemned by the Security Council and the General Assembly.

33. We must then create the proper conditions for the withdrawal of South African troops, including the police, and the repatriation of all exiled persons so that they may participate in the construction of the future of a free and independent Namibia. To that end free elections must be held under the supervision of the United Nations, with the participation of all the nationalist forces in Namibia and without any foreign interference.

34. My delegation would like once again to express its solidarity for the struggle being waged by SWAPO to guarantee the right of the people of Namibia to self-determination and independence. We ask the United Nations, through the General Assembly and the Security Council, to help to ensure the implementation of the principles of the Charter and of resolutions adopted by this Organization.

35. My delegation believes that any weakening of the efforts to put an end to the aggression to which the Namibian people are being subjected, an aggression perpetrated by the authorities in Pretoria, and of the efforts aimed at putting an end to its illegal occupation of that Territory, can only serve to impede the efforts of the international community, represented by the United Nations, to assist that Territory to gain its freedom and independence.

36. To sum up, my delegation would like to emphasize that during this special session the Assembly must take a definite decision to include: (a) the withdrawal of South

African forces, including its police forces; (b) the release of all political prisoners and the smooth repatriation of all the exiles with the guaranteed presence of SWAPO, since SWAPO is the sole legitimate representative of the Namibian people; (c) the holding of free elections under the supervision of the United Nations; and (d) respect for the territorial integrity and sovereignty of Namibia. We must stress the illegality of the annexation of Walvis Bay, which is an integral part of Namibia.

37. Mr. AL SAFFAR (Bahrain): I should like at the outset to congratulate you, Sir, on your election as President of the General Assembly during its ninth special session. We are gratified to see you presiding over the deliberations on an important question—that is, the question of Namibia. Your wide experience in international affairs and in the United Nations qualify you for this high post. Indeed, your election to the presidency is a tribute to the Government and the people of Yugoslavia.

38. More than 11 years have passed since the General Assembly terminated South Africa's mandate to administer Namibia. During the last three decades a large number of countries have attained their independence and have become Members of the United Nations. There still remain other Territories where peoples continue to fight to free themselves from the yoke of foreign domination. The Namibian people, represented by SWAPO, is one of those peoples that are still striving for national independence and sovereignty.

39. South Africa, which was given the authority to exercise the League of Nations Mandate over Namibia, has never co-operated with the United Nations to implement the 1966 decision of the General Assembly, which demanded that South Africa withdraw from Namibia. South Africa has continued its illegal presence in Namibia, in spite of that decision and in spite of a judgement of the International Court of Justice. It not only has defied the will and the resolutions of the international community, but also has consolidated its position in Namibia.

40. South Africa has never tried to create a situation that would prepare the people of Namibia for independence. On the contrary, it has undertaken measures which, in our opinion, are aimed at undermining any peaceful solution of the question. The Vorster régime has imposed a policy of terror on the Namibian people by setting tribes against each other, through the formation of tribal armed units, in order to disrupt the national unity of that people and to undermine the efforts for genuine national independence. The reinforcement of its army of occupation in that Territory, and especially the development of nuclear weapons, do not in any way indicate that South Africa has the intention to withdraw from Namibia. These measures, as we can see, also represent a threat to neighbouring States and to international peace and security.

41. The annexation of Walvis Bay by South Africa violates the fundamental principle of decolonization, as well as the Charter of the United Nations. This act is also in contradiction with Mr. Vorster's own words. In early 1975 Vorster, the Prime Minister of South Africa, stated: "We do not want even an inch of South West Africa's territory and would be only too pleased to get South West Africa off our backs."

42. The annexation of Walvis Bay not only reveals the territorial ambitions of South Africa but also constitutes an obstacle to any peaceful solution of the Namibian question, and it will enable South Africa to retain its control over the Territory and continue to exploit its natural resources.

43. My delegation supports any peaceful and serious initiatives aimed at putting an end to the illegal occupation of Namibia, provided that these initiatives meet the will and the aspirations of the Namibian people, which has with SWAPO its sole and authentic representative. At the same time, we believe that only a settlement based on the provisions of Security Council resolution 385 (1976) could have the widest international support and acceptance.

44. As a matter of fact, the establishment of peace in southern Africa depends on the degree of co-operation that the South African Government is ready to give to the international Organization. So far, it has rejected all the decisions taken by the United Nations with regard to the accession of the Namibian people to independence.

45. In my delegation's view, any genuine initiative to establish a peaceful settlement in Namibia should not in any way jeopardize the position of the patriotic organization, SWAPO, or diminish the role of the United Nations Council for Namibia, which has been designated by the General Assembly to administer the Territory until it accedes to independence.

46. The General Assembly has already considered that South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia constitutes not only an act of aggression against the Namibian people and the United Nations but also a threat to international peace and security.

47. In conclusion, I should like to state that my delegation endorses the principles and the objectives of the Lusaka Declaration with regard to Namibia and rejects any so-called internal settlement imposed by South Africa on Namibia. We recognize SWAPO as the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people and the vanguard of the armed struggle for the liberation of Namibia.

48. In my delegation's view, any initiative that does not include recognition of genuine national independence, national sovereignty and territorial integrity of Namibia is doomed to failure. That is why my delegation is not very optimistic about the outcome of the initiative undertaken by the five Western Powers members of the Security Council. But it still believes that a solution can be reached if South Africa shows a sincere desire for a peaceful solution of the Namibian question.

49. It is clear that, in the absence of an honest and sincere plan that can lead to the genuine national independence of Namibia, the Namibian people, under the leadership of SWAPO, will have no alternative but to continue its armed struggle against the racist régime of South Africa until final victory.

50. On this occasion the General Assembly should assume its responsibility and take effective measures to prevent the imposition of a unilateral settlement of the Namibian question, to protect the territorial integrity of Namibia and

to increase international pressure on the South African régime.

51. Mr. FUTSCHER PEREIRA (Portugal): Mr. President, I should like at the outset to express the deep satisfaction of the Portuguese delegation at seeing you, Mr. Lazar Mojsov, Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs of Yugoslavia—a country with which Portugal entertains the most friendly and cordial relations—presiding over the General Assembly at the special session devoted to the question of Namibia. Your intelligence, experience and diplomatic skill will ensure the success of this special session.

52. Since we last considered the question of Namibia in this very hall during the thirty-second session of the General Assembly, a feeling of both weariness and urgency regarding this issue has been increasingly shared by the international community.

53. For several years now, various forms of diplomatic and political pressure—bilateral and multilateral—have been brought to bear upon the Government of South Africa to end its illegal occupation of Namibia, for the people of Namibia must be enabled freely to exercise their right to self-determination and independence in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) and numerous other resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council. The International Court of Justice in 1971 recognized

“... that, the continued presence of South Africa in Namibia being illegal, South Africa is under obligation to withdraw its administration from Namibia immediately and thus put an end to its occupation of the Territory.”<sup>1</sup>

54. Over the years Africa liberated itself from colonial rule and foreign domination. Namibia, together with Rhodesia, constitutes the last bastion of colonialism in Africa. The perpetuation of colonial rule has forced its people and its national liberation movement, SWAPO, to resort increasingly to armed struggle. The situation which we are now facing is fraught with dangers for peace and security in Africa and, indeed, in the whole world.

55. The position of the Portuguese Government concerning the problem of Namibia is well known and has been frequently stated by my delegation, most recently during the thirty-second regular session of the General Assembly [39th meeting]. I therefore need not repeat it today. We attach great importance to the necessity of bringing about a speedy, democratic and internationally acceptable solution to this long and protracted problem.

56. As we have stated before, we believe—together with the overwhelming majority of the Members of this Organization—that Security Council resolution 385 (1976) constitutes the essential framework within which the transition of Namibia to genuine independence must take place. Only thus will the Namibian people freely enjoy the fundamental human rights so long denied them, their national unity and territorial integrity.

<sup>1</sup> See *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. 58.*



57. Since the adoption of resolution 385 (1976), the problem has been how to ensure its fast and full implementation; in other words, how to avoid the danger of an escalation in the armed struggle. The resulting human and material losses would cause the Namibian people increased suffering and jeopardize their future for, perhaps, many years to come. It is, therefore, a pressing duty for the international community and for the United Nations—in discharging its recognized responsibility over the Territory—to contribute by all possible means to the peaceful attainment by the Namibian people of all the objectives set forth in the Declaration contained in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) and in all other relevant resolutions of the United Nations, within the framework defined by resolution 385 (1976).

58. In the light of these considerations, Portugal fully understands and supports the initiative taken by the five Western members of the Security Council,<sup>2</sup> Canada, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, the United Kingdom and the United States. This initiative aims at obtaining a peaceful transfer of power to the people of Namibia, ensuring the long-demanded withdrawal of the South African administration and military personnel, and holding free and democratic elections in the Territory, under the supervision and control of the United Nations. Those elections will enable the Namibian people to choose a constituent assembly which will shape the political future of the country in accordance with the expressed wishes of the population.

59. One has to recognize the significant progress so far achieved in attempting to narrow the differences between the initially totally opposite positions of SWAPO, the national liberation movement of Namibia, and the South African Government so that practical means of implementing resolution 385 (1976) can be devised. We encourage all the parties involved in these negotiations to show the utmost good will and flexibility, specially SWAPO, without which no sound or internationally acceptable solution to the conflict can be found, and the South African Government, whose overwhelming responsibility in creating the present situation is recognized and condemned by the international community. Only this good will and flexibility can, at this delicate stage, bring about a peaceful and orderly transition to independence for Namibia.

60. Six months ago, not even the most optimistic among us would have thought it possible that the Government of South Africa would react in the way it did recently to the latest version of the Western proposal. Though my delegation does not wish, at this moment, to take a formal position on the substance and implications of the South African statement, we nevertheless think it constitutes a step forward in the painful process of narrowing the distance between the parties concerned.

61. We are at the cross-roads as far as Namibia is concerned. More than ever before, we realize that decisions have to be made soon on the future of southern Africa. We hope that a realistic assessment of all the implications of these choices will be taken into account and that good sense will prevail.

62. Mr. CHEN Chu (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): Mr. President, first of all allow me, in the name of the Chinese delegation, to express congratulations to you on your being elected President of the General Assembly during its current special session.

63. At its thirty-second session, the General Assembly for the first time considered the question of Namibia as an item allocated to the plenary meeting. Now the ninth special session of the General Assembly is devoted exclusively to the consideration of the Namibian question. This shows that the question of Namibia has become an important issue causing ever greater concern among the peoples of the world. It is not only the urgent demand of the Namibian people but also the strong desire of the entire African people and all the countries and people of the world that uphold justice to see an immediate end to the illegal colonial domination over Namibia by the Vorster racist régime, so that the Namibian people may achieve genuine independence and liberation. This must be realized in earnest, and it brooks no further procrastination.

64. The heroic struggle of the peoples of Namibia, Zimbabwe and Azania against colonial and racist domination and for independence and liberation forms an important component of and has made positive contributions to the struggle of large number of countries and people of the third world against imperialism, colonialism and super-Power hegemony. At present, the struggle against imperialism, colonialism and hegemony, with the third-world countries and people as the main force, is surging forward with tremendous momentum, winning great victories on all fronts. In turn, this favourable situation has given an impetus to the rapid development of the just struggle waged by the people of Namibia and other regions.

65. Since the Namibian question was considered at the thirty-second session of the General Assembly last October, the situation in Namibia has continued to develop in favour of the Namibian people. Under the leadership of SWAPO and with the support and assistance of the numerous African countries and people, the Namibian people have persevered in and stepped up the armed struggle, dealing increasingly heavy blows at the Vorster racist authorities. Supporting each other, the struggle of the Namibian people and that of the Zimbabwe and Azanian peoples have converged into a tempestuous and irresistible revolutionary torrent vehemently pounding away at the last bastions of colonialism and racism in southern Africa.

66. Today, the Vorster racist régime of South Africa is more isolated than ever. Nevertheless, like all reactionary forces in history, it will never hand over political power to the Namibian people of its own accord. At present, it is stepping up its counter-revolutionary dual tactics in its struggle to the death. On the one hand, it continues to play the tricks of "peace talks" in an attempt to lull the fighting will of the Namibian people and deceive world opinion. On the other hand, it adamantly refuses to withdraw all its military forces from Namibia and end its illegal rule there. It also wants to annex Walvis Bay, which is an integral part of Namibia. To this end, it continues to send reinforcements to Namibia, introduce large quantities of weapons and equipment and build new military installations. Moreover, it is going all out to strengthen fascist terror and

<sup>2</sup> See S/12636.

repression, brutally mopping up the freedom fighters and treacherously rounding up and persecuting the nationalists. At the same time, it is boldly working to peddle its fraud of a so-called “internal settlement” in its attempt to create a sham independence. All this is aimed at prolonging as far as possible its tottering illegal colonialist rule in Namibia.

67. The facts show that the Vorster racist régime is determined to make itself the enemy of the people of Namibia and the whole of Africa. However, the Namibian people are a heroic people, who can be neither cowed nor duped. Through their protracted struggle they have accumulated rich experience in waging a political and military struggle, and the perverted acts of Vorster and his clique have educated them by negative example. They are deeply aware that genuine national independence can be won only by mobilizing and relying on the broad masses of the people, resorting to armed struggle as the basic means and using revolutionary dual tactics to wage tit-for-tat struggles against the handful of racists.

68. As pointed out correctly in the Lusaka Declaration adopted by the United Nations Council for Namibia last March:

“... the intensified armed liberation struggle by the Namibian people continues to be a decisive factor in the efforts to achieve self-determination, freedom and national independence in a united Namibia.” [see A/S-9/4, para. 31, subpara. 8.]

69. In fact, the favourable situation now emerging in Namibia is the result of the protracted armed struggle persistently carried out by the Namibian people. For a people engaged in a revolutionary struggle can enter into peace negotiations only when they are prepared to fight, and while engaging in peace negotiations it is all the more necessary for them to be prepared to fight; only by basing themselves on the struggle and adhering to principles in the negotiations can they frustrate the machinations of the South African racists and continue to win new victories.

70. At present a question of common concern is the increasing rivalry between the two super-Powers in Namibia and the whole of southern Africa, which has added to the complexity and difficulty of the just struggle of the people of southern Africa. One super-Power is acting in co-ordination with the dual tactics of the Vorster régime, in an attempt to stamp out the revolutionary struggle of the Namibian people and thus preserve its vested interests in this region. Motivated by the need of its global strategy, the other super-Power, which flaunts the banner of “socialism”, is feverishly and desperately carrying out infiltration and expansion in Africa. It has long cast a covetous eye on the strategically important position of and rich natural resources in Namibia and the whole of southern Africa. At present it is trying by every possible means to meddle in and sabotage the struggle of the people of Namibia and southern Africa. “Supporting” armed struggle in name and using “aid” as a bait, it works to interfere in and control the internal affairs of the people of Namibia and southern Africa and to bring their just struggle into its orbit of contention for world hegemony with the other super-Power so as to substitute itself for the colonialists and racists.

71. But before the awakening people of Namibia and the whole of Africa its treacherous calculation is doomed to failure. The countless evil and ugly deeds it has committed on the African continent in recent years have exposed its wanton ambitions and sinister intentions to the light of day. The large-scale naked military intervention it has carried out recently in the Horn of Africa has further enabled the broad masses of the African people to see through to its true characteristics of expansionism and hegemony. Resounding over the African continent is the clarion call for the African people to manage African affairs by themselves and against interference in African affairs by the super-Powers. The people of Namibia, Zimbabwe and Azania have become increasingly aware that genuine national independence and liberation can be won only by taking their destiny into their own hands, further combining the struggle against imperialism, colonialism and racism with that against super-Power hegemony, repelling the tiger at the back door while driving back the wolf at the front gate.

72. The resolutions adopted at the thirty-second regular session of the General Assembly and the Lusaka Declaration adopted by the United Nations Council for Namibia all strongly condemn the continued illegal occupation of Namibia by the South African racist régime, support the armed struggle of the Namibian people, call for the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of all South African military and para-military forces from Namibia and strongly condemn the South African authorities for their illegal annexation of Walvis Bay.

73. The Chinese delegation holds that during the current special session, the Assembly not only should reiterate its strong condemnation of the South African racist régime and reaffirm its support for the just struggle of the Namibian people, but should adopt truly effective measures to put a speedy end to the Vorster régime’s colonial domination and racial oppression of the Namibian people. We also support the long-standing proposal made by a number of African States for imposing mandatory economic sanctions against South Africa.

74. At the first session of the Fifth National People’s Congress of the People’s Republic of China, held on 26 February 1978, Hua Kuo-feng, Premier of the State Council, solemnly reaffirmed on behalf of the Chinese Government and people:

“We firmly support the peoples of Zimbabwe, Namibia and Azania in their just struggle against colonialism and racism and for national independence and liberation.”

And he added,

“Africa belongs to the people of Africa. The African people can settle their own problems by themselves so long as they strengthen their unity and exclude outside interference.”

75. We are deeply convinced that so long as the Namibian people persist in unity and struggle, resolutely exclude super-Power meddling and sabotage and correctly use revolutionary dual tactics to deal with the counter-revolutionary dual tactics of the South African racist

authorities, they can be assured of the final victory in their struggle, with the solidarity and support of the African people and the people of the whole world.

76. Mr. MONTEIRO (Mozambique): Mr. President, my delegation would like to congratulate you on your election to the presidency of the General Assembly at this special session, especially since we know you as an eminent fighter in the cause of freedom and peace and a prominent personality in the friendly country of Yugoslavia. Only a few days ago Your Excellency ended an official visit of friendship to the People's Republic of Mozambique, a visit which greatly contributed towards the consolidation and strengthening of the now traditional ties of friendship and co-operation between our countries.

77. It was during the difficult years of the popular liberation war that we came to know the solidarity and friendship of Yugoslavia. Since then we have been in the same trench in the battle against colonialism and racism, in the struggle for peace, in the efforts to strengthen even more the movement of non-aligned countries, a sure force for our countries and States in the confrontation with imperialism. We therefore rejoice that a representative of Yugoslavia should here be leading this fight against the perfidious forces of colonialism and racism.

78. The convening of this special session of the General Assembly, which takes place in the wake of the important Conferences of Maputo and Lagos, is a severe blow to the interests of the racists and their allies. The manoeuvres which were attempted before our session, the efforts to neutralize or at least to minimize its significance, are sure proof of its impact at the level of international public opinion.

*Mr. Kotsokoane (Lesotho), Vice-President, took the Chair.*

79. We must congratulate the Member States, the African Group and especially the Council for Namibia and its President for having detected and unmasked the manoeuvres, thus making possible the holding of this special session aimed at strengthening international action in support of the just struggle of the Namibian people.

80. Our special session is taking place under excellent conditions at a moment when the correlation of forces is highly favourable to the cause of the true independence of Namibia. Under conditions of great hardship the political struggle of the broad masses, the action of the militants, the heroic resistance of the political prisoners and, above all, the patriotic determination of the SWAPO fighters have forced the foreign occupier to make important concessions. This is to the historical credit of SWAPO's political line, organization and discipline.

81. The politico-military victories of SWAPO are closely linked with the political and diplomatic action of Africa, the community of socialist States, the non-aligned countries and all progressive States which enabled the United Nations to take the necessary measures to isolate the occupiers of and aggressors against Namibia. Thus the international community withdrew Pretoria's legal powers over Namibia in favour of the Council for Namibia and the Commissioner for Namibia.

82. The international community recognized SWAPO as the legitimate representative of the people and decided to increase support for the Namibian people's struggle. It was therefore in the context of politico-military drawbacks within Namibia and politico-diplomatic defeats at the international level that certain Western countries were compelled to undertake initiatives destined to put a stop to the process which would inevitably lead to a serious defeat for the colonialists in Namibia.

83. Of those initiatives, last May at the Maputo Conference the President of the People's Republic of Mozambique, Samora Moisés Machel, said:

“On Namibia, the United Nations has often held debates and proposed the just way for the solution of the conflict. Resolution 385 (1976) of the Security Council, taken in its entirety, constitutes such a platform.

“The recent initiatives by the five Western members of the Security Council, if based on this context will contribute to the acceleration of the resolution of the conflict. If, however, once again they are aimed at safeguarding interests which are alien to the people and privileges for the settlers, if they contribute to the division of the Territory and the appearance of puppets as bogus valid interlocutors, then the initiatives will only serve to lengthen the conflict uselessly.”

84. Demonstrating once again that the freedom fighters are the authentic fighters for peace and defenders of the dialogue, with great sacrifice SWAPO agreed to hold discussions with the Western Powers in the hope of saving human lives and reaching, along the diplomatic path, a just peace founded on real independence and the territorial unity of Namibia.

85. SWAPO intelligently combined the diplomatic front with the development of the political and armed combat, thus reducing the margin for manoeuvre available to the aggressors and destroying the possibility of puppet solutions. The clarity and firmness of SWAPO, the unwavering support of Africa and of the community of socialist States and all progressive countries, the action of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, of the Commissioner for Namibia and of the Council for Namibia—all have progressively forced the enemy to accept the principle of the national independence of Namibia.

86. When colonialism, racism and imperialism seem to accept the just demands of the people it never means that the enemy's nature has changed. It is a tactical withdrawal designed to gain time and space so as to achieve the triumph of new manoeuvres. It is an apparent change, aimed at promoting through a new medium the permanent objective of exploitation of the people and their wealth. That is why, on the one hand, colonialism claims to accept the independence of Namibia, while, on the other, it perfidiously dismembers the Territory, promoting tribal antagonism and annexing Walvis Bay, the only deep-water port of the Territory. The enemy accepts the change of flag the better to prevent the true economic emancipation of the Territory and to maintain a permanent system of blackmail through which they hope to condition the political options of Namibia, in addition to the military threat against Namibia.

87. The territory of Walvis Bay is an integral part of Namibia, historically, culturally, ethnically, geographically and economically. Whatever criteria we choose, Namibia and Walvis Bay have never been, are not and cannot be separate entities. The recent attempt to annex Walvis Bay reveals the brutality of the expansionist and dominating designs of the colonial Power.

88. It is within this expansionist perspective that the colonial Power wishes to keep its occupation troops even after the election of the constituent assembly. These demands are particularly dangerous coming from a country whose constant aggressiveness is proved by the facts.

89. South Africa is the only State that has been so often condemned by the Security Council for its aggressive threats against neighbouring States. The People's Republic of Angola, the Republic of Zambia, the Republic of Botswana and the Kingdom of Lesotho have repeatedly denounced the threats, frontier violations and invasions undertaken against them. On the other hand, South Africa has never been subjected to aggression by its neighbours. South Africa is the only State that has passed a law in Parliament authorizing its armed forces to intervene militarily in the territory of the sovereign African States south of the Equator. South Africa is the only State in Africa that has plunged into the nuclear arms race. South Africa is the only State that illegally occupies Namibia and wants the illegal dismemberment of the Territory. South Africa's are the only troops that arrest, torture, murder and massacre the citizens of Namibia.

90. The alleged fear that SWAPO might jeopardize the electoral process is equally cynical. That is the argument put forward by a country whose legislation deprives the overwhelming majority of its citizens of the right to vote. That is the argument put forward by the Power which up to now has been preventing the Namibian people from expressing their will through the ballot box.

91. It is our duty to face up to the enemy's manoeuvres, to prevent the colonialists from hijacking the results of our sacrifices and victories. It is the popular struggle led by SWAPO, combined with our fight to isolate Pretoria, that has created the present favourable conditions. It is our duty to strengthen our support of SWAPO and to continue the isolation of the Pretoria régime until the accession of the Territory to independence is guaranteed. Political, diplomatic, material and military support to SWAPO must be intensified in order to neutralize any new manoeuvres, and thus ensure the implementation of United Nations decisions and of the agreements which will eventually be signed.

92. The programme of action approved by the Maputo Conference and in the recent Lusaka meetings of the Council for Namibia outlines the correct forms of support for SWAPO at this decisive moment. It is important that this General Assembly and the coming meeting of the Security Council should firmly reaffirm the principle of the territorial integrity of Namibia, including Walvis Bay. Such a reaffirmation of our former decisions would create the necessary political conditions for the Namibian people to triumph in the battle for the recovery of Walvis Bay. To do otherwise would be to reward the aggressor.

93. It is our duty to send to Namibia an efficient and large military force to guarantee control of the Territory, a force effectively to see to the dismantling and evacuation of the repressive forces and to guarantee the freedom of the electoral process. It is our concern that the directly interested parties, particularly SWAPO, be consulted about the composition of the United Nations force. We believe that the various tendencies represented at the United Nations, particularly those which have been in the vanguard of support for the Namibian people, should be included in that force.

94. It is fundamental that the representative of the Secretary-General, supported by the Security Council, should be in a position to prevent any measures that are harmful to the re-establishment of peace and the democratic process. He should equally have means at his disposal to put into effect the necessary dispositions leading to independence and democracy in Namibia.

95. In all circumstances, it is our duty to support the Namibian people, to increase our vigilance and to make sure that a united, democratic Namibia joins the international community as a sovereign State.

96. Mr. VUNIBOBO (Fiji): May I be allowed to associate my delegation with those who have spoken previously in congratulating Ambassador Mojsov most warmly on his unanimous election to the high office of President of the General Assembly at its ninth special session. We are confident that under his distinguished leadership the very important responsibilities of the special session will be brought to a successful conclusion.

97. The current special session of the General Assembly is taking place at a crucial stage of Namibia's prolonged pursuit of its inalienable right to self-determination and independence, as enunciated in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) on decolonization. That a special session of the General Assembly devoted exclusively to the question of Namibia has been convened at this time is in itself an indication of the high priority that the international community rightly accords to the speedy elimination of the illegal colonial situation in Namibia.

98. We are mindful that the present session is taking place amidst various efforts towards an early resolution of the Namibian question. To cite but a few examples: the matter was discussed at the International Conference in Support of the Peoples of Zimbabwe and Namibia, held at Maputo during May of last year, and my delegation had the opportunity and privilege to be represented at that important conference; more recently, the Council for Namibia undertook extensive consultations leading eventually to its extraordinary session at Lusaka and the comprehensive Lusaka Declaration that emanated from that session which is before us. We should like to express our sincere appreciation to the Council for discharging its important role as the legal Administering Authority of the Territory and to both the Council and the Commissioner for their continued commitment to the furtherance of Namibian freedom and well-being.

99. My delegation has also had the opportunity to participate in the recent deliberations 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 concerning Namibia. Moreover, we have noted with interest the tenor of Security Council document S/12636 relating to the Namibian situation that was recently circulated and which contains the proposals of the five Western members of the Security Council. In this connexion, we have followed carefully the account of the current status of the Western proposals as outlined by the Secretary of State for External Affairs of Canada in his statement to the General Assembly on 25 April [3rd meeting], as well as reports of recent developments relating to Namibia. Despite the vicissitudes and the frustrations so far experienced, and even at this late hour, we are still hopeful that a peaceful settlement of the question will be achieved.

100. The continued international initiatives being undertaken in support of Namibia's inalienable right to self-determination, including the present special session, should, in our view, serve as another urgent and unequivocal reminder to South Africa to relinquish its illegal occupation in favour of an internationally acceptable solution. Its continued intransigence and further manoeuvres on its part designed to bypass relevant international decisions—including those that we hope will eventuate from our current deliberations—will, in our view, only jeopardize what now appears to be improved prospects for an early and peaceful resolution of the question. We earnestly hope that South Africa will realize that it cannot indefinitely stall changes in that part of the world.

101. We are only too conscious of the fact that freedom has been deliberately denied to the Namibian people because of South Africa's illegal presence in the Territory. The problem has been further aggravated by South Africa's persistent refusal to withdraw from the Territory, despite several calls from the United Nations to do so. Moreover, instead of complying with the relevant United Nations decisions, South Africa has entrenched its occupation by arbitrarily extending its repulsive *apartheid* system to Namibia. As far back as 1966, the United Nations categorically pronounced itself on the question when it terminated South Africa's Mandate over the Territory and placed it under its own jurisdiction. Subsequently, many decisions were adopted on the subject, including the historic verdict of the International Court of Justice in 1971, declaring South Africa's presence in Namibia illegal. Sustained efforts on the part of the international community resulted in the unanimous adoption of the important Security Council resolution 385 (1976), which, in essence, once again established the conditions for a genuine and expeditious decolonization of the Territory. Among its well-known provisions, resolution 385 (1976) sought immediate South African withdrawal and called for free elections under United Nations auspices for the whole of Namibia as one political entity.

102. However, as is well known, it could have been predicted that South Africa would ignore that resolution, and, as was to be expected, it went one step further by attempting to devise its own formula for the Territory's decolonization through the so-called Turnhalle Conference. It is thanks to continued pressure from SWAPO, supported by the international community, that South Africa appears

to have realized the futility of that exercise. It needs to be mentioned that among its obvious short-comings was the appearance it gave of a genuine process leading to independence, while in fact it merely sought to perpetuate South Africa's presence through the bantustanization of the Territory. It also fell far short of the provisions stipulated, for instance, in resolution 385 (1976). Moreover, the failure to consult SWAPO once again revealed that South Africa aimed at imposing its own solution on the Namibian people. The general rejection of the so-called Turnhalle Conference instigated by South Africa should, we would have thought, make it quite clear that any partial solution that seeks merely to reformulate the *apartheid* system under the guise of genuine decolonization will be rejected by the international community. Moreover, it should also be stated that Namibia being an international Territory, South Africa will be well advised to be guided fully by the people of Namibia, including SWAPO, in a genuine decolonization of the country.

103. We must reiterate our deep concern regarding the arbitrary imposition of racially discriminatory and repressive laws on Namibia. Apart from the excesses of the *apartheid* system, we are aware of the persistent violation of human rights resulting from such acts as increased militarization of the Territory, particularly on its northern border. My delegation deeply regrets the deliberate suspension of liberties through such measures as the arbitrary arrests, detentions, and so on outlined, for instance, by the President of SWAPO, Mr. Sam Nujoma [1st meeting]. We firmly support the call for an immediate release of all political prisoners and detainees, since we are convinced that only within an enlarged framework of freedom could the people of Namibia freely choose their own destiny.

104. The present economic situation of the Territory is also far from encouraging. Apart from the discriminatory land-holding system devised under the infamous Odendaal Plan, South Africa has unilaterally annexed Walvis Bay. It is imperative that the economically vital deep-water port of Walvis Bay revert to Namibian sovereignty so that the Namibian people can enjoy their own resources to the full. Indeed, among other relevant United Nations decisions, this will be consistent with the appropriate provisions of resolution 385 (1976).

105. To conclude my intervention, may I reiterate that my delegation unreservedly supports the attainment of early independence on the basis of majority rule. Since it refers to an international Territory, we believe that the United Nations should be fully involved in the process leading to independence. My delegation also feels that sustained pressure must continue to be applied by the international community so as to facilitate a negotiated settlement that will be in full harmony with the expressed wishes of the Namibian people. It is our hope that the ongoing initiatives will compel South Africa to respond fully to the demands of the Namibian people. Finally, it is our sincere belief that Namibia will finally attain its freedom, independence and sovereignty, which for so long have been denied to it by South Africa's illegal occupation of the Territory.

106. Mr. AL-SAHHAF (Iraq) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The United Nations General Assembly is holding

this special session pursuant to resolution 32/9 of 4 November 1977, which my country co-sponsored. That was subsequent to the fifth special session in 1967, when, pursuant to resolution 2248 (S-V) of 19 May of that year it was decided to create the United Nations Council for Namibia, which since that date, has held legal authority to administer Namibia until its independence. That decision followed the General Assembly's termination of South Africa's Mandate over the Territory pursuant to resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966.

107. The United Nations, through the General Assembly and the Security Council, has consistently confirmed the Mandate of the Council for Namibia, ever since its creation up to the present day, in the face of the persistent refusal of the racist and colonialist Pretoria régime to put an end to its illegal presence in the Territory. Despite the numerous resolutions adopted by the General Assembly, the most recent of them being the light resolutions adopted at the thirty-second session [32/9 A to H], and despite Security Council resolutions 264 (1969) and 385 (1976), the occupation of Namibia by Pretoria has gone on, and the genocide against its people has continued. Racial discrimination, police terror, imprisonments, torture and assassinations are unceasingly perpetrated against those Namibians who oppose the illegal occupation of their country and are against the colonial administration of the Territory. Furthermore, the policy of bantustanization and the degradation of the natural resources of Namibia by multinational groups in collusion with Pretoria are growing apace inordinately.

108. Despite the successive resolutions adopted by the United Nations and the international conferences, the situation in Namibia has not changed one whit; in point of fact, Pretoria is not yet genuinely prepared to give up its illegal occupation, which is based on repression and plunder. On the contrary, attempts are now being made on the part of the racists to perpetuate the colonization of Namibia by disrupting the national unity and territorial integrity.

109. On 17 May 1977, Vorster's Government organized a referendum for the whites in order to give them a tribal constitution, the Turnhalle Constitution, which would ensure political and economic domination for the whites in Namibia.

110. After the first round of talks with South Africa, the five Western members of the Security Council inaugurated what they called the "Legislative Council of Nama" and on 28 July 1977 they proclaimed the creation of the so-called "Legislative and Representative Council of Damara".

111. It was then—as Mr. Sam Nujoma, President of SWAPO, told us on 20 March 1978 in Lusaka—that South Africa began its efforts to strengthen its army in Namibia which, numerically speaking, was already very considerable and brought into that country a number of tanks and a large amount of munitions. It also started to build barracks and to manufacture atomic weapons.

112. The direct purpose of the so-called constitutional conferences, the formation of tribal units and the escalation of military forces is to impose a so-called internal agree-

ment in Namibia in order subsequently to set up a puppet régime that would be made up of the Turnhalle group. At the same time, this would be accompanied by a violent military campaign against SWAPO and its supporters.

113. Everyone knows that Namibia possesses extremely important mineral resources. It is a treasure house of raw materials: diamonds, pewter, uranium, zinc, tungsten, vanadium and lithium, as well as gas and oil deposits. But the profits of the exploitation of all these resources do not reach the Namibians themselves. They do not benefit that people. In fact, what we are witnessing is a veritable economic plundering of that wealth by Western countries and their patrons, and, above and beyond all that, all these economic activities take place precisely in the area that is occupied by the whites. There are 88 foreign companies with headquarters in Namibia which are plundering the resources of that country in an unprecedented manner in defiance of Decree No. 1 of the United Nations Council for Namibia.<sup>3</sup> Among those Western multinational corporations, the Diamond Company, Inc. and Tsumeb Corporation, Ltd. are two mining companies whose output represents 90 per cent of the production of that country. The net product of Namibia has increased on an average of 153 per cent since 1960; in other words, it has reached an average growth rate of 11 per cent per year. But the Africans, that is, the people of Namibia, have received nothing from this increase. In fact, while the average income at Windhoek has risen to 81.25 Rand per month, the average salary of those Africans who work in the mines is 30 Rand. Thus, the whites, the foreign companies and the Government of Pretoria continue to grow wealthy by exploiting the wealth in Namibia. The connivance between the foreign imperialists and their racist representatives at Pretoria is complete.

114. In the report prepared by Barbara Rogers entitled "The relation between the Namibian uranium and the South African régime", we find the following:

"The Rossing Uranium Mine provides a major economic and strategic incentive for the South African occupation régime to refuse to withdraw from Namibia. Benefits from the project include foreign exchange from exports, major financial investments in the occupied territory, a crucial element of South African nuclear industry, and vital political support from the foreign Governments with a stake in the Rossing Mine. The project could never have been undertaken without foreign companies and governmental backing."<sup>4</sup>

115. Also, in its business and financial section *The New York Times* of 4 December 1977 mentioned that:

"About 350 American companies . . . operate in South Africa with an aggregate direct investment of nearly \$1.7 billion—an estimated 17 per cent of the total foreign investment there."<sup>4</sup>

116. The assistance received by the white racist minority in South Africa economically, militarily and politically

<sup>3</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-ninth Session, Supplement No. 24A*, para. 84.

<sup>4</sup> Quoted in English by the speaker.

from the Western Powers and their allies, such as the Zionist entity, has allowed it to occupy Namibia and to violate its territorial unity. It is no mere chance that the General Assembly should have held two special sessions recently. The first concluded on 21 April and concerned the Zionist aggression against Lebanon. The second is the present session. Thus we see that links between Israel and South Africa are growing ever closer, assuming various forms which show that there is an unholy alliance between the racist entities in South Africa and in Tel Aviv with the support of world imperialism.

117. The reports of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* concerning the increasing economic, military, political and technological co-operation between the Zionist Israelis and racist South Africa, speak for themselves. The international community and progressive forces have condemned all those links. The most recent General Assembly resolution adopted in this regard was resolution 32/105.

118. At a time when an appeal is being made to the international community to provide assistance and support to the Namibian people and to its popular organization, SWAPO, in an effort to end the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa and at a time when the Security Council is calling for an arms embargo against South Africa in accordance with its resolution 418 (1978), we see the Israeli Minister of Finance visiting South Africa for a series of meetings between the two entities. The newspaper *The Washington Post* of 14 February 1978 reported the following:

“The Israeli Minister of Finance observed that there existed strong relations between the two States.”<sup>4</sup>

And, in another place in the same newspaper, it is stated:

“Israel, for example, has sold and delivered to South Africa three 420-ton gunboats. It is understood that at least three more are being built in South Africa under a licensing agreement.”<sup>4</sup>

119. Faced with the continued illegal occupation of Namibia, despite all the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, particularly Council resolution 385 (1967) whose full and immediate implementation we have demanded as a result of the military and economic support provided to South Africa by certain Western Powers, in particular, the States members of NATO, and the racist régime in occupied Palestine, the people of Namibia have had no choice but to take up arms in order to gain their independence, build a free and united Namibia and put an end to all the forms of barbaric repression directed against the inhabitants of the country and to all the forms of ruthless exploitation of their resources. The armed struggle of the Namibian people, led by SWAPO, has the sure and total support of the non-aligned countries of the progressive world, support that has taken concrete form in General Assembly resolution 31/152 of 20 December 1976, which considers SWAPO to be the sole representative of the Namibian people and grants that organization observer status.

120. The armed struggle being waged under the leadership of SWAPO has forced the illegal South African régime to recognize, at least in theory, that there can be no hope of

reaching an internal or international solution of the Namibian problem without the participation of SWAPO. But, while the South African Government has been obliged to recognize, grudgingly, that there can be no lasting solution without SWAPO, it is clear that Pretoria is quite determined to do everything possible to limit the participation and activities of SWAPO, as well as its freedom of action during the envisaged elections.

121. My country's position regarding the liberation of Namibia is based on the principle—long since adopted by the Ba'ath Arab Socialist Party as part of its foreign policy—that the liberation movements in the world, and particularly in Africa, which are struggling against colonialism and foreign domination, in all their forms, must be supported unreservedly. My country has always upheld the claims of SWAPO and the people of Namibia as a whole. In particular, it has always voted in favour of all the resolutions on this subject adopted by various United Nations bodies, including the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, of which my country is a member.

122. Iraq's position has always been and remains one of complete support for the Namibian people in its efforts to achieve self-determination and independence in a united Namibia, as required by the relevant General Assembly and Security Council resolutions, and in conformity with the principles laid down, in particular, in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) and in Security Council resolution 385 (1976).

123. We reaffirmed that position of the revolutionary Party of Iraq during the visit made to Baghdad at the beginning of April this year by Mr. Sam Nujoma. At that time, the Deputy Secretary-General of the Ba'ath Party confirmed our complete opposition to the imperialist and Zionist designs against the developing countries and the liberation movements in the world, as well as our total support for the struggles being waged against the racist régimes in order to put an end, once and for all, to the oppression of the peoples in the Territories that are still colonized. He concluded by stating that everyone in Iraq was united in the struggle against the racist and colonialist régimes.

124. The illegal occupation of Namibia by the Pretoria Government makes clear two essential facts which must be borne in mind. First, the policy and aims of the Government of South Africa, as well as the methods to which it resorts, have always been and remain in complete contradiction with the purposes of the United Nations Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the requirements of human conscience. Secondly, until force is used and the enforcement measures provided for under Chapter VII of the Charter are applied, it will be impossible to guarantee the implementation of the relevant General Assembly resolutions, and there will be no hope that South Africa will accept any kind of solution to the Namibian problem other than the total and actual annexation of Namibia.

125. Although we are discussing today the question of Namibia, we have no need to prove the illegality of the occupation of that country by South Africa. On that point

there is unanimity. The view can be summed up in this simple sentence: Namibia is not an integral part of South Africa. Namibia has been a Trust Territory of the United Nations since 1966; hence, from that time on, South Africa's presence has been illegal—as, indeed, the International Court of Justice stated in its advisory opinion of June 1971.

126. The Government and people of Iraq, guided by their policy of unshakeable support for national liberation causes, and victims themselves, together with their Arab brothers, of the racist Zionist entity's threat in occupied Palestine, wish to express here their complete support for the people of Namibia under the leadership of SWAPO. We express the hope that this special session will be able to adopt effective measures to guarantee the total and immediate independence of Namibia, within a framework allowing for the exercise of all the fundamental rights of the people of Namibia. Hence, we support the draft declaration and programme of action submitted by the United Nations Council for Namibia [*see A/S-9/7, annex*].

127. Mr. ROS (Argentina) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The latest developments in regard to Namibia make it clear that this debate is taking place at a crucial time for the future of the Territory. It therefore seems fitting for the international community to reaffirm the validity of the principles that must govern the solution of this important question. In that connexion I should like to recall, as previous speakers have done, that the question of Namibia has been on the agenda of the United Nations for 32 years and that throughout that long period, both the General Assembly and the Security Council, as well as the International Court of Justice, have repeatedly pronounced themselves on the question.

128. These pronouncements have acquired particular importance since the General Assembly's adoption of resolution 2145 (XXI), in which it terminated South Africa's mandate over Namibia and transferred the administration of the Territory to the United Nations. The rejection of that decision by Pretoria placed South Africa in a situation of rebellion vis-à-vis the international community and made its presence on the Territory illegal and contrary to the principles and purposes of the Charter.

129. The continuation of this anachronistic situation and the close links of the problem of Namibia with other conflicts in southern Africa meant, furthermore, that as time went by a grave situation was being created in that region, which, as has repeatedly been stated, is jeopardizing international peace and security. Within this context the position maintained by Argentina has been firm and completely in accord with the pronouncements of the General Assembly, the Security Council and the International Court of Justice to which I have referred. Accordingly, my country has invariably maintained and reiterates today that:

130. First, since the adoption of resolution 2145 (XXI) Namibia and its inhabitants are a direct responsibility of the United Nations.

131. Secondly, South Africa illegally occupies and administers Namibia and must, therefore, withdraw completely from the Territory.

132. Thirdly, the Namibian people have the inalienable right to self-determination, freedom and national independence in accordance with the United Nations Charter and resolutions 1514 (XV) and 2145 (XXI) and other relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council.

133. Fourthly, as stipulated in paragraph 7 of Security Council resolution 385 (1976), in order that the people of Namibia may be enabled freely to determine their own future, it is imperative that elections be held, under United Nations supervision and control, throughout the Territory of Namibia considered as a single political entity.

134. Fifthly, the United Nations Council for Namibia, which was established under General Assembly resolution 2248 (S-V), is the legal Administering Authority of Namibia until independence.

135. Sixthly, there must be respect for the territorial integrity of Namibia, the unity and national identity of its people and their right fully to enjoy the natural resources of the Territory.

136. Seventhly, any negotiated settlement intended to solve the problem of Namibia must be carried out within the framework of the relevant United Nations resolutions and with the participation of all the parties involved, including SWAPO, which is the decisive political force for the liberation of Namibia.

137. The fact that the position of Argentina and the principles approved by the United Nations with respect to the question of Namibia are identical goes hand in glove with the total support of my country for the principles of the peaceful settlement of international disputes and for the principal and most effective mechanism provided for under the Charter for its implementation, namely, negotiation. Accordingly, as I stated at the thirty-second session of the General Assembly [*36th meeting*] my country supports every political and diplomatic initiative intended to arrive at a peaceful settlement of the problem by way of agreement among all the parties concerned, including, obviously, SWAPO.

138. More specifically, at that time, the Government of Argentina expressed its support for the negotiations being carried out by the five Western members of the Security Council. As we see it, these negotiations do not depart from the principles confirmed by the United Nations with regard to Namibia; on the contrary, they are directed towards the implementation of Security Council resolution 385 (1976) by setting up a mechanism acceptable to all the parties concerned.

139. It must be pointed out that the initiative seems to have become more current and more forceful because of the announcement by the South African Government that it accepts the proposal submitted by the five Western countries. Undoubtedly, this is a new and important development which can only be considered as being extremely encouraging, and it reaffirms our faith that the problem of Namibia can be solved peacefully. We shall have to persevere with faith to attain the objectives which the United Nations has set for Namibia.



140. Without prejudice to this, we cannot fail to point out that we regret that the proposal of the five Western countries does not refer to the situation created in respect of Walvis Bay. In our opinion, failure to resolve that problem might conspire against the soundness of any agreement and in due course contribute to indefinitely prolonging the conflict which persists in the Territory.

141. In brief, my Government trusts that no opportunity that might bring us closer to a just, peaceful and orderly solution to the problem of Namibia will be lost. We are certain that political realism and the concern to save the Namibian people from the horrors of a possible conflict whose consequences are unforeseeable will prevail at all times. Within this context, my Government wishes to declare that, in the event that a solution acceptable to all the parties concerned is found, it is prepared to co-operate with the United Nations and the Secretary-General to ensure that by this means Namibia will peacefully evolve towards full independence.

142. I cannot end this statement without making two brief additional remarks.

143. In the first place, I should like once again to express my delegation's satisfaction at the work being done by the United Nations Council for Namibia, which, under the effective and intelligent guidance of its President, Ambassador Gwendoline Konie, has continued to be a vital instrument for the General Assembly to be able to discharge its responsibilities towards the Territory.

144. Secondly, and finally, I wish also to reiterate the great interest with which my country is following the development of events in connexion with Namibia particularly, and with southern Africa in general, an interest which has two basic reasons. It is logical because of our geographical location, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, our resolute wish that Namibia shall shortly be transformed into a genuinely independent and sovereign State which, free from any kind of foreign pressures, will be able to draw up its own national objectives within the framework of the rights and obligations of States as provided for in the United Nations Charter.

145. Mr. ABDULAH (Trinidad and Tobago): In the interest of brevity, and heeding the oft-repeated entreaties of the President, my delegation will refrain from addressing the usual encomium to him upon his election. In doing so, I wish to state, nevertheless, that the fully merited tributes that have already been paid to him personally and to his great country respond in their entirety to the feelings of my delegation on this occasion.

146. This ninth special session of the Assembly on the question of Namibia is taking place at an opportune moment, for the thrust which was given to the cause of decolonization in Africa by the collapse of the Portuguese colonial empire has been blunted by the determination of the racist minority régimes in southern Africa to perpetuate their hold over the territories of Zimbabwe and Namibia. Today, it has become absolutely necessary for the international community to adopt more concrete measures for the realization by the people of those territories of their inalienable right to self-determination and independence.

147. It is not the intention of my delegation to recount in historical detail the facts surrounding the status of the international Territory of Namibia. Suffice it to recall that the General Assembly in its resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966 terminated the Mandate of South Africa over South West Africa—as it was then called—and placed the Territory under the direct responsibility of the United Nations. This was followed in May 1967 by a special session of the General Assembly during which a United Nations Council was established to administer the Territory and to take appropriate steps for the attainment by the people of Namibia of their independence.

148. It is a matter of public records that in the 11 years that have elapsed since the decision of the General Assembly to terminate South Africa's Mandate over Namibia and to assume direct responsibility for the Territory, South Africa has defied the collective will of this Organization and has continued its illegal occupation of Namibia. Indeed, none of the numerous resolutions of the General Assembly or of the Security Council designed to secure South Africa's withdrawal from Namibia has had any effect in diminishing the control over and influence in the Territory by the Pretoria régime. The sense of outrage engendered by this defiance on the part of one Member State is one which should compel us at this special session to deal in a decisive manner with the question of Namibia. Failure to do so can only result in a serious questioning of the credibility and authority of the United Nations generally, and more so in so far as its role in the decolonization process is concerned, having regard to the fact that General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) applies fully to Namibia, which enjoys the distinction of being the only dependent Territory under the legal administration of the United Nations.

*Mr. Mojsov (Yugoslavia) returned to the Chair.*

149. The conditions under which the people of Namibia continue to live belie the fact that resolution 1514 (XV) containing the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples applies to them. Who here will deny that Namibians are subjected to alien subjugation, domination and exploitation, and that this constitutes a denial of fundamental rights, is contrary to the Charter and is an impediment to the promotion of world peace and co-operation? Who will assert that the people of Namibia have been permitted, by virtue of their inalienable right to self-determination, freely to determine their political status and freely to pursue their economic, social and cultural development? Is it not true that in order to delay the realization of independence by Namibians, it has been alleged that they lack the necessary political, economic, social and educational preparedness and that armed action and repressive measures of all kinds have been directed against Namibians to prevent them from exercising peacefully and freely their right to complete independence? Moreover, who is not aware of the attempts that have been and are being made to disrupt the national unity and territorial integrity of the Territory contrary to the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations?

150. If the situation I have just outlined has a familiar ring about it, it is because these references are direct quotes

from the Declaration contained in resolution 1514 (XV). Every one of the articles of this Declaration has been breached in the case of Namibia. My delegation has not, however, given up hope that the Declaration will be fully applied to the international Territory of Namibia. To achieve this, it is of paramount importance that the United Nations play the role which has been envisaged for it under the terms of the many relevant resolutions to which all Members of the General Assembly have lent support. In this respect, the special responsibility which has been placed on the Council for Namibia must be recognized.

151. Trinidad and Tobago, through its membership in the Special Committee against *Apartheid* and the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples has been closely involved in the problems of southern Africa. Trinidad and Tobago has worked and will continue to work actively to bring about the independence of Namibia. It has demonstrated its full support for and commitment to the struggle of the Namibian people through its contributions to the United Nations funds for southern Africa and its programmes of scholarships for the training of Namibians. Indeed, at this very moment two Namibian students, on the recommendation of SWAPO and endorsed by the OAU, are undergoing training in Trinidad and Tobago. One of them is pursuing a four-year degree course in agriculture at the University of the West Indies campus in Trinidad and Tobago.

152. Trinidad and Tobago has always sought to promote a negotiated settlement for Namibia. Since the Security Council adopted resolution 385 (1976), we have attempted to follow the various initiatives that have been taken to bring about a negotiated settlement to the conflict. We have not always been certain of the direction of those initiatives, but in so far as they were aimed at the transfer of power to the people of Namibia through peaceful means we were prepared to welcome them. Thus, the proposals which were put forward by the five Western members of the Security Council, and which have been reportedly accepted with some reservations by one of the parties, seem to my delegation to provide a basis for moving the Territory towards independence. My delegation, however, considers that these proposals need careful study and analysis, particularly with regard to the role of the United Nations during the crucial transition stage. Moreover, my delegation has serious misgivings regarding the omission of the issue of Walvis Bay from the proposals. The fact that it is the only port of the Territory means that without it Namibia could be forced into a dependence which would have dangerous implications for its future. We believe, nevertheless, that the door should not be closed on this account to further negotiations for a peaceful solution to this long outstanding question.

153. In our view, the minimum elements to ensure the immediate independence of Namibia through peaceful means are: first, an end to South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia; secondly, free elections under United Nations supervision and control for the whole of Namibia as one political entity, on the basis of one man, one vote; thirdly, reaffirmation of the territorial integrity of Namibia and of Walvis Bay as an integral part of the Territory; and

fourthly, increased assistance to the people of Namibia under the leadership of SWAPO.

154. Many speakers before me have warned that time is running out and that the United Nations must act decisively and immediately. My delegation shares this sense of urgency and urges this Assembly to act now to put an end to the intolerable situation which Namibians have been made to bear for so long.

155. Mr. BISHARA (Kuwait): Mr. President, the delegation of Kuwait derives great pleasure from seeing you preside over the General Assembly at its ninth special session.

156. The debate on the question of Namibia is timely, productive and, in view of the complexity of the issue, indispensable. Security Council resolution 385 (1976) embodies the principles essential to the solution of the problem. After listening to preceding speakers I have come to the conclusion that on Namibia there is unique unity of purpose. There are, naturally, differences in emphasis, in style, in tactics, but these in no way detract from the strength and vigour of that unity of purpose. No other colonial issue has brought about such a remarkable unity. Rarely has the General Assembly almost unanimously taken so strong a position on such a complex issue. This in itself is an achievement.

157. The aim of the special session on Namibia is to marshal unqualified support for the Namibian people in their struggle for genuine self-determination and independence. It is also to convey to South Africa the international indignation at and opposition to its policy of *apartheid*, its illegal occupation of Namibia and its attempts at the fragmentation of the Territory.

158. One can say without running the risk of being severely criticized that there is a broad consensus on a good number of principles. There is a consensus that Security Council resolution 385 (1976) constitutes a sound and credible framework for the solution of the problem. That resolution was adopted unanimously and should remain as the basis for negotiations in the days to come. There is also a consensus on the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa. There is no disagreement whatsoever on the fact that South Africa occupies Namibia in defiance of the opinion and ruling of the International Court of Justice and of resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. South Africa is applying the policy of *apartheid* and fragmentation in Namibia. It is using the area as a security zone against the irresistible tide of change. But all that effort by South Africa is of no avail.

159. There is indisputable unanimity in the General Assembly on the attainment of independence by Namibia in 1978. Moreover, there is no disagreement at all that this independence should and must be genuine and pure and must reflect the free will of the Namibian people. The presence of Namibia in the family of free nations is long overdue. We are certain that Namibia will play its role in the international community very soon.

160. Among the positive elements in this debate that have struck my delegation is the almost unanimous insistence on

the territorial integrity of an independent Namibia. There is no room for compromise on this important and vital principle. An independent Namibia means the extension of its sovereignty over all its territory. Walvis Bay is part and parcel of Namibia. There is no meaning to an imperfect independence. A truncated Namibia is a far cry from the genuinely independent Namibia all of us want to see. Therefore, it is not logical to expect the Namibians to sing the lyrics of independence if it is a defective independence. An amputated Namibia would be a departure from the spirit and letter of resolution 385 (1976) of the Security Council; it would only sow the seeds of future conflict rather than eliminate conflict. On the other hand, the importance of the will of the international community in defending an intact, independent Namibia that includes Walvis Bay should not be underestimated. South Africa is in earnest in wishing to gobble up Walvis Bay, but we in the United Nations should not let that expansionist design succeed.

161. The delegation of Kuwait is gratified to note the emphasis placed by every delegation which has spoken so far on the role of SWAPO in the attainment of independence. My country recognizes SWAPO as the only legitimate voice of the Namibian people. Without SWAPO there will be no independence, but with its vigorous participation and effective co-operation there will be genuine independence. The freedom fighters of SWAPO merit our commendation and admiration for their unflinching sacrifices in the face of impossible odds. Without SWAPO Namibia would have been reduced to a human reservoir of cheap labour that assisted in the whites' quest for a life of physical comfort. Kuwait therefore endorses its struggle for a genuinely independent Namibia. The intensification of the struggle for the independence of Namibia is one of the prerequisites for its attainment. The rulers of South Africa will not abdicate their privileged position in Namibia because of the sudden emergence of a wave of human gallantry in their hearts. The independence of Namibia must be extracted from the teeth of the lords of *apartheid*.

162. We in Kuwait recognize the need for political and material support for SWAPO in its struggle for a free Namibia and have already met our commitment through the Committee for the Liberation of Africa of the OAU.

163. There is also a consensus on the role of the United Nations, and this has been amply emphasized in the course of this debate. All of us seek the attainment of genuine independence by Namibia. The only body which is able to provide an impartial witness to the free will of the Namibians is the United Nations. Therefore elections must be under the supervision of the United Nations, and this should not be left to the local police, which are bound to act as a front for the South African rulers. We have no confidence in the impartiality of those local police. A United Nations presence in Namibia to supervise the elections and exercise control during the transitional period is indispensable to the expression of the free will of the Namibians. This will dispel any doubt as to the genuineness of the outcome.

164. There is also a strong consensus in this debate on the rejection of the internal settlement. In the prevailing circumstances, the internal settlement means South Africa's

failure to respond to the free expression of the will of the Namibians. It would be a bogus, sham and spurious arrangement that would be bound to crumble. The outcome of this debate will undoubtedly discourage the Pretoria régime in its endeavour to promote its Uncle Toms in Namibia.

165. There has also been strong and unmistakable denunciation of South Africa's manoeuvres in Namibia in the course of this debate. We can anticipate what is in store for the United Nations on this question. The unanimity in the international community on the rejection of these devices of South Africa designed to prolong its dominance in Namibia should not be wasted. It is true that South Africa counts on the support of the Western Powers, but it is also important that the unity of purpose which has been displayed at this special session so far should not be dissipated because of disagreement on timing and unimportant details.

166. The delegation of Kuwait is heartened to see the forceful opposition to the presence of South African troops in Namibia so unanimously expressed. The real and unpoluted independence of Namibia which is the main aim of this Assembly cannot be attained while South Africa maintains its active military presence in the Territory. The mere presence of those troops violates the principle of free elections.

167. There is one point which my delegation would like to emphasize at this stage. None of the speakers has accepted the notion of negotiation on independence as a substitute for the achievement of independence by Namibia in 1978. The alarming fact, in present world conditions, is that negotiation on principles has become a substitute for their implementation. States talk about negotiation rather than implementation. South Africa, therefore, should not be allowed to prolong the negotiation process instead of implementing Security Council resolution 385 (1976). It must be forced to implement it.

168. South Africa labours under the delusion that it can indefinitely elude the application of sanctions in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter. This is the responsibility of the General Assembly at this special session on Namibia. We in Kuwait believe that the vacillation of South Africa on Namibia warrants the invoking of Chapter VII of the Charter. Therefore we believe that the General Assembly must achieve the following: the rejection of the application of the heinous policy of *apartheid* in Namibia; the scrupulous implementation of resolution 385 (1976) as it stands, without the alteration of any of its provisions; the support for the independence of Namibia based on the territorial integrity of the area without bargaining over certain portions of Namibia that are advantageous and favourable to the administering Power; the recognition of the indispensable role SWAPO plays in the attainment of a genuine independence for Namibia; the support for the struggle of the Namibian people under the leadership of SWAPO, without whose active participation in the negotiations civil war is unavoidable; the aborting of the so-called internal settlement, which is nothing but an expansion of the system of *apartheid* to Namibia; the unequivocal determination that Namibia should be independent in 1978 under the super-

vision of the United Nations and on the basis of universal adult suffrage in accordance with the provisions of Security Council resolution 385 (1976); an end to the use of Namibia as a base for aggression by South Africa against independent and peaceful neighbouring African States; and support for the Council for Namibia, which is entrusted, on behalf of the United Nations, with administering the area, and whose function has been usurped and reduced by South African occupation of Namibia;

169. Finally, the delegation of Kuwait hopes very soon to see Namibia within the fold of the family of free nations in this hall.

170. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call upon representatives who wish to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

171. Mr. KHARLAMOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): We who are taking part in this important session are discussing an extremely serious question: how, as quickly as possible and most effectively, using the resources of the United Nations, and with the individual assistance of every country represented here, we can help the long-suffering Namibian people to attain genuine independence and freedom and to create an independent State free from racism, colonialism, *apartheid* and every other kind of oppression.

172. However, there are among us representatives of States who use this important rostrum for completely different purposes. They are attempting over and over again to repeat insinuations, fabrications and slander against the policy of the Soviet Union with regard to African countries and other parts of the world. Among them is the representative of China, and I should like to make the following statement.

173. If the Chinese delegation were to be more attentive it would learn that it is repeating exactly the assertions of the fascists and racists of Vorster in the sense that the peoples of southern Africa are being threatened by communism, by the Soviet Union and so on and so forth. Unfortunately, that representation is repeating over and over again the same nonsense about our country's policy, as the record will show.

174. The Chinese representative has repeated here statements about events in the Horn of Africa. I should like to answer him.

175. If he keeps to the same position, he is repeating only imperialist propaganda, and were I a propagandist I would pay him for his services. He is playing right into the hands of imperialist propaganda on this question.

176. The communiqué on the recent talks between the Soviet Union and Cuba with regard to events in the Horn of Africa reads as follows:

“The Soviet Union and Cuba are in favour of the earliest possible establishment of a lasting peace in the Horn of Africa on the basis of renunciation of territorial claims and principles of mutual respect for sovereignty, territorial integrity, inviolability of frontiers and non-intervention in each other's internal affairs of each of the

parties in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter and the purposes and decisions of the Organization of African Unity. Further, the establishment of good-neighbourly relations between the countries of the Horn of Africa are in keeping with the interests of all the States of that area.”

The communiqué goes on,

“The Soviet Union and Cuba condemn the attempts of international reaction to curb the process of normalization of relations and to maintain a hot-bed of tension in the area. The Cuban side indicated the form of support given by the Soviet Union to the just cause of all anti-imperialist and progressive forces of the world.”

177. I do not want to read any further. I can only say that wherever a hot-bed of tension is created, China is always on the side of imperialism, on the side of the colonialists, on the side of those who want to fish in troubled waters. And what is more, it makes slanderous fabrications about our country.

178. In so far as concerns Namibia, which is the question we are discussing, our position has been set forth in the statement of the Permanent Representative of the USSR to the United Nations, Comrade Troyanovsky [*3rd meeting*]. Tomorrow we shall hear the statement of the representative of SWAPO, who I am sure will answer what we have been hearing here from certain Western countries concerning their proposals. We do not intend to analyse those proposals here. We consider that the Namibian people should obtain real freedom, and the sooner the better. What the Namibian people need is independence itself, not talks about independence. That is the position we adhere to and we shall continue to adhere to it.

179. In so far as concerns our assistance to the national liberation movements in Africa, the representative of SWAPO and the representatives of other movements can say a good deal about that. We have been helping, we are continuing to help and we shall go on helping until the attainment of the total freedom of Africa from racism, colonialism and every other kind of oppression. That is our Leninist position of principle, and we shall adhere to it.

180. In so far as concerns the representative of China who today attempted to exploit the events in the Horn of Africa, I shall answer him simply by saying: Recall recent events in Angola. On whose side were you working in Angola? With the racists of South Africa and their henchmen with reactionary groups. Whom are you helping now in the struggle against the People's Republic of Angola which has become independent? Once again, the same groups. There are other examples; I can produce them.

181. You have said a great deal too about the might and power of the Soviet Union. Yes, indeed, we are proud of the fact that we have become a mighty, powerful country, after being a weak and powerless one. But we use that power for peace, to prevent a new war. And what are you doing? You say that war is inevitable. If you were only talking, that would not matter much; but you have the largest army in the world. You have dug shelters throughout your country. Against whom? Who is threatening

you? The Soviet Union has no intention of invading any country—and that has been repeatedly stated by the leader of our Party, the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, Comrade Brezhnev. You are preparing for war everywhere. You are calling for the strengthening of the aggressive imperialist blocs in Asia. You want to expand military bases in Asia. You have territorial ambitions against practically all States on your frontiers. And after that dare you accuse other countries of expansionism? Do you have any conscience?

182. You charge us with this, that and the other; but our policy is clear: we are in favour of détente, we want to strengthen détente, and we want every country freely, without outside intervention, to settle its own internal affairs and problems.

183. Once again we have made new proposals on the question of disarmament which only yesterday or the day before were set forth by the General Secretary of the Central Committee, Mr. Brezhnev. Throughout your United Nations membership, where and on whose side have you always been whenever we have tried to decide any disarmament questions—nuclear, non-nuclear, conventional or non-conventional?

184. Yesterday you issued a press release about the neutron bomb. You were practically calling for it to be used. Have you really reached such a point?

185. The peoples of Asia, Africa and other continents can be sure that they can rely on the Soviet Union. We have been helping and will continue to help them.

186. In so far as concerns you, the representative of China, I am very sorry to have to say this from this rostrum, but the time will come when this important forum will be condemning your country as one of the major warmongers and instigators of a new war.

187. Mr. LAI Ya-li (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): The Chinese delegation deems it necessary to make a few remarks in response to the shameless abuse and vilification just uttered by the Soviet delegation.

188. In our statement this afternoon, the Chinese delegation presented an abundance of irrefutable facts to expose the criminal acts of Soviet social-imperialism in carrying out its aggression and expansion in Africa and in sabotaging the national liberation struggle in southern Africa. This has hit social-imperialism where it hurts.

189. Flying into a rage and bursting into helpless exasperation, the Soviet representative resorted to vilification and slander, in an attempt to cover up its own ugly features. But that is of no avail.

190. In each of their statements the Soviet representatives are accustomed to recite their leaders' incantations about their so-called support to the African people, yet they never dare to touch upon the facts enumerated by the Chinese delegation in exposing their acts of social-imperialism. The great Chinese writer, thinker and revolutionary Lu Hsun once said: "Fact is a ruthless thing, which can smash empty words to pieces."

191. People have seen clearly that it is Soviet social-imperialism that is carrying out aggression and expansion all over Europe, the Middle East and Africa in its fierce rivalry for world hegemony with the other super-Power. It wantonly interferes in the internal affairs of African countries, trying to subvert the lawful Governments of those countries; it engineers and organizes invasion by mercenaries and carries out naked military intervention against sovereign African States; exploiting the differences between African countries that are a product of history, it sows dissension among them, adding fuel to the fire so as to profit therefrom; it also spares no efforts to create a split among the African national liberation organizations, wilfully lauding one party while denigrating another, and uses a variety of tactics for control and sabotage under the name of "aid". The large-scale naked military intervention it has carried out recently in the Horn of Africa is a glaring fact known to all.

192. Under these circumstances, the Soviet representative is only exposing himself by declaring that "the Soviet Union seeks no privilege, interests or hegemony in Africa". The facts show that social-imperialism is the most dangerous and vicious enemy of the numerous African countries and peoples. Nevertheless, it is also a paper tiger, outwardly strong and inwardly weak. Its perverted acts have met with strong condemnation by the numerous African countries and people, suffering one shameful set-back after another.

193. Early last year, the Sudanese Government expelled Soviet military "experts". In March last year, the people of Zaire successfully smashed the mercenary invasion engineered by social-imperialism. Subsequently, the Somali Government solemnly declared the abrogation of its "friendship treaty" with the Soviet Union, immediately revoked all Soviet military installations and demanded the withdrawal of all Soviet "experts", military and civil, from Somalia within a set time-limit, etc. All these acts constitute heavy blows at the social-imperialist aggression and expansion in Africa, making positive contributions to upsetting the super-Power's global strategic plan for launching its war of aggression. We would like to ask here: Does the Soviet representative dare to deny such clear facts? The fact that the Soviet representative dodges the truth and resorts to deceit only shows his guilty conscience and further exposes the feeble nature of social-imperialism being fierce of visage but hollow within.

194. As regards the attacks and calumnies the Soviet representative made regarding China's foreign policy, they are indeed beneath refutation. He slanderously accuses China of being warlike, while it is obviously the Soviet Union that is frenziedly carrying out arms expansion and preparations for unleashing a new world war under the smoke-screen of a sham "détente". He slanderously accuses China of having territorial ambitions, while it is obviously the Soviet Union that is pursuing hegemony everywhere, carrying out its policies of aggression and expansion and occupying the territory of other countries. For instance, to date it is still occupying the four northern islands of Japan and is subjecting some of its so-called "allies" to its full control and enslavement, and is stretching out its hands everywhere to menace the national existence of other countries. Such behaviour of a thief crying "catch the thief" is clumsy in the extreme. Following the teachings

of our great leader and teacher Chairman Mao Tsetung, the Chinese Government and people have consistently supported the peoples of the world in their struggle against imperialism, colonialism and hegemony. This is a fact known to all. It is futile for the representative of social-imperialism to undermine the militant friendship forged between the Chinese Government and people and the African countries and people in the common struggle against imperialism, colonialism and hegemony and against racism and Zionism.

195. Mr. KHARLAMOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): I have no intention of diverting the attention of the Assembly from the question under discussion. This has been the persistent practice of the Chinese delegation, on any pretext, and even in connexion with the question of Namibia.

196. Now, this is what I wish to say in order to avoid taxing your patience any longer: the Chinese representative from this rostrum simply spoke about his own experience—experience with China's policy in the international arena. As concerns the policies and practices of my country, I wish to reiterate that only the day before yesterday the General Secretary of the Central Committee of our Party and Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, in reply to malicious slanders against the policies of our country and to the injustice being done by imperialist propaganda, abetted by China, made the following statement:

“Peace, non-interference in internal affairs, respect for independence and territorial integrity, equality, and mutually beneficial co-operation—all these are the indispensable and the most important elements of détente and lasting peace. Such is our policy in Europe, and it is the same in Africa, Asia, Latin America, and everywhere else in the world. And if anyone thinks that the Soviet Union can be diverted from this course with slander and threats, then he's completely mistaken.”

And the Chinese representative also is profoundly mistaken in this.

197. In the same speech, Comrade Brezhnev stated further:

“... it is high time that thought should be given to putting a complete stop to any further quantitative and qualitative growth of the armaments and armed forces of States with a large military potential, and thereby create conditions for their subsequent reduction. Specifically, we are calling for discussion of a programme of the following measures, to be put into effect within a definite time-limit: to stop manufacturing all types of nuclear weapons; to stop manufacturing and to ban all other types of weapons of mass destruction; to stop developing new types of highly destructive conventional arms; and to renounce expanding the armies and increasing the conventional armaments of the permanent members of the United Nations Security Council and countries associated with them under military agreements.”

Comrade Brezhnev said further:

“Certainly, it is no simple matter to agree on these things. Probably, we could first tackle some one angle—say, the termination of the manufacture of nuclear arms, as we have already proposed.”

198. As for everything else that was said by the Chinese representative, I simply will not waste your time on it. Those are our proposals, and soon everyone will see where, on whose side, China stands in putting these proposals into practice.

199. Mr. LAI Ya-li (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): The Soviet representative was completely unable to deny any of the facts which we have enumerated. As we know, facts are, after all, facts. Bragging and losing his temper will get him nowhere, for such behaviour cannot frighten anyone, nor can it obliterate the iron-clad facts. As for the shameless calumnies he levelled against China, would it not be closer to the truth if they were taken as a self-portrayal of social imperialism?

*The meeting rose at 6.40 p.m.*



CONTENTS

Agenda item 7:  
Question of Namibia (*continued*)

**President: Mr. Lazar MOJSOV (Yugoslavia).**

AGENDA ITEM 7

Question of Namibia (*continued*)

1. Mr. NARANCIO (Uruguay) (*interpretation from Spanish*): At the present stage of the consideration by the Assembly of the so-called "question of Namibia" the delegation of Uruguay comes to this rostrum briefly, at the risk of repeating ourselves, to establish the traditional position of our Government on this and other related matters.

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

3. Uruguay, in accordance with its traditional position against racism, supports the principle of self-determination of peoples on which the law which established Uruguay's own independence in 1825 is based and which was confirmed in the Constitution of 1830. It is for this reason that Uruguay looks with sympathy on the similar process followed by the new African States. This is also in keeping with our traditional position of repudiation of racism, discrimination and slavery, a position which was already in existence, albeit timidly, since Uruguay was under Spanish rule, when, early in the eighteenth century, such expressions as "virtual abolitionism" are to be found. It is also in keeping with the rights of slaves and with the recognition by General Artigas, the founder of our nationhood, during the process of Uruguay's accession to independence, of the already diminished indigenous communities as "those having the primary right", until the laws, after 1842, finally abolishing slavery. What is certain is that slaves in Uruguay in colonial times were treated far more as human beings than were the workers in the countries which underwent

the industrial revolution. As heirs, in large part, of the cultural tradition of Spain, we say with Don Quixote "Take note, Brother Sancho, that no person is better unless he does better". This became substantive law when embodied in the eighth article of the Constitution, which reads: "All peoples are equal before the law, there being no distinction among them other than that based on ability or virtue."

4. Furthermore, in Uruguay there has been no expression whatsoever of racism for over a century, except for isolated cases 40 years ago, instigated from the outside by psychopaths, adventurers or foreign agents. Thus we are ahead of other nations, whose efforts and difficulties concerning the elimination of racism we understand. However, in Uruguay, were any such thing to happen in the future, the offenders would be dealt with under the law of 1942 which provides for prison terms of 10 months to five years "for those who promote, establish, organize or direct associations, bodies, institutions or departments aimed at inciting or imposing racial struggle or hatred".

5. Four years ago, at the eighteenth General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), I recognized on behalf of Uruguay the contribution made by the black race to our national structure, and I added that the peaceful and fraternal coexistence in primary and secondary schools and universities, workshops and offices, including our foreign service, among men and women of the most diverse races and origins constituted an example of which we are proud.

6. It is also true that this is so in Uruguay because we are a peace-loving country. In our national Constitution it is established that "in international treaties concluded by the Republic must be included a clause concerning the submission of all disputes between contracting parties for decision by arbitration or other peaceful means". This is not a mere declaration. For over a century our armed forces have not gone beyond our borders to wage war against any other people. They have prepared themselves to defend our national independence and sovereignty, to maintain the security of our community and to protect the responsible exercise of freedom and the rights of each and every one, the only limitations being those imposed by a temporary need and those which may be required for peaceful coexistence in a civilian society. They have done so with the corresponding sacrifice. Racist aggression or any other form of totalitarian or imperialist expansion under whatever banner has always been and will always be rejected by the people and Government of Uruguay. That is why we consider the recollection of Mahatma Gandhi expressed at this rostrum during the thirty-second session by the Foreign Minister of India, Mr. Atal Bihari Vajpayee [*18th meeting*] to have been particularly appropriate. Gandhi, the apostle of non-violence, about whom Uruguayans learn in school

and whose memory we have perpetuated by a monument and the naming of a public street, calls upon us to exert our best endeavours to ensure that violence, condemned in his world-famous struggle, does not continue to claim innocent victims.

7. It is in keeping with these ideas that we believe that the attempts to find a peaceful solution initiated by five members of the Security Council and inspired by the spirit of Article 2 (3) and the philosophy which underlies Chapter IV of the Charter are beneficial and we hope that they will be crowned with success.

8. These are the principles and reasons which have guided and guide Uruguay on the question of Namibia. We are guided by no other interest than that of ensuring that that people determine its own destiny in freedom, peace and labour. Our future conduct in this Assembly will be to fight for compliance with the points we have made or to support those which come closest to them.

9. We wish to thank the United Nations Council for Namibia for its praiseworthy work, which it has carried out in the midst of serious difficulties.

10. I shall conclude because time is gold when human lives and suffering are involved. We do not wish to contribute to drowning the question of Namibia in a sea of words and paper. If an understanding is not reached there will be bloodshed. The pages of history are full of tragic examples of this. Let us therefore recall the wise words of George Santayana in *Life of Reason*: "Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it."

11. Mr. HOVEYDA (Iran): Like previous speakers, I should like to congratulate you, Sir, on your election as President of the General Assembly during its ninth special session on Namibia. I am confident that your able leadership will bring this special session to a successful conclusion.

12. The ninth special session of the General Assembly is being held at a crucial moment. On the one hand, there is a widespread feeling of frustration and disappointment due to the persistent refusal of South Africa to comply with the decisions of the United Nations and other international bodies on the question of Namibia. This situation has made it impossible for the people of Namibia to exercise freely their legitimate right to self-determination and independence. On the other hand, encouraging developments seem to have taken place which could positively influence the future course of events in Namibia and accelerate the process of the transfer of power to the people of that Territory.

13. As is well known, the United Nations has since its inception been faced with the question of Namibia. Numerous resolutions and decisions have been adopted by the General Assembly, the Security Council, 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 United Nations Council for Namibia with a view to putting an end to the illegal presence of South Africa in that Territory and achieving the long-awaited freedom and independence of

the Namibians. Namibia has also been the subject of an advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice. Yet all the efforts of the international community have failed to bring about the desired results and the people of Namibia are still under foreign domination. Meanwhile the Government of South Africa has persistently defied the decisions of the United Nations and, indeed, world public opinion and has even taken steps to strengthen its grip on Namibia through various means. Iran, for its part, has joined the international community in condemning that defiant attitude on the part of South Africa.

14. The Security Council meetings of January 1976 that led to the unanimous adoption of resolution 385 (1976) were a clear demonstration that the international community could no longer remain indifferent to such a situation.

15. The developments which took place after the decision of the Security Council—in particular, the holding of the International Conference in Support of the Peoples of Zimbabwe and Namibia which led to the adoption of the Maputo Declaration in support of the Peoples of Zimbabwe and Namibia and Programme of Action for the Liberation of Zimbabwe and Namibia—further demonstrated that the question of Namibia had acquired an added urgency and that the international community had become fully aware of the necessity for prompt action.

16. The holding of the special session at this crucial moment brings the United Nations to a point where decisive action, supported by the co-operative efforts of its Members, is needed to permit the people of Namibia to exercise its inalienable right to self-determination and independence. In this connexion, it should be noted that the initiative taken by five members of the Security Council seems to have created a new momentum which could accelerate this inevitable process. It is therefore imperative for the international community to make every effort to ensure the success of this important session of the Assembly, keeping always in mind the fundamental principle that any plan for a negotiated settlement of the question of Namibia must first be acceptable to the people of the Territory.

17. It has always been a policy of my Government to oppose colonialism and colonial domination in all its forms. Iran has consistently supported the inalienable right of the people of Namibia to self-determination and independence. We believe that South Africa's presence in Namibia is illegal and that the United Nations has a direct responsibility for the administration of the Territory and for taking all necessary measures to safeguard the interests of the Namibian people. We also believe that the territorial integrity of Namibia must be respected, and we consider Walvis Bay to be and integral part of the Namibian territory.

18. The ninth special session of the General Assembly provides us with a good opportunity for taking prompt and positive action to bring about a peaceful solution to this problem. In our view, the plan presented on 10 April 1978 by five members of the Security Council<sup>1</sup> deserves the

<sup>1</sup> See S/12636.



careful consideration of all the parties concerned. It is high time that the people of Namibia, under the leadership of the South West Africa people's Organization (SWAPO), were given an opportunity to exercise their legitimate right to self-determination and independence. My delegation would like to express the hope that during the ninth special session the General Assembly will accelerate that process so that the people of Namibia can find their rightful place among the family of nations.

19. Mr. HANNAH (New Zealand): This ninth special session of the General Assembly has been convened to consider one of the most serious questions confronting the United Nations today, one involving flagrant defiance of the principles of the Charter. For far too long the people of Namibia have suffered under an illegal occupation, and for far too long the authority of this Organization has thereby been challenged by South Africa. The convening of this special session arises out of justified feelings of frustration, which my delegation fully shares, at this situation. The aim of the special session, as we see it, is to urge the parties concerned to agree upon a practical and immediate approach to ending the illegal occupation of Namibia peacefully in order that the people of the Territory can achieve, through democratic means, their rightful independence in a united and viable country. The achievement of such a peaceful solution must of course accord with the principles enshrined in the Charter, in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) and, particularly, in Security Council resolution 385 (1976).

20. My delegation is under no illusion that the achievement of a peaceful settlement is a simple task, but a number of recent developments have encouraged us in the belief that such a settlement is now very close to reality. Conversely, we are convinced that failure how to conclude an acceptable solution will plunge Namibia into a long and bitter war with incalculable consequences for the people of the country and the region.

21. The proposals laid before the Security Council on 10 April by its five Western members are the result of intensive and arduous negotiations with all the parties concerned. They offer, in the view of the New Zealand delegation, a realistic and practical approach to bringing an end to South Africa's illegal occupation and to providing for free and fair elections, without fear of intimidation or harassment, through which the people of Namibia can elect representatives to a constituent assembly. That assembly would then devise a constitution under which Namibia would achieve its independence. The guarantee of the full implementation of the various elements in the proposals will rest, rightly, with the United Nations itself through the proposed United Nations Transition Assistance Group under the responsibility of a special representative appointed by the Secretary-General.

22. My delegation does not wish to enter into a more detailed examination of the proposals at this stage. We believe that they are clear in their intention and that the comments by the representatives of the five Western States during this debate should have eliminated any possibility of misinterpretation, deliberate or otherwise. Suffice it to say that my delegation notes, of course, the overriding consideration that the proposals have been drawn up in accordance with the provisions of Security Council reso-

lution 385 (1976), which was unanimously adopted on 30 January 1976.

23. There is, however, one aspect of the Namibia question which, as has been explained, was not dealt with in the proposals of the five but which has attracted considerable attention in this debate: that is, the question of Walvis Bay. As my delegation stated at the thirty-second session of the General Assembly [57th meeting], we feel that any exclusion of Walvis Bay from Namibia would undermine that country's integrity and impede significantly its chances of building a viable economy. In our view, therefore, a negotiated solution to the question of Namibia should provide for the inclusion of Walvis Bay in the territory of a free and united Namibia. We recognize that there are different positions of principle between the parties concerned on this issue but we believe that, as in other cases, it should prove possible to move towards an early negotiated solution without necessarily prejudicing those positions.

24. In reviewing the course of developments in the last year, my delegation cannot fail to commend the responsible and reasonable leadership shown by SWAPO and its President, Mr. Nujoma, and the constructive part played by the front-line States and by other leading African nations in seeking a just and acceptable solution to the problem of Namibia. We welcome SWAPO's support for a negotiated settlement and its willingness to participate in free, democratic elections under United Nations supervision and abide by the result of those elections.

25. While our condemnation of South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia—which still continues—remains unabated, it appears also that the Government of South Africa has finally recognized the futility of any attempt to continue its illegal occupation, whether directly or through an internal settlement. The announcement of South Africa's acceptance of the proposals of the Five is a welcome sign of that recognition. We urge all parties concerned to ensure by their further final efforts that the people of Namibia will indeed become free within the next few months.

26. Namibia has been a question of major concern to the United Nations since its inception, and more particularly since the United Nations assumed special responsibility for Namibia over 10 years ago. Notwithstanding the frustration we have all felt at South Africa's persistent defiance of this Organization, there is, in our view, no question that the United Nations, particularly through the Council for Namibia, has contributed greatly towards the creation of an independent, free and united Namibia. The goal has not yet been reached, but it is within our grasp. The task of this special session should be to make practical and realistic recommendations towards that end, preparatory to the Security Council's taking an early decision on appropriate action.

27. New Zealand, for its part, reaffirms its support for the people of Namibia in their struggle for self-determination, independence and freedom, and New Zealand's commitment to finding a peaceful, internationally acceptable solution which will at last enable them to exercise their legitimate and sovereign rights.

28. Mr. HULINSKÝ (Czechoslovakia) (*interpretation from Russian*): The very decision to hold this special session of

the United Nations General Assembly on the question of Namibia demonstrates that it is high time for decisive steps to be taken to put an end to racist South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia—steps which would immediately ensure the transfer of full authority in Namibia to the patriotic forces in the country, under the leadership of SWAPO, which has been recognized by the United Nations as the sole, authentic representative of the Namibian people.

29. More than 10 years have elapsed since the United Nations declared South Africa's occupation of Namibia illegal and itself shouldered direct responsibility for that Territory. Since that time, the General Assembly and the Security Council have adopted numerous resolutions demanding that South Africa withdraw unconditionally from Namibia so that the Namibian people might exercise their inalienable right to self-determination and independence. However, the South African régime not only has refused to implement those decisions but has in fact initiated new measures in order to perpetuate, albeit under a new label, its colonial, racist domination over that Territory.

30. Numerous United Nations documents illustrate the fact that, in order to achieve that end, South Africa is stepping up its military potential in the Territory of Namibia. Preparatory to striking an armed blow against SWAPO and establishing a puppet régime in the Territory, South Africa is expanding its network of military bases, particularly in the northern parts of Namibia, and is training tribal armies and mercenary units. The occupation régime continues to practise even more savagely its policy of murder, mass arrests and arbitrary detention and other repressive measures by the police against the people of Namibia, in particular against those who are members and supporters of SWAPO, in the hope of depriving SWAPO of popular support. The illegal régime is stepping up its policy of splitting up the Territory into so-called homelands, which are in every respect similar to the South African bantustans, thus violating the territorial integrity of Namibia. Its criminal character has been attested to by frequent acts of aggression against the independent African States, in particular against the People's Republic of Angola and the Republic of Zambia.

31. In the economic field, there is a continued ruthless exploitation and pillage of the natural resources of the Territory on the part of the South African and foreign monopolies, which make many millions in profits at the expense of the Namibian people.

32. Of particular concern to us are the manoeuvres that are being undertaken to impose on the Namibian people—following in the wake of Smith and his allies—a so-called internal settlement that is aimed at creating a puppet régime that would be designed to give the semblance of legality to the ongoing occupation of that Territory by the *apartheid* régime of South Africa.

33. In describing the present situation in Namibia, the United Nations Council for Namibia stated *inter alia* in the Declaration that was recently adopted at Lusaka that:

“Irrefutable evidence from inside Namibia shows that South Africa has, over the last few months, embarked on

a reinforcement of its already huge army in Namibia in preparation for a major confrontation with the liberation forces led by SWAPO. South Africa's activities involve a huge military build-up within Namibia, including the shipment into Namibia of large numbers of tanks, large quantities of ammunition, construction of army barracks and the development of atomic weapons. The immediate objective of this military build-up is to consolidate the occupation régime's position, to carry out its hegemonic ambitions in this region, to prevent the oppressed Namibian people from achieving genuine national independence and to create conditions for imposing a puppet régime in Namibia drawn from the Turnhalle group.”  
[See A/S-9/4, para. 31, subpara. 11.]

34. It is quite obvious that this conduct on the part of South Africa represents a serious violation of the principles of the Charter and a constant threat to peace and security not only in that part of the African continent but also beyond its boundaries.

35. However, it is quite obvious as well that the South African racists could continue to refuse to comply with United Nations decisions as long as they have only because of the active support—political, economic and military—of a number of Western countries, in particular certain members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization bloc. It is precisely because of their assistance that South Africa has been able to create a powerful military industry and is now even preparing to develop its own nuclear weapon.

36. The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic has consistently favoured the final removal of the vestiges of colonialism and racism, and defends the idea of solving the Namibian problem in full accord with the will and legitimate aspirations of the people of Namibia.

37. The just solution of the problem on the basis of a strict compliance with the relevant resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly is possible only provided that an end is put to the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa through the immediate and unconditional withdrawal from the entire Territory of Namibia, including Walvis Bay, of all South African troops, police and administrative personnel and the dismantling of all military and paramilitary units in that area. South Africa should immediately liberate all political prisoners and detainees and repeal in Namibia all racist and discriminatory laws and decrees. A just settlement should guarantee the unity and territorial integrity of Namibia, including the town and harbour of Walvis Bay, which is an integral part of Namibia and is closely linked to it by geographical, historical, cultural, economic and ethnic ties. An important prerequisite for a proper solution of this problem is to ensure that, as soon as possible, authority in the country is transferred to the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people, SWAPO. Precisely for this purpose the United Nations should exercise its special responsibility for the governing of Namibia until its complete liberation.

38. The Czechoslovak delegation entirely supports the demands that have been made by the African States to the effect that at its present session the General Assembly should request the Security Council to take the severest possible measures against the occupying force, including

sanctions in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter—in particular, far-reaching economic sanctions and an embargo on oil and weapons supplies.

39. At the same time, the present session should reaffirm previously adopted decisions in order to bring about the immediate and genuine independence of Namibia, in particular the provisions of Security Council resolution 385 (1976). This means that we must counter not only all the manoeuvres of the racists aimed at imposing on the Namibian people a so-called internal settlement but also any proposals that are not in full accord with the decisions adopted on this matter by the Security Council and General Assembly and that attempt to circumvent those decisions. It is not surprising that the provisions contained in a number of those proposals are unacceptable to SWAPO. Is it possible to equate SWAPO—which is fighting against the occupying forces for the freedom of its country and of the indigenous population of that area—with the occupying South African régime and to ask it to make the same concessions? Who has given individual Members of the United Nations the right to modify the decisions taken by the Organization regarding Namibia and to create an atmosphere in which pressure is exerted on others to adopt them? The combined pressure of all Members of the United Nations is essential, but it should be exerted only on South Africa to ensure that it complies with the wishes of the United Nations.

40. The inalienable right of the Namibian people to liberty and independence cannot be the object of an experiment. Our Organization should be fully aware of the tremendous responsibility that it assumed in connexion with Namibia 10 years ago and it should be vigilant to ensure that the process of the decolonization of the Territory is carried out without detriment to the fate of the Namibian people. The Organization should also be fully aware of the fact that the ways and means employed to bring about the decolonization of Namibia will create a precedent with all the consequences flowing therefrom with regard to the problem of Southern Rhodesia and vice versa.

41. The draft declaration and programme of action approved by the United Nations Council for Namibia [see A/S-9/7, annex] contains, as we see it, the fundamental steps that can, if they are unconditionally supported by the Members of the United Nations, promote the immediate abolition of the racist régime and ensure the genuine independence of Namibia. The Czechoslovak delegation therefore fully supports the adoption of those documents by the General Assembly at this special session.

42. I should like once again to assure the representatives of SWAPO that the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic will continue to give SWAPO all the diplomatic, moral and material support it may require in its just struggle for the liberation of its country.

43. There can be no doubt that the armed struggle of the Namibian patriots, under the leadership of SWAPO, has been and, considering the present situation in the Territory, will continue to be a decisive factor in the efforts to achieve freedom and complete independence for a united Namibia. The United Nations should, in its turn, resolutely support the efforts being made by SWAPO and thus help the

Namibian people to attain power in their country—power which belongs to them by right.

44. Mr. HUSSEN (Somalia): I should like to congratulate you, Sir, on your unanimous election to the presidency of the General Assembly at its ninth special session. We are confident that under your skilful guidance and because of your competence and wide experience, the work of this historic session will be crowned by success.

45. The convening of this special session of the General Assembly devoted to Namibia clearly shows the impatience of the international community with South Africa's continued illegal occupation of Namibia—an occupation universally condemned as an act of gross violation both of the rights of the Namibian people and of United Nations authority. It is the hope of my delegation that the convening of this special session is also evidence of the determination of all Member States to join in a concerted effort to end the long agony of the people of Namibia and ensure their speedy accession to full and unequivocal independence.

46. The main obstacle in the way of a peaceful settlement has always been the intransigence of the Pretoria régime, which from the very first session of the General Assembly has consistently shown contempt for the United Nations demand for the withdrawal of South Africa from Namibia and the termination of its illegal control and exploitation of the land and people of Namibia.

47. In recent times there has been a strong consensus in the international community on the principles which should govern Namibia's march to independence. My Government had hoped that negotiations for a peaceful settlement might go forward on the basis of Security Council resolution 385 (1976). However, much publicized cosmetic changes have been introduced to cover both the face of *apartheid* in Namibia and the reality hidden behind South Africa's proposal to grant a semblance of independence to the Territory. The relaxation of a few petty *apartheid* laws cannot hide, for example, the massive military build-up in Namibia, including the development of nuclear weapons. This intensive militarization seems more like a preparation for total war against the forces of national liberation and genuine independence than a preparation for the peaceful transfer of power. It is also difficult not to see this development as an attempt to intimidate neighbouring African States, which, as we know, have already been subjected to acts of aggression by the armed forces of the Pretoria régime.

48. In addition, the international community cannot view with anything but alarm and deep suspicion the current campaign of harassment and violent oppression being directed against members and supporters of SWAPO. This vicious campaign is hardly evidence of South Africa's good faith or of its willingness to create the necessary conditions for free and democratic elections. The United Nations has repeatedly affirmed its support for the leadership of SWAPO, the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people. We must strongly condemn South Africa's attempt to undermine and destroy the liberation movement dedicated to preserving Namibia's unity and nationhood.

49. It is profoundly disturbing to note South Africa's plan to extend its policy of bantustanization to Namibia. The preservation of the unity and nationhood of Namibia has been a constant concern of the world Organization. And yet every administrative contrivance the illegal régime has sought to impose on the Namibian people, like the abortive so-called Turnhalle constitutional conference, has had its roots in the heinous policy of *apartheid*. Today, even while South Africa speaks of independence for the Territory, it is making all efforts towards creating conditions for imposing a puppet régime based on tribal groups. This vicious policy of divide-and-rule provokes unrest and strife, which will give the Pretoria régime a pretext for maintaining bantustans and inciting to violence as an excuse for tightening military control. The attempt to impose the so-called internal settlement which will preserve South African hegemony must be seen for what it is, and must be condemned by the international community.

50. My Government particularly condemns the decision of Mr. Vorster's Government to annex Walvis Bay, which is without question an integral part of Namibia. This desperate attempt to retain economic control of Namibia through control of its commercial lifeline must be exposed in all its perfidy and must be vigorously opposed by Member States of this Organization.

51. In a speech delivered at a State banquet during his recent visit to the People's Republic of China the President of the Somali Democratic Republic, Mr. Mohamed Siad Barre, speaking of Namibia, stated, *inter alia*, that:

“The Somali Government looks forward to the day, in the immediate future, when Namibia will emerge as an independent African country with its territorial integrity intact, including Walvis Bay.”

52. Somalia knows only too well, from its history, the tragic consequences of colonial imperialist arrangements made without the consent or knowledge of the people directly concerned. Such arrangements unjustly deny to peoples their national heritage and create serious obstacles to the exercise of their inalienable right to self-determination and nationhood. In basing its illegal annexation of Walvis Bay on discredited policies of a past era, when colonial lands and peoples were traded back and forth to satisfy the selfish and cynical interests of the colonial Powers, the Pretoria régime has shown once again its contempt for the Charter and for the conditions of its membership in this world Organization.

53. My delegation believes that it is imperative that Member States present a united front in upholding those established principles which must form the basic prerequisite for Namibia's independence. The Lusaka Declaration of the United Nations Council for Namibia has restated, in the light of these realities, the principles and the policies which we must follow if we are to carry out faithfully the task that we assumed 12 years ago of ensuring for the people of Namibia their right to self-determination and independence and to the unity and territorial integrity of the nation.

54. My delegation believes, above all, that it is of the utmost importance to reaffirm the direct responsibility of

the United Nations for Namibia. In this context my Government believes that the efforts of the five Western Powers to achieve a negotiated settlement is a constructive contribution to the resolution of the Namibian problem. We trust, however, that in the course of these negotiations the essential principle of United Nations responsibility will not be undermined nor Namibia's attainment of genuine independence jeopardized by allowing the illegal South African régime to believe that it has any right to make demands or press for concessions. We trust, too, that any negotiations for an internationally agreed upon settlement will deal only with the modalities for the transfer of power from the illegal régime to the Namibian people and that such modalities will be worked out with the complete approval of SWAPO and within the framework of United Nations supervision.

55. While my Government hopes for a peaceful transfer of power, it is aware that the liberation forces of Namibia must be on guard against the desperate manoeuvres of Pretoria's Government to retain its illegal control over Namibia. We therefore firmly support the emphasis of the Lusaka Declaration on the need for the strongest possible moral and material support for SWAPO.

56. It will be recalled that in the Mogadiscio Declaration of 1971 the members of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) reaffirmed the legitimacy of the liberation struggle against the forces of colonialism and racism. That Declaration took note of the obvious fact that all avenues of peaceful change had been closed to the patient and long-suffering peoples oppressed by minority rule in southern Africa. It also emphasized that the major responsibility for achieving freedom lies with the oppressed peoples and their liberation forces using all means at their disposal, including armed struggle. My Government therefore has no hesitation in reiterating its unqualified support to and solidarity with SWAPO, which has been always prepared to negotiate a peaceful settlement based on genuine independence for the people of Namibia.

57. While the chief obstacle to the independence of Namibia has been South Africa's intransigence, another major hindrance has been the support given to South Africa by some Western countries in its illegal control and exploitation of Namibia. The rich natural resources of the Territory continue to be plundered and squandered for the benefit of the white minorities in Namibia and South Africa, as well as the foreign companies operating there in collusion with the illegal régime.

58. My Government sincerely hopes that, in these days when a final and decisive effort is needed more than ever before to achieve our long-standing goal of Namibian independence, there will be a renewed commitment to the realization of that goal, the need for which can hardly be over-emphasized. In this context the States whose nationals are involved in the plunder of Namibia's wealth should bring pressure to bear on them and their companies to make them cease and desist from any form of co-operation with the illegal régime in Namibia.

59. The Namibian situation makes the strict observance of the arms embargo against South Africa imperative. In our view—and, I am sure, in the view also of the majority of

Member States—any breach of the embargo and any co-operation with the racist régime in South Africa in the development of nuclear weapons constitute a serious threat to the security not only of the region but also of the world at large.

60. Until the people of Namibia achieve their national aspirations—and I hope that it will be very soon—they will need extensive material and technical assistance from the international community. In accordance with the Lusaka Declaration and other declarations and resolutions on Namibia, my Government urges all Member States and the specialized agencies to contribute as generously as possible to the Nationhood Programme for Namibia and to the other United Nations projects which are aimed at preparing Namibia for independence and for the national consolidation of the new State.

61. In conclusion, let me say that my delegation is confident that this special session on Namibia will demonstrate its determination that South Africa's illegal occupation and exploitation of Namibia must be put to an end and that the people of Namibia shall at last achieve unreservedly their legitimate right to self-determination and independence.

62. If the momentum of this and other initiatives does not succeed in overcoming the intransigence South Africa has shown for the past 30 years, the Security Council will have no alternative but to take strong measures to compel Mr. Vorster's régime to withdraw from Namibia. My Government believes that in such circumstances nothing less than comprehensive economic sanctions will suffice to elicit a positive response. If the Security Council were to fail once again to take the necessary effective measures, it would not only be seriously derelict in discharging its responsibility to the Namibian people but also damage its own authority and credibility in world affairs.

63. Mr. DESSANDE (Chad) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, first, I should like to express the pleasure of my delegation at your election to the high office of President of the General Assembly during this special session. Your election is a tribute paid to your wide experience and to your thorough knowledge of the questions confronting our world, as well as to the constructive role in the vanguard played by your country, Yugoslavia, as a member of the non-aligned movement and in the United Nations.

64. We are equally pleased at the election of Ambassador Gwendoline Konie, President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, as head of the Special Committee, and convey to her our sincere wishes for the success of the work of that important Committee.

65. The defiant attitude which has always been displayed by the Pretoria *apartheid* régime towards the many resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, the arrogance which that régime has constantly shown in regard to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice and Vorster's obstinate refusal to accept the proposals which have been made, have led us once again to meet in special session to take stock of the internal and international situation obtaining with respect to Namibia

and to adopt specific decisions likely to speed up the process of the accession of that Territory to self-determination, freedom and national independence.

66. Eighteen years ago, the General Assembly adopted resolution 1514 (XV) which embodies the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. In that historic Declaration, Member States declared that:

“The subjection of peoples to alien subjugation, domination and exploitation constitutes a denial of fundamental human rights, is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations and is an impediment to the promotion of world peace and co-operation.”

67. Ever since then, the decolonization of territories has been the focus of the efforts of the whole United Nations system and the legitimate hope of peoples and countries still under foreign domination. Were we to draw up a balance sheet of the accomplishments so far, we would see important gains in the asset column: dozens of countries have acceded to independence and now contribute to the solution of present-day problems. One can say without exaggeration that the liberation movement launched by that Declaration has scored unprecedented victories and has brought us closer to the eagerly awaited moment when colonialism and racism will have disappeared from our planet. However, it is to be regretted that despite the time which has elapsed, the Namibian people continue to be denied their right to determine their own destiny and freely to choose, as other people do, their own social system. Since the process set in motion by that Declaration is irreversible, there must be no exceptions. Namibia, like other countries, must reap the fruits of that universal process.

68. South Africa has no legal authority whatsoever over Namibia since its Mandate was revoked by the General Assembly in 1966, in resolution 2145 (XXI), because of its inability to accomplish the noble tasks which had been entrusted to it in the aftermath of the First World War. The decision of the General Assembly was unequivocal. It stated clearly that South Africa no longer had the right to continue to administer the Territory and that Namibia was thus placed under the direct responsibility of the United Nations. The General Assembly then established the United Nations Council for Namibia, whose role was to administer the Territory of Namibia and replace the bogus South African authority there by the United Nations presence.

69. How can we then understand the presence of South Africa in Namibian territory in any other way than as an expression of defiance, which Vorster, with the blessing of his friends, has hurled and continues to hurl at the international community?

70. Need we recall that the Security Council decided in resolution 269 (1969):

“... that the continued occupation of the Territory of Namibia by the South African authorities constitutes an aggressive encroachment on the authority of the United Nations, a violation of the territorial integrity and a denial of the political sovereignty of the people of Namibia”.

Need we recall that the Security Council further declared in resolution 276 (1970):

“... that the continued presence of the South African authorities in Namibia is illegal and that consequently all acts taken by the Government of South Africa on behalf of or concerning Namibia after the termination of the Mandate are illegal and invalid”.

71. By its refusal to withdraw from Namibia, South Africa has thus entered into open conflict with all the African countries as well as with all other countries that love peace and justice, in other words, the reason for the collective interest of the international community in the question of Namibia. The position of Chad on this question has been clearly defined in the declaration of general policy of the Supreme Military Council and of the Provisional Government. The people of my country unswervingly support the struggle of the Namibian people. That armed struggle of the people under the leadership of the liberation movement, SWAPO, which is the sole and authentic representative of the people, is a reaction to the intransigence and irresponsible South African ambitions in Namibia. The legitimate struggle will be intensified as long as acceptable conditions are not obtained. It is therefore imperative for the international community to see to it that the situation does not worsen.

72. The deterioration of the situation in Namibia, resulting from the illegal occupation of that country by the Pretoria régime, the intensification of acts of aggression against African States, and specifically against Zambia, Angola and Botswana, as well as the oppression to which the Namibian people has been subjected, constitute a continuing threat to international peace and security. The question of Namibia therefore requires concerted and prompt action. It is no longer time for the hypocrisy which has characterized the positions adopted by certain United Nations Members whose behaviour has always blocked the implementation of the many resolutions adopted on this question. History will show that the Namibian people and African peoples in general have been victims of the deceit of those Members. It is no longer easy to join the world in denouncing the South African presence in Namibia while aiding Vorster to consolidate his position. Co-operation between South Africa and some Member States in the economic and military fields as well as in matters of security has continued to aggravate the situation in Namibia and has encouraged Pretoria to persist in the odious racist propaganda with which it supported the Turnhalle Conference, and in its cynical plan to appropriate Walvis Bay, which geographically, economically, politically and culturally is an integral part of Namibia. We have repeatedly condemned that co-operation which, regardless of its nature, enables Pretoria to maintain and tighten its hold over Namibia, to threaten the African States of the subregion and to continue violating the inalienable rights of the Namibian people.

73. For us, the basis of a solution to the question of Namibia is Security Council resolution 385 (1976). We shall judge on its true merits any individual or collective initiative that follows the principles embodied in that resolution. The proposals of five members of the Security Council have been considered by us because we believe that

they contain important elements to be considered and that they constitute a useful document in the search for an appropriate solution to the Namibian question. Nevertheless, we wish to express here the difficulties that our delegation faces in viewing favourably the position of Pretoria on those proposals, a position which must be examined in depth by the authors of those proposals.

74. The formula which should be retained is that which would advocate the withdrawal of all South African military and para-military forces from Namibia, the unconditional liberation of all political prisoners and the return to Namibia of all Namibians in exile, and the endorsement by the United Nations Council for Namibia of any provisional authority appointed in the Territory before its accession to complete independence within its present borders, including Walvis Bay.

75. Our Assembly should support any initiative which takes these elements into account, since its responsibilities include mobilizing support for the struggle of the Namibian people for self-determination, freedom and independence in a united Namibia and bringing about the complete and unconditional withdrawal of the *apartheid* Republic of South Africa from the Territory.

76. The United Nations Council for Namibia has submitted to the General Assembly a working document containing a draft declaration and programme of action concerning Namibia. We can only congratulate the members of the Council on the serious work done in preparing that document which undoubtedly reflects the feeling of the international community concerning the outmoded behaviour of the South African régime in Namibia. We support the contents of the document, which in our view would mean:

77. First, strong condemnation of the Pretoria régime for its illegal occupation of Namibia, its savage repression of the people of that Territory, its plundering of the Territory's resources and its flagrant aggression against Angola, Zambia and Botswana;

78. Secondly, denunciation of co-operation with South Africa in all areas and in particular in the economic, military and diplomatic fields;

79. Thirdly, the unconditional support of the international community for the legitimate armed liberation struggle being waged by the Namibian people under the leadership of its only authentic representative, SWAPO; and,

80. Fourthly, reaffirmation by the international community that Walvis Bay is an integral part of Namibia.

81. Mr. CHARLES (Haiti) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, the delegation of Haiti is very pleased that you are presiding once again over the General Assembly at this new session, and is convinced that, thanks to your personal distinction, your well-tryed experience and your talents as a seasoned diplomat, you will once again direct the work of this General Assembly on the question of Namibia with equal success.

82. The Government of the Republic of Haiti welcomes the convening of this special session of the General Assembly for the purpose of considering, in accordance with resolution 32/9, the explosive situation which has been created by the persistent refusal of South Africa to withdraw from Namibia notwithstanding the repeated injunctions of the General Assembly and the Security Council of the United Nations.

83. The Republic of Haiti, which was the first to run up the flag of revolt by the enslaved black peoples to free themselves from the colonial yoke, is following with great interest the course of events in that part of the world, events which could well deteriorate into a conflagration with incalculable consequences if a satisfactory solution is not speedily found to this problem, which is, above all, a problem for the United Nations as the legal Administering Authority of that Territory.

84. The Namibian problem, in sum, can be defined in very simple terms. In effect, it is a matter of simply putting an end to the occupation of Namibia, which has been declared illegal by the International Court of Justice and the United Nations, by compelling the racist Vorster Government to withdraw its criminal administration while at the same time making it possible for the people of Namibia as a whole to exercise its inalienable right to self-determination and independence. However, despite its apparent simplicity, that problem has for more than 10 years now eluded any solution which would be in accordance with the wishes of the international community, on the one hand, and the legitimate aspirations of the Namibian people, subjugated, humiliated and deprived of its most elementary rights, on the other.

85. Nevertheless, many efforts have been made within the United Nations system and through other governmental and non-governmental organizations to take up the challenge which has been so arrogantly posed by the colonial and racist régime of South Africa. Many resolutions have been adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council, in particular resolution 385 (1976) which, *inter alia*, refers to the process of withdrawing the South African administration from Namibian territory. South Africa, with its usual brazenness and buttressed by the support that has always been provided by its faithful Western allies, is doing everything possible to consolidate its position and continues to frustrate the hopes of the Namibian people longing for peace and justice.

86. We note with indignation that in its desire to reinforce its illegal occupation the racist South African Government is stepping up arbitrary detention, torture and assassination of patriots and systematic acts of terrorism against the indigenous population of Namibia. It is dismembering the Territory by creating bantustans and organizing tribal armies devoted to its interests. It has decided to annex the territory of Walvis Bay, which is an integral part of Namibia, and, in order to consolidate its hold on the country, with disgustingly cynical cunning it is proposing to set up a puppet government as the final solution of the problem.

87. Confronted with the intransigent and ill-considered attitude of South Africa, the General Assembly, anxious to

discharge its full responsibilities, requested in resolution 32/9 the convening of a series of plenary meetings of the United Nations Council for Namibia in order to take stock of the situation and prepare for the present session. Following those meetings, a draft declaration and programme of action were prepared for submission to the General Assembly for consideration. Those important recommendations of the Council, if they are adopted and fully implemented, will, we are certain, win the support of the international community and undoubtedly lead to the elimination of that potential source of tension and to the establishment of an era of peace and justice in an independent, united and sovereign Namibia. As a member of the United Nations Council for Namibia, whose efforts we fully support, the delegation of Haiti reaffirms its support for that declaration and the programme of action that relates to it. At the same time we energetically condemn South Africa for its acts of aggression that have been perpetrated against the Namibian people and for the organized exploitation and depredation of its natural resources by South African and foreign companies.

88. In thus endorsing the decisions of the United Nations Council for Namibia, the Government of the Republic of Haiti equally condemns the preparations being made by the Pretoria régime to establish a puppet régime to be imposed on Namibia and to substitute for SWAPO, which is the sole authentic and legitimate representative of the Namibian people. The semblance of authority to be exercised by that so-called government, born of the Turnhalle talks, would in fact only serve to perpetuate South Africa's effective presence in the Namibian territory through intermediaries and, in the final analysis, would simply be a repetition of the grotesque scenario of the so-called Salisbury agreement.

89. At this critical time when all of Africa and its sons of the Diaspora, as well as the rest of the international community, are mobilizing to carry out a final assault on the last bastions of colonialism, racism and *apartheid*, we cannot agree with the internal settlement proposed by South Africa, the purpose of which is to convert Namibia into a vassal State controlled by Vorster. It is our view that the only possible and acceptable solution should be the free exercise of the right to self-determination by all Namibians.

90. We believe that everything should be done to prevent the creation of a Salisbury-Pretoria-Windhoek axis—because, in view of South Africa's military and economic potential and its imperialist designs, the creation of such an axis would undoubtedly constitute a perpetual danger to the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the African States neighbouring on South Africa which have already been frequent victims of the acts of aggression perpetrated by the racist army of Vorster.

91. With respect to Walvis Bay, the Government of Haiti condemns its annexation and declares that act to be null and void. It is unthinkable that after all these years of desperate struggle, all the sacrifices that they have made to free themselves from the occupation of the South African racists, the Namibian people should be constrained to yield up that integral part of their national territory. The conclusion of such a bargain, apart from the serious consequences which it might have for the economic and political future of the Territory, would, in the opinion of

my delegation, be a disgraceful and immoral act in which the United Nations should not be involved. We condemn that attempt and request this Assembly to take steps to ensure that, when independence comes, not an inch of Namibian soil is left to the mercies of the colonialist, racist régime.

92. In the meantime, the tragic reality is that, stubbornly refusing to make peace with the rest of the world and entrenching itself behind its weapons of mass destruction and its policies of *apartheid* that it has now introduced into Namibia, South Africa continues to mock the international community. Far from preparing to withdraw from that Territory, South Africa is taking every step to strengthen its military potential there, in the hope that it will score a military victory over the SWAPO liberation forces.

93. The presence of a large number of tanks and large quantities of ammunition, the fact that barracks are being built, not to mention the manufacture of atomic weapons—all that reveals in Namibia the warlike intentions of the Government of South Africa. It is obvious that the purpose is none other than the consolidation of the occupation régime so as to prevent the people of Namibia from acceding to genuine national independence. For that purpose, South Africa is also recruiting collaborators, tribal elements, real henchmen, *agents provocateurs* and trouble-makers whom it is using to combat the valiant militants of SWAPO.

94. Aware as we are of those facts, and since we cannot forbid others to use the same techniques and weapons to which we resorted in winning our independence, the Republic of Haiti fully supports the liberation movements fighting in Namibia and, in so far as it can, will give every kind of moral and financial support to the true people of Namibia. We consider SWAPO as the sole legitimate representative of the Namibian people on the territory of Namibia, and observe further that any arrangements entered into that would exclude SWAPO and the United Nations cannot have our support. We demand South Africa's complete and unconditional withdrawal from Namibia to make it possible for the Namibian people, under the direction of SWAPO, to exercise sovereign control over its territory.

95. It is undeniable that the rebellious attitude of the Government of South Africa towards the United Nations is a dangerous threat to international peace and security. Drastic steps should be taken to force South Africa to respect the decisions taken by the Organization. As the legal Administering Authority, the United Nations should take over effective control of the Territory of Namibia. In this regard, the Security Council should act with more firmness and apply against South Africa the full range of sanctions laid down in Chapter VII of the Charter.

96. It is for that reason that the Republic of Haiti gives its full support to the recommendation contained in subparagraph 37 of the Lusaka Declaration [*see A/S-9/4, para. 31*], whereby the General Assembly should urgently consider any necessary action in this regard, should the Security Council prove powerless.

97. The Haitian delegation has listened with considerable interest to the statement made by the Secretary of State for External Affairs of Canada [*3rd meeting*], speaking on behalf of the five Western members of the Security Council, in the course of which he placed before this Assembly for its consideration a proposal designed to implement the pertinent provisions of Security Council resolution 385 (1976). We have taken note of the communication relating to the acceptance of this by Mr. Vorster, the Prime Minister of South Africa.

98. We also noted that the President of SWAPO, in his statement made at the meeting on 24 April [*1st meeting*], did not reject the five-Power proposal but reserved his right to speak "in due course".

99. Without in any way claiming to be SWAPO's spokesman, my delegation has some serious reservations on certain aspects of the five-Power proposal. The proposal does not actually state that the administrator-general of South Africa would work under the orders of the United Nations special representative. According to that proposal, the maintenance of public order during the electoral campaign would be assured by the very South African police force which at present continues systematically to massacre the Namibian patriots.

100. Furthermore, we find it very difficult to understand how it is possible to ask a freedom fighter to lay down his arms before his goal has been reached, as this Western proposal seeks to do. In this connexion, we would recall the words of the Commissaire François Santhonax, when he was sent to Santo Domingo at the time of the slave uprising which was to end in the creation of the sovereign State of Haiti. He said, "He who takes away your gun wants to make a slave of you."

101. The South African administrator-general of Namibia and the United Nations special representative there will have to agree on the organization of elections under the supervision of the massive South African forces and a special United Nations force. The fate of Walvis Bay is still a big question mark. This picture causes our delegation to have many reservations, since during the transitional period South Africa would still be the unchallenged master of the situation in the Territory.

102. We insist that if indeed there are elections, the population of Walvis Bay also shall be permitted to participate in that important process, which will affect the destiny of Namibia as a whole.

103. Despite the obvious weaknesses in the five-Power proposal and our own reservations thereon, the Haitian delegation, in accordance with its policy of participating in the search for peaceful, negotiated solutions to the problems facing our Organization, will not oppose any consensus reached by this Assembly, provided that it meets the legitimate aspirations of the Namibian people and enables them to exercise fully their right to self-determination and national independence.

*The meeting rose at 12.35 p.m.*





CONTENTS

Agenda item 7:  
Question of Namibia (*continued*)

*President: Mr. Lazar MOJSOV (Yugoslavia).*

AGENDA ITEM 7

Question of Namibia (*continued*)

1. Mr. TSHERING (Bhutan): Mr President, the delegation of the Kingdom of Bhutan is delighted to see you presiding over the General Assembly at its ninth special session devoted to the question of Namibia. Your wide experience in international affairs and the manner in which you guided the work of the thirty-second session and the eighth special session of the General Assembly makes us confident that our deliberations on Namibia will reach a fruitful conclusion.

2. The convening of this special session is important to the oppressed people of Namibia and to the international community as an opportunity for reasserting the support of the Member nations and reviewing the responsibilities of the United Nations. It is an appropriate time for the General Assembly to assess the situation in depth.

3. We believe that this special session is being held at a time when the negotiating efforts related to independence and the liberation struggle both inside and outside Namibia have reached a high level of intensity. Indeed, we have reached a cross-roads. The majority people in southern Africa are now more determined than ever to free themselves from the illegal racist régimes. We are also aware that the United Nations has a special responsibility over Namibia. My delegation therefore hopes that this special session will be able to assess the situation in its proper perspective.

4. The question of Namibia was inscribed on the agenda of the United Nations in 1946. Since then it has been on the agenda of the United Nations. General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) of 1966 terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia and resolution 2248 (S-V) of 1967 established the United Nations Council for South West Africa (Namibia). The International Court of Justice also held that the continued presence of South Africa in Namibia being illegal, South Africa was under obligation to withdraw its administration from Namibia immediately and thus put an end to its occupation of the Territory.<sup>1</sup> The United Nations

<sup>1</sup> See *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. 58.*

has adopted other relevant resolutions designed to bring about the withdrawal of South Africa from Namibia. The Member States of the United Nations, year after year, have reaffirmed their support of and commitment to a free Namibia and its people, free from the illegal occupation of the racist régime of South Africa. The Heads of State and Government of the non-aligned movement at their summit conferences declared their full support for the liberation of Namibia from the illegal racist administration and called for self-determination by the people of Namibia under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO).

5. Yet the people of Namibia have not been able to exercise their inalienable right to self-determination. Many lives have been lost and property destroyed but the people in Namibia still continue to endure suffering at the hands of the racist régime in south Africa. How long will the Namibian people and the international community be able to tolerate such a situation? The time has come indeed to put an end to this intolerable oppression perpetrated by the *apartheid* régime of South Africa.

6. South Africa has so far demonstrated only callous intransigence. The racist régime has also flouted the resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly of the United Nations. All this irresponsible behaviour on the part of South Africa is in defiance of the will of the international community. Because of the behaviour of one Member State, unfortunately, the ability of the United Nations to maintain international peace and security is being questioned. We must not allow the continuance of such a situation. South Africa is also proceeding steadily with the fragmentation of the Territory into so-called homelands or bantustans. The racist régime in Pretoria has continued its persecution of the African nationalists in the hope of weakening SWAPO leadership. There is an escalation of brutality and intimidation by south Africa in order to divide Namibia and perpetuate the illegal administration of the Territory.

7. There appears to be a calculated campaign of terror and attacks on men, women and children, and particularly on the supporters of SWAPO, with destruction of their property and homes. In a recent statement at Lusaka, the President of SWAPO, Sam Nujoma, stated:

"In Namibia the obnoxious system of colonial oppression and exploitation is being massively intensified by the South African régime. Armed forces are being increased and deployed all over the country. New military bases and other facilities are being established. Acts of terror and oppression are being committed daily, while the political, social and economic conditions continue to be miserable beyond description."

8. The situation seems to be deteriorating with every passing day, with untold suffering by the people of Namibia. It is evident that the Turnhalle group is being incited by South Africa to promote its puppets and quislings, which only encourages fratricidal war and a reign of terror. Despite that situation, the people of Namibia and their SWAPO leaders are more than ever determined to achieve self-determination and independence. This is evident from the recent statement of Sam Nujoma, the SWAPO leader, who said at the beginning of this special session:

“...so long as racist South Africa continues to entrench and perpetuate its colonial military occupation and so long as the plundering... of our natural... resources continue, for so long will SWAPO persist in the intensification of the armed struggle.” [*1st meeting, para. 132*]

9. The recent Lusaka Declaration adopted at the extraordinary meetings of the Council of Namibia and the reports of the special consultative missions to many countries show precisely the support enjoyed by SWAPO and the course that events are taking. Time will fast run out unless an urgent solution is found.

10. The racist South African authorities characterize the elementary human rights exercised justifiably by the people of Namibia as acts of terrorism. The South African racist régime refuses to understand the determination of SWAPO and the people of Namibia to liberate the country and bring it to political freedom and true national independence. Thus, so far the South African régime has insisted on the so-called Turnhalle internal settlement process. Such solutions, as we know, are based on human degradation, domination and brutal oppression.

11. A recent International Labour Organisation statement on Namibia has revealed indisputably the existence of wide discrimination under the illegal racist administration in Namibia. The South African Constitution, legislation and administrative control have created employment and labour conditions which exclude the African working population from sharing the economic benefits of the Territory. South Africa has used all its military and economic power to sustain its domination of the Territory and to exploit and exhaust Namibia's natural resources, to the detriment of present and future generations.

12. We in Bhutan view with dismay the methods employed by South Africa to perpetuate its illegal presence in Namibia. The continuation of the abhorrent policy of *apartheid* and all the obnoxious methods used by the racist régime is in direct conflict with the principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The attitude of South Africa and its *apartheid* policy are indeed an affront to the dignity of man. No people can be expected to undergo oppression and indignity for so long, as have the people in southern Africa and Namibia. They have carried out a long and arduous struggle in order to be able to form an independent nation of their own and determine their own destiny. The people in Namibia have waited too long for freedom.

13. The solution of the problem is now more urgent than ever. At previous sessions of the General Assembly my

delegation supported resolution 385 (1976), which was adopted unanimously by the Security Council. We believe the decision of the Security Council was a step in the right direction and consistent with the aspirations of the people of Namibia and the responsibilities undertaken by the United Nations. The SWAPO leadership has displayed a constructive attitude with regard to the implementation of resolution 385 (1976) in its entirety. SWAPO has also expressed its willingness to take part in free, fair and democratic elections under the control of the United Nations. Mr. Nujoma, the President of SWAPO, recently said at Lusaka:

“In New York SWAPO made far-reaching and substantive concessions towards progress in the talks. These include an acceptance of 1,500 enemy troops, who will remain in Namibia throughout the proposed electoral process, while our own liberation forces will be under the confinement and surveillance of the United Nations peace-keeping force. Moreover, we reiterated our readiness to participate in free, fair and democratic elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations and to abide by the results of such elections.” [*See A/S-9/4, p. 14.*]

We commend the constructive attitude thus demonstrated by SWAPO.

14. It is in this spirit of seeking an urgent solution of the crucial problem in Namibia that the delegation of the Kingdom of Bhutan also appreciates the efforts made by Canada, the Federal Republic of Germany, France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America as members of the Security Council. We now have before us, in document S/12636, a proposal submitted by them. This was presented in a cogent manner by the Secretary of State for External Affairs of Canada on behalf of the five Western members of the Council [*3rd meeting*]. We understand that the objective of the proposal is the independence of Namibia in accordance with Security Council resolution 385 (1976). Indeed, no effort should be spared to find a solution through peaceful negotiations so that further suffering and bloodshed may be avoided.

15. My delegation also listened with attention to the views of many speakers who preceded me and to the keynote statement made by Sam Nujoma, President of SWAPO. From a quick glance at the proposal of the five Powers, my delegation is inclined to agree with those speakers who feel that, although well-meaning, it perhaps suffers from certain drawbacks, and that there should be room for further negotiations.

16. The delegation of the Kingdom of Bhutan believes that in any effort towards the resolution of the problem of Namibia, the position of SWAPO, as the authentic representative of the people of Namibia, must be taken into account, as well as that of the United Nations, as the Administering Authority until the Territory of Namibia attains independence. My delegation also believes that in the meantime the historic Maputo Declaration in Support of the Peoples of Zimbabwe and Namibia and the Programme of Action for the Liberation of Zimbabwe and Namibia as already outlined in General Assembly resolution 32/9 should be implemented, and that resolution 32/105 F

should be observed, so as to support the liberation efforts of SWAPO and the neighbouring States.

17. On the question of Walvis Bay, my delegation believes that it is an integral part of Namibia. The annexation of Walvis Bay by the Pretoria régime is an example of its stubborn intransigence and desire to perpetuate its domination over the Territory. The annexation of Walvis Bay has an ominous implication for the future of an independent Namibia. It is a major deep-water port of significant economic importance. By expropriating Walvis Bay, South Africa shows every sign of its intention to continue economic as well as political domination of Namibia even after its independence. South Africa's annexation of Walvis Bay is an act of aggression against the Namibian people and has been rejected by the United Nations.

18. South Africa has used Namibian territory to commit aggression against neighbouring countries. The other day [*1st meeting*], the President of SWAPO, Mr. Nujoma, said that irrefutable evidence had been gathered inside Namibia of an extensive military build-up in the country. New types of heavy and sophisticated armaments were being deployed. A large number of tanks, combat aircraft artillery pieces and large quantities of ammunition were being shipped into Namibia. New bases, barracks and military airfields were being built in strategic areas in the country for offensive purposes against SWAPO and the Namibian revolution. In the circumstances and the volatile conditions prevailing in the area, the increasing guerrilla warfare could spread and involve more than just SWAPO and the South African forces. Moreover, South Africa is also using uranium mined in Namibia and the Kalahari Desert, to further its nuclear programmes.

19. Thus, South Africa has created a dangerous situation which poses a threat to international peace and security. In view of such an ominous situation, the Secretary-General has said that there can be no peace in South Africa until the necessary changes so long called for by the United Nations were effected and that we could no longer afford delay as the potential for major disaster became more real everyday.

20. At this crucial stage in the struggle of the Namibian people, if all efforts to find a peaceful solution should fail, the delegation of the Kingdom of Bhutan believes that the international community must take definitive action to ensure the complete and unconditional withdrawal of South Africa from Namibia, as envisaged in Security Council resolutions 264 (1969), 269 (1969), 366 (1974) and 385 (1976), including measures under Chapter VII of the Charter.

21. Mr. ASHTAL (Democratic Yemen) (*interpretation from Arabic*): I am very happy to congratulate you, Sir, on your election as President of the General Assembly at this special session devoted to Namibia and its people who are suffering from the worst forms of colonialism, exploitation and racial discrimination. The confidence the General Assembly has placed in you is a great tribute to you and to your country, Yugoslavia, for the important role it has played in the struggle against colonialism and neo-colonialism and in supporting the peoples of the world in their struggle for liberation, progress and peace.

22. After 11 years of debate on the self-determination of the people of Namibia, the convening of this present session is of special significance since it occurs at a decisive stage when the people of Namibia hope to realize their aspirations for freedom and complete independence. Namibia is now on the threshold of independence as a result of the heroic struggle of its people under the leadership of SWAPO, its sole representative. From this rostrum I should like to hail its leaders and fighters.

23. The determination of the racist régime in south Africa to perpetuate its occupation of Namibia, subjugate it for military purposes, so as to serve world imperialism and thus threaten the peace and stability of neighbouring African countries, in particular Angola, Zambia and Mozambique, and the exploitation of the human and natural resources of Namibia for the benefit of the ruling party in South Africa and for that of transnational capitalist corporations, are in a sense, flagrant attacks on the people of the area and transgressions against the United Nations and its Charter. Nothing proves that more than the oppression and brutal repression of the heroic people of Namibia and of their legitimate representative, SWAPO.

24. We are witnessing today new attempts to deprive the people of Namibia of full independence, by offering partial solutions, which aim at replacing direct occupation with neo-colonialism and keeping the occupying foreign forces under the United Nations flag. On the other hand, South Africa's determination to annex Walvis Bay—using various pretexts—reaffirms the limitless greed of the racist régime in Pretoria.

25. We wonder how there can be free elections and self-determination for the Namibian people with the military presence of South Africa, even if such presence were merely a formal one. Genuine independence cannot take place without full sovereignty and respect for Namibia's territorial integrity. Any partial solution not according full independence to Namibia and protecting its territorial unity is merely a solution serving the interests of racist South Africa and world-wide imperialism and, in effect, is nothing but an attempt aimed at dividing Namibia and promoting its imperialist domination under the banner of alleged independence.

26. Our country lived under colonialism for 190 years, and attained its independence after an armed struggle by the people. We are fully aware of the fact that independence cannot be real unless it is a complete and unconditional independence. If Namibia wants independence today, it can be guided by the teachings of history which point the way, for independence is indivisible, freedom is indivisible and sovereignty is also indivisible.

27. Independence is indivisible, as are freedom and sovereignty. That is the destiny of Namibia, which has been fighting for so long and now enjoys the full support of the international community and the strength and determination of its militants.

28. The merely formal concessions offered by South Africa and its allies are nothing but attempts to gain time and ensure the continued control of neo-colonialism over Namibia. If the ultimate interests of the Pretoria régime and

its imperialist allies imply a certain negligence and a desire to gain time and win new friends through procrastination, the interests of the people of Namibia demand that the fight continue to be waged until full independence and sovereignty are won.

29. SWAPO has agreed to peaceful negotiations for a settlement in Namibia, if that is possible. SWAPO has also agreed to free elections to determine the form of the new régime, under United Nations supervision, and we are convinced that the complete withdrawal of South African forces will make possible free elections, as well as complete independence and sovereignty for the Namibian people, in accordance with the recommendations of the United Nations Council for Namibia and the pertinent United Nations resolutions on Namibia.

30. Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): Sir, may I at the outset, offer my delegation's heartfelt congratulations on your unanimous election as President of the General Assembly at this important special session. The wise and inspired leadership you bring to your high office and your diplomatic skill are significant assets for the successful accomplishment of our work in the coming days. It is my delegation's belief that your high qualities of integrity of character and dedication to the ideals and objectives of the United Nations justifiably rank you among the most successful Presidents the Assembly has ever had.

31. I wish on this occasion to pay a tribute also to the leading role played by Yugoslavia, a fellow non-aligned country, in the cause of freedom and decolonization the world over. I also wish to express my delegation's deep appreciation to Ambassador Konie of Zambia, President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, and to Ambassador Salim of the United Republic of Tanzania, Chairman 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, as well as to the bodies over which they preside, for their significant contribution towards the liberation of Namibia and decolonization in general.

32. The convening of this special session on Namibia has particular significance. It is the second special session of the General Assembly on the same subject. In the 11 years since the termination of South Africa's Mandate and the first special session on the subject, nothing effective has been achieved to relieve the plight of this nation from increasingly oppressive measures imposed by the illegal Pretoria régime.

33. A whole series of resolutions by the General Assembly and mandatory decisions by the Security Council have been disregarded by the South African Government and remain wholly without effect to this day. The holding now of a second special session on this subject brings into sharp focus the inability of the world Organization to give effect to the resolutions of its main organs, and the compelling need for measures, as expressly provided in the Charter, to give substance and validity to the Organization through the effectiveness of its resolutions. It should not be overlooked that the very concept of the United Nations stands or falls by its ability to perform its primary function of promoting international legal order, security and peace in the manner

provided for in the Charter. If the United Nations does not implement the resolutions of its main organs, it cannot function effectively. And this is the essence of the matter underlying all unsolved and proliferating international problems.

34. The position of Cyprus on the question of Namibia is well known. Constant and dedicated support for causes like that of Namibia is ingrained in the very bloodstream of the people of Cyprus, whose age-long history has been that of a struggle against foreign domination in a constant endeavour to retain or regain its independence and freedom.

35. The cause of the people of Namibia struggling for their independence and the survival of their threatened identity and status is our cause. The analogies between the plight of the Namibian people and that of the people of Cyprus are many and striking. Our hearts, therefore, beat in rhythm with theirs.

36. We have supported and sponsored all the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and Security Council. Our stand and over-all policy on this and similar issues is guided by our adherence to the principles of the Charter: those of equal justice, territorial integrity, unity and self-determination, which in our time and age are the accepted norms for social and international order. This order has to apply everywhere, and the means of enforcing it against its violators and aggressors, whoever they may be, are fully provided for in the Charter.

37. We therefore take a strong and positive stand on the question of Namibia and join our voice in solidarity with our brothers of Africa, and of all freedom-loving peoples of the world, in calling for the liberation of the people of Namibia and for an end to the illegal military occupation of that country by South Africa.

38. The General Assembly terminated the Mandate of South Africa over Namibia and placed the Territory under the direct responsibility of the United Nations by resolution 2145 (XXI). The South African Government, however, all along has been stubbornly refusing to abide by the United Nations resolutions and pursues its illegal occupation and administration of Namibia to this day; moreover, it is tightening its control and enforcing its inhuman legislation through police action. Worse still, it is attempting to promote a sinister plan for breaking up the unity of the country and destroying its identity and international status, and for this purpose it is proceeding to split the Territory into separate administrative units—bantustans—with a view to partition as a means of annexing the Territory.

39. The Cypriot people have bitter experience of this policy of division aiming at partition with annexation as the goal. They are in a similar position, striving to save themselves from the clutches of aggressive occupation coupled with partitionist policies, in most respects analogous to those from which the people of Namibia are now suffering, in both cases in flagrant violation of specific resolutions of the General Assembly and mandatory decisions of the Security Council.

40. This partitionist policy of the Pretoria régime in Namibia is the gravest aspect of the situation, an aspect

which particularly requires urgent action, for if such a process of partition is allowed to continue, it will bring about an irreversible and irreparable situation, creating one more focus of perpetual war and an explosive threat to peace that is never repaired, as has been shown in all other cases of partition in the world. The splitting of a country is like the splitting of an atom—far-reaching in its explosiveness and destruction.

41. We strongly condemn South Africa's attempt to retain control over and to annex Walvis Bay in clear violation of international law, of the United Nations Charter and in particular, of Security Council resolution 385 (1976). There can be no compromise regarding the status of Walvis Bay, which forms an integral part of Namibia's economic, cultural and political life. An imperative element for a solution of the problem is the preservation of the territorial unity and integrity of Namibia. The existence of South African military bases in Walvis Bay is a threat to its national security and unity.

42. The illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa must be ended by the latter effecting its complete and unconditional withdrawal so as to enable the Namibian people under the leadership of SWAPO—its sole and authentic representative—to exercise fully its right to self-determination and independence.

43. The draft declaration and programme of action drawn up by the United Nations Council for Namibia [see A/S-9/7, annex] gives a correct assessment of the situation in that country and provides an effective programme of action. We fully endorse its recommendation to the Security Council to take the necessary steps to terminate the illegal occupation of Namibia. We believe that the time is now ripe for applying effective measures of enforcement action as provided in Chapter VII of the Charter to put an end to aggression. It is gratifying to note that there is now a convergence of opinion in this respect. We firmly believe that such measures as are warranted by the situation should also be applied by the Security Council in analogous cases of aggression, forcible expulsions and massive colonization from outside in the exercise of racial discrimination and in violation of relevant United Nations resolutions—and this is particularly so where the resolutions are unanimously adopted—as in the case of Cyprus, in an attempt to change by force the demographic character of the island.

44. My country shares, along with the other non-aligned nations, in the condemnation of the racist régime of South Africa for its continued illegal occupation of Namibia and the system of *apartheid* it forces upon it. Action must be taken by the General Assembly at this special session to abolish this inhuman system and all its practices in Namibia and to secure the release of all political prisoners and permit the return of political exiles and refugees so as to enable the Namibian people freely to exercise their inalienable right to self-determination.

45. The United Nations has been established to safeguard peace and security, and to that end to promote human rights, social justice and legal order. Resolutions alone, no matter how masterfully drafted, cannot bring about the desired end. It is their implementation that is of paramount importance, for that alone materializes the objectives of the Charter.

46. We live in a nuclear era when the preservation of peace with justice has become inextricably linked to the survival of human civilization and perhaps even of human life on this planet. We express the hope that in a spirit of wider understanding and enlightened approach to world problems, the international community of the United Nations will finally find its way out of the present chaotic situation and harmonize through the Charter the relations of nations towards the common good.

47. The PRESIDENT: The representative of the South West Africa People's Organization has asked to be allowed to make a brief statement at this juncture, and I now call on him.

48. Mr. NUJOMA (South West Africa People's Organization): Mr. President, I thank you very much for giving me this great honour of addressing this august Assembly once again and reassuring you of SWAPO's great satisfaction with the wisdom and the principled manner that you have displayed in guiding the deliberations of this historic session on the question of Namibia so far.

49. At the same time, I should like to express my sincere thanks and appreciation to the representatives and foreign ministers who made constructive contributions during the debate of the General Assembly at this special session in support of the struggle of the people of Namibia against colonial subjugation.

50. In my present statement I will concentrate on some points and vital issues that have been raised by some speakers in the current debate, especially by the Secretary of State for External Affairs of Canada, who addressed this Assembly on behalf of the five Western members of the Security Council, and by the representatives of the Federal Republic of Germany and France.

51. Those particular interventions have created a new element in the course of our deliberations by giving undue emphasis to just one aspect of the efforts directed towards the resolution of the Namibian problem, namely, their proposal. This, we believe, is a deliberate attempt to divert the attention of this Assembly from the critical situation on the ground in Namibia and from the items on the agenda of the special session. Coupled with this attempt was the earlier move of the Five in submitting their proposal to the Security Council<sup>2</sup> despite the understanding between them and SWAPO that this should not be done until there was an agreement or a clear understanding regarding the areas of disagreement. Without prejudice to the authority of the Security Council to consider or decide upon matters brought before it by its members, we feel, nevertheless, that that action was premature and appeared to have been clearly aimed at pre-empting the holding of the special session.

52. I represent the oppressed people of Namibia who are daily being arrested, tortured, imprisoned, maimed and killed by the colonial system of military occupation, which is supported and sustained by the governments and the powerful multinational corporations of the major Western countries. In spite of this situation, my colleagues and I

<sup>2</sup> See S/12636.

agreed to engage in discussions and exchanges with those who said they wished to assist in the effort of the rest of the international community to bring about the necessary conditions for the independence of Namibia.

53. I said to the Five on 8 August 1977 in New York, when we started the exploratory talks on Namibia, that we were then—as we still are today—willing and prepared to take the political risks inherent in negotiations because we have always regarded negotiations as an essential part of the struggle. What we will not do, however, is commit the crime of national suicide. The sacrifices that the combatants of the People's Liberation Army of Namibia (PLAN) make daily, in the face of the brutal military occupation of our country, and the continuing suffering of the Namibian patriots are always present in our thoughts and actions, reminding us that we must never falter or betray the sacred cause for which they are dying and sacrificing.

54. I recall that statement of 8 August last year, when I said: "SWAPO is, therefore, hopeful that as we start the proposed talks, honesty, sincerity and a sense of honour will be manifested throughout." We are not being naive about the conflicting interests of the Namibian people, on the one hand, and those of the racist régime of South Africa and its Western supporters, on the other.

55. I must say in all sincerity and frankness that the recent developments surrounding the manner in which the Western proposal has been handled and presented here have had the effect of creating confusion in the United Nations—which was perhaps the objective.

56. Another added element, with equally confusing effect, is that contained in a note dated 25 April 1978 from racist South Africa. I have no intention of addressing myself to the note itself or to its source. I am, however, concerned about what it contains. In it, Vorster talks about the assurances and clarifications on their proposal given by the five Western Governments to his régime shortly before and after their strategy meeting held recently in London. It was only after receiving such guarantees that the régime decided to "accept" the Western plan. SWAPO does not think that the timing of these developments was a mere coincidence. Rather, we maintain that all this was done to diminish the importance of the deliberations of this session and to give the false impression that a settlement is at hand for Namibia. We are certainly interested to know what these assurances and clarifications are. Nothing convincing has been offered so far.

57. We agreed to participate in the talks with the Five expecting that our views on the independence of Namibia would be regarded as important and would be respected, even when they were not accepted. With the submission of the Western proposal to the Security Council on 10 April 1978, the Five issued an ultimatum unilaterally: that this was the final document; the parties to the conflict had either to take it or leave it. But then there was the London meeting and the subsequent meetings in Pretoria. SWAPO was told that the proposal was "final and definitive" when it was submitted to the Security Council. Consequently, there was no way for us to amend it further. In the case of South Africa, however, the proposal was still open-ended; it became "final and definitive" only after South Africa had

sought and obtained further "assurances" and "clarifications"—as recently as 24 April 1978, the very day that the debate started in this Assembly.

58. Let the initiative of the Five be clarified and brought back into perspective. Let the Five, SWAPO and South Africa engage in further talks to resolve the outstanding issues in order to reach an agreement so that the settled matter can be brought before the Security Council for its consideration. The situation as it stands now is that, in addition to the crucial issues of Walvis Bay, location of the South African residual force and the role of the United Nations, there are new elements which, rather than simplifying the situation, have further complicated it.

59. As for the illegal South African régime of military occupation, its colonial commitment is to perpetuate its grip on Namibia, in utter defiance of United Nations authority and in manifest aggression against our people.

60. The existing reign of terror has now been compounded by the latest emergency measures imposed on Namibia by the resident agent of the illegal racist South African régime. The latest information which we have received this very day from Namibia is that more than 32 leaders and members of SWAPO have been arrested by the South African racist police in the country.

61. It must be noted that none of the Western spokesmen to whom I referred regarded these measures as grave enough to warrant their indignation and condemnation. They conveniently ignored them in their statements and concentrated on self-praise.

62. It will be recalled that the Vorster régime a few years ago enacted a law under which it can attack any African country south of the equator. On this basis, between this régime and the illegal minority rebel régime of Salisbury, Angola, Botswana, Mozambique and Zambia have all been attacked and acts of aggression are still being committed against them daily.

63. This time, with regard to Namibia, Vorster has taken for granted, according to the Associated Press story in *The New York Times* of 26 April 1978, that "South Africa would intervene militarily if it became necessary" in Namibia. This is the aggressive nature of that régime and the reign of terror which it maintains in Namibia in particular and southern Africa in general. This is what this Assembly and the United Nations as a whole must address themselves to, as Namibia is the direct responsibility of this Organization until independence.

64. As far as we are concerned, our position is the following. In the proposal of the Five, the role of the special representative of the United Nations is deliberately framed in ambiguous terms so as to confuse those who read it. However, it is SWAPO's firm conviction and contention that it is the United Nations which must have effective supervision and control of the transition process, including the holding of elections. The special representative must superintend the whole transitional process. In other words, he must be placed in a superior authority in respect of the South African senior civil servant in Namibia.

65. According to the proposal of the Five, South Africa is left with extensive power to influence the outcome of the transitional process. First, South Africa is to be left with an entrenched administration over the whole of Namibia. Secondly, South Africa is to be allowed to have its huge paramilitary police force intact in the Territory during the transitional period. Thirdly, South Africa is to be allowed to have 1,500 troops strategically located in the north-central part of Namibia. Fourthly, South Africa's aggressive claim to Walvis Bay is tacitly conceded to, thus allowing it to have more than a division of its armed forces at Rooikop in the Walvis Bay area, in addition to the 1,500 troops.

66. SWAPO is firmly convinced that, when all these essential elements of State power and physical control are left firmly in the hands of South Africa, while the authority of the United Nations is compromised and gently undermined, it will be very difficult, if not impossible, for fair, free and democratic elections to be held in Namibia. With the cards so one-sidedly stacked in South Africa's favour, SWAPO believes that it is essential that the United Nations presence in Namibia should be extremely substantial. Its authority should undoubtedly be superior to that of the South African illegal régime in Namibia. Hence, it is our conviction that the civilian component of the United Nations should number not fewer than 1,000 people and the military component not fewer than 5,000 men. We are convinced that only such a substantial presence of the United Nations can ensure fair and democratic elections, prevent hostilities between South Africa and SWAPO armed forces and restore the psychological confidence of the Namibian people.

67. SWAPO has maintained and still maintains that Walvis Bay is an integral part of Namibia. Therefore, for us the question of Walvis Bay is not negotiable and cannot be compromised. We construe the resolve of the five to expunge the question of Walvis Bay from their proposal to be a deliberate contrivance designed to ensure South Africa's strategic leverage for blackmailing and committing acts of aggression against an independent Namibia. Furthermore, we regard it as an attempt expediently to remove the problem of Walvis Bay from the agenda of the United Nations, thereby making it easier for racist South Africa to tighten the screws around an independent Namibia.

68. SWAPO once again maintains that it is both politically and militarily unacceptable for the 1,500 South African troops to be positioned at Oshivelo or at Grootfontein. It is not politically justified. The political purpose that these troops are supposed to serve can still be served if they are stationed at Karasburg towards the borders of Namibia and South Africa.

69. If South Africa is seriously considering giving up its illegal occupation of Namibia in a manner acceptable first and foremost to the Namibian people, in particular, and to the international community in general, South Africa should agree to the aforementioned demands.

70. SWAPO would like to repeat its considered and long-held position as follows:

71. First, assuming that all conditions for free, fair and democratic elections, as stipulated in Security Council

resolution 385 (1976) have been agreed upon, SWAPO would be prepared to enter into a cease-fire agreement with South Africa.

72. Secondly, SWAPO agrees to the proposed United Nations transition assistance group. This should consist of a civilian team of no fewer than 1,000 people as well as a United Nations peace-keeping force of no fewer than 5,000 men. The two aforementioned sections of the assistance group should be under the authority and direction of the United Nations special representative.

73. Thirdly, SWAPO also agrees to the proposed appointment of a United Nations special representative to superintend the transitional period leading to independence. With a senior South African civil servant in a subordinate position, whose role would be to answer questions relating, among other things, to the handing over of Namibia's files, treasury and other public property, the special representative would be responsible for the implementation of the over-all supervision and control of the political process and security arrangements leading to independence.

74. Fourthly, upon assuming his duties and responsibilities, the United Nations special representative must ensure the release of all political prisoners within two weeks.

75. Fifthly, SWAPO accepts the principle of submitting its own forces to the confinement, surveillance and monitoring of the United Nations peace-keeping force in Namibia in order to ensure that the cease-fire agreement is effectively observed.

76. Sixthly, to the best knowledge of SWAPO, there are about 50,000 South African troops deployed throughout Namibia, including the Walvis Bay area. We propose that, with the exception of 1,500 men, all these troops should be withdrawn within three months from the date of the cease-fire agreement.

77. Seventhly, the 1,500 South African troops which will remain in Namibia during the transitional process should be confined to base in the southern part of Namibia from which they will be withdrawn into South Africa within seven days after the certification of election results.

78. Eighthly, the withdrawal of South African troops, with the exception of the so-called token force, must include the dismantling of the bantustan tribal authorities, security forces, citizen forces, tribal armies, commandos and shooting clubs.

79. Ninthly, SWAPO agrees that a disarmed South African police force should be placed under the operational control of the United Nations special representative.

80. Tenthly, SWAPO's position is that Namibia's territorial integrity and national unity, including Walvis Bay, are inviolable and non-negotiable. Therefore, our concession that a so-called token force of 1,500 South African soldiers remain in Namibia during the transitional period includes all South African troops presently stationed at Walvis Bay and its environs.

81. In the light of the aforementioned facts, SWAPO strongly believes that it is essential and imperative to have further talks in order to iron out the outstanding issues so as to ensure an acceptable settlement.
82. In conclusion, as I said in my earlier statement, at the special session the Assembly should devote its time to the items on the agenda and complete the work in accordance with the draft declaration and programme of action as planned.
83. Mr. SOURINHO (Lao People's Democratic Republic) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, I should like, on behalf of the delegation of the Lao People's Democratic Republic, to convey to you my warm congratulations upon your unanimous election to the presidency of the General Assembly at its ninth special session. Having been accustomed to working under your competent and enlightened guidance during the thirty-second regular session and the eighth special session of the General Assembly, my delegation is happy to continue doing so at this session. Thanks to your distinguished qualities, my delegation is convinced that you will acquit yourself excellently of the heavy responsibilities entrusted to you.
84. This is the second time in the space of less than 12 years that the General Assembly has been convened in special session to consider the question of Namibia. This testifies to the gravity and urgency of the question and also to the determination of the international community to put an end, once and for all, to the colonial and illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa. My delegation takes great pleasure in the convening of this session, which will certainly mark an important stage in the history of the struggle of the Namibian people to achieve the enjoyment of their right to self-determination, independence and freedom.
85. The history of the struggle of the Namibian people is as old as, and even older than, the history of the United Nations itself. But, in fact, it was only from 1966, when the United Nations put an end to the Mandate of South Africa over Namibia, that the struggle of the Namibian people assumed international proportions. It is from that date also that the situation in Namibia began an uninterrupted deterioration as a result of the persistent refusal of South Africa to withdraw from the Territory. The General Assembly, which met for the first time in special session in 1967 to study the question of Namibia, took important measures in that regard. Among other things, it established the United Nations Council for South West Africa (Namibia), to which it entrusted the task of exercising the administrative and legislative authority over the Territory until the attainment of independence.
86. Ever since that historic event, both the United Nations Council for Namibia and the General Assembly, each within its field of competence and its sphere of activities, have exerted unflagging efforts to see to it that the people of Namibia acquire their national rights. But their efforts were frustrated because of the intransigent attitude of the *apartheid* régime of South Africa, which constantly opposed all their activities.
87. The *apartheid* régime of South Africa has continued until today to occupy Namibia illegally, flagrantly violating all the relevant and repeated resolutions of the United Nations.
88. While the ninth special session of the General Assembly is meeting, new developments in the situation in Namibia are giving rise to considerable concern. Indeed, it emerges from the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia contained in document A/S-9/4, and also from the very important statements we have been hearing since the beginning of our debate and, in particular, those of the President of SWAPO and the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, that the racist and reactionary régime of South Africa has strengthened even further its already considerable military potential in Namibia and has intensified the organization of tribal armies with the obvious purpose of preparing for a major confrontation with the liberation forces, led by SWAPO, and that the *apartheid* régime of South Africa has not given up its diabolical plan to replace the SWAPO leaders, when the time comes, by puppet elements emerging from the so-called Turnhalle constitutional conference, to whom it will hand over power when it withdraws from Namibia.
89. Along with these fundamentally belligerent acts and sly manoeuvres, the racist and colonialist régime of South Africa has undertaken the annexation of Walvis Bay, which is an integral part of Namibian territory, and has stepped up even further its policy of oppression and barbarous repression of the Namibian people, particularly the leaders of SWAPO and its sympathizers. Furthermore, continuing its policy of escalating violence and aggression, the *apartheid* régime of South Africa has undertaken military incursions and has committed numerous acts of naked and flagrant aggression against the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of neighbouring independent African States.
90. These few facts which I have just enumerated prove, if proof is needed, that the racist and colonialist régime of South Africa represents not only a danger to peace and security in southern Africa but also a serious threat to international peace and security.
91. In the face of the prospect that the Namibian conflict one day may inexorably transcend its local framework and spread to the entire African continent with incalculable consequences, my delegation, like the vast majority of the members of this Assembly, calls unceasingly for a just and lasting solution of the problem of Namibia. In this context we have supported all the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly calling on the *apartheid* régime of South Africa to end its illegal occupation of Namibia and to withdraw unconditionally and immediately from the Territory so that the valiant Namibian people may exercise freely and fully their right to self-determination, independence, freedom and dignity. We have also vigorously condemned the illegal and continued occupation of the Territory of Namibia by the racist and colonialist régime of South Africa, as well as its annexation of the port of Walvis Bay, which is an integral part of Namibia.
92. Furthermore, we have also categorically denounced the policy and practices of barbaric repression carried out by the racist and reactionary régime of South Africa against the Namibian people, as well as the acts of aggression committed against neighbouring independent African States.



93. Moreover, in the interest of the Namibian people, we have gravely deplored the savage and shameless exploitation of the natural wealth of Namibia by the South African monopolies and imperialist transnational corporations.

94. Finally, as unimpeachable testimony to our attachment to the cause of the independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity, freedom, dignity and social progress of the Namibian people, as of all peoples, we warmly supported resolution 32/9 H of 4 November 1977, adopted by the General Assembly at its thirty-second session, which led to the convening of this current session devoted to Namibia.

*Mr. Ashtal (Democratic Yemen), Vice-President, took the Chair.*

95. At the risk of being tedious, we have felt it necessary to reaffirm our position on all aspects of the Namibian problem in order to explain the attitude that will be taken by our delegation in the course or at the conclusion of the deliberations at this ninth special session.

96. It is clear to us that at this session the General Assembly should above all reaffirm the authority and the responsibilities of the United Nations, and in this particular case the responsibilities of the General Assembly with regard to Namibia and the Namibian people in accordance with resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966 and resolution 2248 (S-V) of 19 May 1967, as well as the other relevant resolutions adopted subsequently by the General Assembly and the Security Council concerning Namibia. In this connexion, any attempt or manoeuvre undertaken with or without the agreement of the *apartheid* régime of South Africa, but above all with its agreement, aimed at removing the settlement of the Namibian question from the authority of the United Nations should be rejected. The racist and colonialist régime of South Africa, having given proof for many long years of persistent intransigence, will never willingly agree to withdraw completely from Namibia.

97. In the face of the growing success of the liberation struggle of the Namibian people under the leadership of its authentic and sole representative, SWAPO, the racist South African régime resorts to delaying tactics in order to postpone to an ever later date the true settlement of the Namibian problem.

98. On the basis of the arrogant intransigence of the *apartheid* régime of South Africa and of the various diplomatic manoeuvres it has undertaken since the unanimous adoption by the Security Council of resolution 385 (1976), my delegation sincerely believes that the only reasonable settlement of the Namibian problem would be one based strictly on the principles laid down in the Security Council resolution to which I have just referred. In our judgement, any solution or compromise which is not based on the demand for the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of the racist régime of South Africa and for respect for the territorial integrity of Namibia cannot fail to give rise to serious risks for the future.

99. Furthermore, my delegation also feels that no one has the right to decide on a settlement of the problem of Namibia in opposition to the will of its people, whose authentic representative is SWAPO.

100. The sufferings of the Namibian people have already been going on for too long, as has the anxiety of the world in general. The General Assembly should, at this session, take concerted action with a view to putting an end to this situation. It should adopt urgent and appropriate measures, in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter, to ensure that the South African *apartheid* régime implements all its resolutions on Namibia and withdraws immediately and unconditionally from Namibian territory. The General Assembly should also demand once again that the colonialist and imperialist Powers which give political, economic, military and other support to the *apartheid* régime of South Africa, co-operate effectively in the United Nations work on decolonization in order to put an end once and for all to the colonial situation which prevails in southern Africa.

101. There can be no peace or lasting security in that part of the world until the last bastions of colonialism and imperialism have been eliminated.

102. Mr. ALZAMORA (Peru) (*interpretation from Spanish*): For the delegation of Peru it is a source of special satisfaction and encouragement that the General Assembly at this special session on Namibia is being presided over by a statesman with the standing and prestige of Mr. Lazar Mojsov, whose valuable contributions to the cause of freedom and justice ensure that we shall successfully confront the great responsibility of this special session, one destined to be the culmination of the historic process of liberation which has world-wide significance not only because of its meaning but also because it is the symbol of the final stage of colonialism and the dawn of its elimination.

103. At this stage of that process there is no longer room for rhetoric. For many years persistent action of the United Nations—and in particular the worthy labours of the United Nations Council for Namibia—has mobilized world public opinion in support of the people of Namibia. The collective efforts of all the peoples of the world committed to the struggle against colonialism and racism and, most importantly, the heroic struggle of the Namibian people led by SWAPO, have, as the result of this pressure, created the conditions required to put an end to the illegal South African occupation and enable the people of Namibia to exercise their right to self-determination and independence.

104. The development of that process leads us to the prospect for a peaceful negotiated settlement as the sole alternative to an armed struggle for freedom which can no longer be postponed. Negotiations must, fundamentally and *a priori*, be in good faith, and notwithstanding their complexity, they must prove to be immediately feasible.

105. SWAPO has already given ample proof—and it has confirmed it today—of its willingness to negotiate in a constructive spirit; it is now up to South Africa to demonstrate with deeds the genuineness of its intentions, by helping to create conditions for peace and security that will guarantee an effective transfer of power. First and foremost, it is up to the five Powers, whose efforts we have followed anxiously and with appreciation, to consolidate the progress that has been made by their classification of important outstanding issues and by providing the neces-

sary guarantees for successful negotiations, and that applies in particular to the role and authority of the United Nations during the transition period. It is for the United Nations itself, however, clearly and firmly to define the legal and political framework within which the negotiations are to take place, if they are to be consistent with United Nations responsibility to ensure the birth of a free, independent and sovereign Namibia, preserving its full right to self-determination, national political unity and territorial integrity, including Walvis Bay, and the legitimate enjoyment of its natural resources.

106. In our task we must be keenly aware of the historical background of the situation and be aware of the impatience and frustration of a people which has been oppressed and harassed for many decades and whose fundamental rights have been violated. In spite of various admonitions and the decisions of the international community, their legitimate aspiration for freedom and justice have been defied by the racist occupier, whose rebellious attitude has jeopardized the prestige and moral and political authority of the United Nations, and against whom, if there is any further attempt to thwart the peaceful transition we are now seeking, the measures provided by the United Nations Charter must be applied.

107. We must be prepared to encourage and support the possibilities of honest, realistic and fruitful negotiations over the short term; but we must take care that the negotiations are not used for evasive or dilatory purposes or to flout the rights and aspirations of the people of Namibia which are the rights of the international community as a whole, which is ready to support a peaceful and democratic transition of power by using all the machinery provided by our Organization to ensure the necessary guarantees, so as to offer all Namibians the right of expression and the right to participate in the determination of their own future, without any discrimination, without any harassment or constraints from within or outside the country.

108. With the same firmness and determination with which we participated in the campaign against colonialism, racism and *apartheid*; with the same faith that we have supported the cause of the Namibian people, Peru is prepared to support any negotiations leading to an honest, genuine transfer of power and to independence. But we are also prepared to resist any attempt to divert us from our goal of freedom that would perpetuate, in any form, domination and dependence.

109. This is a decisive hour for the people of Namibia, and we share their sufferings and hopes. We stand by them in their struggle, and we are prepared to celebrate with fraternal joy their final victory and admission to the community of the free peoples of the world.

110. Mr. CUEVAS CANCINO (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Perhaps the Assembly will allow me to begin my statement with a preliminary observation.

111. Just a few minutes ago the Assembly heard Mr. Nujoma. Although there are similar views—about which on behalf of Mexico I shall speak later—I note certain differences of opinion which might require clarification on our part. Mexico's participation in the Namibian problem

remains unchanged, since it is based on the concept that the existence of this Organization and our membership in it should inevitably lead to peace and understanding among the peoples of the world.

112. On 25 April a communiqué issued by the Permanent Mission of South Africa was circulated to the Members of this Assembly. At first glance, it certainly did not appear to have special significance. But those of us who first dealt with the problem of Namibia—when the Territory was known as South West Africa—realize that a process that had lasted for six decades was coming to an end and was a genuine triumph for mankind.

113. I clearly recall the days when the colonial empires were full of pride and vainglory and when South Africa made little effort to conceal its utter scorn for our Organization. In those days the Latin Americans constituted the largest group in the General Assembly and it was our honour to be staunch defenders of human rights on all continents. Our majority at the time was always a decisive voice in the anti-colonial struggle and we never were found wanting in the fight against spurious interests in matters pertaining to the freedom of peoples. We were also ready with our support when the first plebiscites were organized and the first cracks appeared in what had been great empires. Our voice was decisive in initiating the great tidal wave of freedom in Africa and Asia.

114. The memory of our own colonial past has hardly been dimmed by time, and we recall with pride, but not without pain, the sacrifices of many generations; we remember how our people were reduced by half in a struggle whose heroes are remembered today. Their heroism was indeed admirable, but it was our desire to spare our fellow peoples of the world such terrible suffering. We used the trusteeship system and gave a special meaning to Chapter XI of the Charter, which could hardly have been anticipated by the signatories of the San Francisco Charter, and we were among the proud architects of this Organization, whose majority today is made up of newly independent States.

115. But the core of colonialism was South Africa, with its antediluvian system of *apartheid* and its disdain for the material well-being of any who were not in the white minority. Our efforts to detect a chink in what appeared to be solid armour were for some time to no avail. Gradually, attention was focused on what today is Namibia. It was the Special Committee on South West Africa which tried to provide some meaningful substance to the first, albeit insignificant, gains conceded to the United Nations by the first of the advisory opinions of the International Court of Justice. I clearly recall the setbacks suffered by the then representative of Uruguay, Mr. Rodríguez Fabregat, when he had to deal with the foolish pride of Pretoria.

116. But the preaching continued, as did the international efforts. There was a gradual tightening of the moral authority of the Charter, which represents the aspirations of all mankind. Here, South Africa was obliged to report; there, it was told that its measures were inadequate; yonder, it was told that it could not apply its system of *apartheid* to a Trust Territory; and still further it was asked to account for whatever it had gained from the illegitimate

exploitation of a territory that had been entrusted to it as a sacred charge. However, our efforts appeared lilliputian. Even when the General Assembly, wearied after much plotting and scheming, put an end to the Mandate in 1966, the independence of Namibia still seemed far off indeed.

117. Who would quarrel over a Territory with a Power that was the best armed in the African continent? But the Namibian people were already alert to the possibility of their independence, and the struggle became more widespread. The arid plains of Namibia are stained with the blood of fallen patriots, and the many bones that are scattered about there are reminders of those who laid down their lives to build their country. My delegation is honoured to pay a tribute to those tenacious patriots, represented by SWAPO in our Organization, and to those who have played an exalted and magnificent role in the armed struggle.

118. It is precisely at this special session that the Assembly must ask itself serious questions about the continuance of the violence. Violence is indispensable at times, and there are occasions when human life seems indeed to be a depreciated currency. When this session began, my delegation believed that this was the only possible course, and we took part in the work of the Council for Namibia in preparation for this session of the Assembly, in the conviction that it was necessary to assert the rightness of the struggle in the Territory itself and in this Organization as well. But the efforts of the five Western Powers, within the framework of Security Council resolution 385 (1976), finally brought about the surrender of the once-proud and intractable South Africa. Perhaps because of the speed of the *peripeteia*, as the Greek tragedians call it, the Assembly has failed to perceive the profound change that has taken place; the Power that today acknowledges as necessary a United Nations presence in the Territory, the one that accepts its inability to maintain peace, the one that refers respectfully to the need to assert the will of the majority and accepts United Nations jurisdiction for the building of a future Namibia, is the self-same Power that only yesterday mocked any idea of independence and had the effrontery to suggest that Namibia was an integral part of its metropolitan territory.

119. My delegation believes, therefore, that the time has come to harvest the fruits of all those sacrifices and to guide Namibia to prompt independence in democracy and peace. We believe that the future of that people can now be viewed in peaceful terms, for its sons no longer need to bow to the harsh demands of heroism.

120. Now let me take up directly the conditions for the future peace. It is hardly necessary to make the point that they hinge on the proposals put forward by the five Powers to South Africa, which it has accepted—obviously, with reservations, but accepted nonetheless. It is clear that the proposals of the Western Powers are open to criticism: my Government, for example, believes that the manner in which the United Nations special representative and the South African administrator-general work together is far from clear; that the role which has been assigned to SWAPO in the electoral process as the spokesman for the heroic struggle of the Namibian people for independence is inadequate; that the establishment of the military section of the United Nations assistance group needs to be spelt

out; that the relationship between the South African police forces and the United Nations military forces must be clearly defined; and that, finally, we should like the Council for Namibia to be accorded its rightful pre-eminence. Indeed, we have not forgotten that that organ was created by the General Assembly precisely to administer Namibia until its people could directly and democratically exercise their sovereignty. Now that this possibility is materializing, it would seem that the role of the Council for Namibia should be increased, not reduced.

121. There are other observations that I could make, some of which have already been aired in these plenary meetings. I might comment on the attempted amputation of part of the Namibian territory which would deprive the new Namibian nation of Walvis Bay. Of course, this is not among the observations put forward by South Africa in its reply to the five Western powers and, naturally, Pretoria has reverted to its customary pseudo-legal arguments, reviving the argument about a difference in the origin of the Territories which, in its halcyon days, it had undertaken to unify. In regard to respect for Namibian territorial integrity, the Assembly will now have to take a stand by reiterating—so that South Africa will not think it has been forgotten—that any claim that would injure that territorial integrity is groundless.

122. The Western proposals and their acceptance by South Africa thus serve as a basis for negotiation; indeed, my delegation considers them an important and very sound basis for negotiation. They will, no doubt, require improvement, but it is vital for Namibia's future to prevent South Africa from returning to its proud isolation and, on the pretext of a lack of understanding on the part of the United Nations, granting a sham autonomy which will make inevitable a long struggle which is now no longer necessary.

123. My delegation has listened with pleasure to the many speakers who have expressed themselves in favour of negotiation. Today negotiation is possible. The path towards independence is no long meandering in the direction of violence. It is for the Assembly at this special session to ensure this positive progress by the adoption of a resolution in that sense which would embody a principle long cherished in my country and in the United Nations: that all controversies or conflicts can and must be settled by the peaceful means of negotiation.

124. That is the most appropriate procedure, and the General Assembly, as the principal organ of the United Nations, might ask the Security Council to implement the provisions of its resolution 385 (1976), since that is now a possibility thanks to the efforts of the five Western Powers. That is a proper and necessary outcome of our work and would have the decided support of the Mexican delegation.

125. Mr. ABE (Japan): It is indeed a great pleasure for me and for my delegation to deliberate once again under Ambassador Mojsov's presidency on a question of extreme importance. We rest our full trust in his dynamic and able leadership, which has already been amply demonstrated on past occasions, including the thirty-second session and the eighth special session, and during this ninth special session. I am firmly convinced that the present special session of the General Assembly will be led to a successful conclusion under his able guidance.

126. We are meeting in this special session of the General Assembly at a time when the prospect for the problem of Namibia is both critical and promising—more promising than it ever was at any time in the past.

127. As will be recalled, and as has been pointed out by most of the speakers who preceded me, the problem of Namibia has defied the efforts of the United Nations continuously for more than 10 years, since the General Assembly adopted resolution 2145 (XXI), the resolution that terminated the Mandate of South Africa over the Territory of Namibia.

128. In the face of South Africa's persistent refusal to comply with the repeated demands of the United Nations that it must withdraw from the Territory of Namibia, the United Nations finally succeeded in overcoming differences within itself as to how the independence of Namibia should be achieved when the Security Council adopted unanimously its resolution 385 (1976) in January 1976.

129. It is needless to elaborate on the content of that resolution, but its fundamental significance needs to be emphasized. First, it declares the democratic principle of free elections as an essential element in determining the future of the Namibian people; secondly, it provides a series of conditions required for such elections to be conducted in a free and fair manner under the supervision and control of the United Nations; and thirdly, it also provides concrete steps to terminate completely the illegal occupation of the Territory of Namibia by South Africa.

130. That unanimously adopted resolution has never been challenged by any Member State since its adoption. It is invaluable as it offers a firm basis on which any internationally acceptable solution should be founded. The adoption of the resolution, however, led nowhere, particularly because of South Africa's opposition. It has had to wait for the strenuous efforts of the five members of the Security Council who have volunteered to assume the task of setting the implementation of the resolution in motion since early 1977. Obviously their task has not been easy because it has dealt with very high requirements, on the one hand, and with difficult and complex realities, on the other. The proposal that the five countries recently submitted to the Security Council is the culmination of their untiring efforts, which took more than one year. Before arriving at that conclusion, the five countries had held intensive and unremitting talks with all the interested parties, including the Government of South Africa and SWAPO. The active participation of SWAPO in those talks should be underlined. The indomitable will of SWAPO in the search for the earliest possible attainment of the national independence of Namibia, as personified by Mr. Sam Nujoma, its President, during those talks, has won the whole-hearted appreciation and support of the international community. The five countries have done their best to cover the interests and reflect the aspirations of the Namibian people to the maximum extent possible. My delegation finds the proposal a commendable one since it maintains fully the fundamental principles of Security Council resolution 385 (1976), and at the same time suggests realistic and viable ways to realize them. In the view of my delegation, the proposal provides a really constructive and workable path towards a peaceful solution of the problem of Namibia.

131. In the course of our deliberations here, we have heard certain opposing or cynical views on the proposal on which I do not intend to comment. However, we have also heard sincere and constructive questions and comments on the proposal. We believe that those questions and comments should be answered. In brief, we feel that if a point in question is one that may impair the basic principles of the solution, we must consider it seriously. But if it is not a problem of that nature it may well be taken care of by the mechanism that is to be established. It is in this context that my delegation submits that the proposal of the five countries should be supported by the General Assembly at this special session.

132. It goes without saying that if the proposal of the five countries is accepted not merely by one side but by all parties concerned, the ensuing task of the United Nations should be to secure its strict and faithful implementation in its true spirit and in accordance with the terms fully agreed upon by the parties. The United Nations should therefore keep a close eye on any possible attempt at circumvention. As my delegation has stated on many occasions, our sympathy and support for the cause of the Namibian people will never be reduced until they gain their genuine independence.

133. At the thirty-second session of the General Assembly I concluded my statement [*57th meeting*] on the question of Namibia by saying that I hoped that genuine independence for Namibia would be brought about at the earliest possible time, hopefully by the next session of the General Assembly.

134. I hope that I can still use the same concluding remark at this special session with a slight change with regard to timing, but this hope greatly and decisively depends upon what this Assembly will decide regarding the proposal by the five members of the Security Council.

135. Mr. HEPBURN (Bahamas): First, in extending congratulations to Ambassador Mojsov on his election as President of the General Assembly at this special session, I should like to assure him that the delegation of the Bahamas stands ready to assist him in the execution of his duties.

136. Needless to say, my delegation is honoured to speak on this special occasion, although I must admit that there is nothing new or original that I can add to what previous speakers have said concerning the history of the question of Namibia, which has been on the agenda of the Assembly for over 30 years. Nevertheless, I can only hope that this brief statement will lend added strength to the numerous appeals which have been made in this hall, especially since 1966, when the General Assembly adopted resolution 2145 (XXI) warning South Africa of its interference in the status of South West Africa, commonly known as Namibia.

137. What is most significant to my delegation is the decision taken at the fifth special session, in 1967, when the United Nations Council for Namibia was given the Mandate to do all in its power to bring about independence in Namibia by June 1968 [*resolution 2248 (S-V)*].

138. Nearly 10 years have elapsed, and the status of Namibia is unchanged despite the many General Assembly

and Security Council resolutions, shuttle diplomacy, tribal interventions and extensive national and international negotiations. One cannot refrain from wondering what has gone wrong.

139. It probably would be inappropriate or even impossible for my delegation to cite a single cause for the dilemma in Namibia, but Shakespeare's phrase "something is rotten" is certainly applicable. Suffice it to say that at the last session of the Assembly, when my delegation wholeheartedly supported the idea of a special session on Namibia [41st meeting], it stated that in order for any progress to be made, the Namibian problem had to be considered in relationship to the crisis in southern Africa as a whole.

140. Southern Africa, which comprises a number of sovereign States, includes the Pretoria régime, which is the hub of the anxiety facing Namibia, and indeed all Africa. In a broader context, it can be said that because of the vast natural resources of the area and the strategic position, enhanced by good ports and invaluable sea lanes and land routes, southern Africa holds a kind of fascination for commercial and political entrepreneurs whose main objective seems to be exploitation. The game of exploitation is apparently centred on profit or loss, and if there were a slogan for such operations, it could well be "the survival of the fittest". Fair competition is healthy and should not be frowned upon, but in southern Africa the abominable policy of *apartheid* and racial discrimination denies justice and equality.

141. Another factor is that the conflicts regarding the acceptance of majority rule and territorial integrity tend only to aggravate an already volatile situation. It is easy to comprehend why a minority régime solidly in control of power would hate to talk about one man, one vote in a country that is so rich in natural resources. Similarly, it must be recognized that a people in the majority would feel cheated and debased under a system which perpetuates oppression and servitude.

142. The foregoing assumptions help to clarify partially why no serious consideration may have been given before the 1960s to a question that highlighted infringement of human rights and personal freedom. There was too much at stake and no one wanted to kill the goose that laid the golden egg.

143. We are now in the 1970s and these issues are common knowledge, yet there seems to be a stalemate.

144. Outside the jurisdiction of the United Nations, certain measures have been proposed. On 25 May 1963 the Organization of African Unity recommended self-determination, majority rule and sanctions against countries that "... lend direct or indirect support or assistance to all those colonialist Governments ... to suppress national liberation movements".

145. In 1969, 13 Heads of eastern and central African nations signed the Lusaka Manifesto, which called for peaceful change, but use of arms if necessary. Two years later, in 1971, the Mogadiscio Declaration called for the intensification of armed struggle. Until the present, there

have been a series of negotiations and sanctions which have often proved inconclusive.

146. To add insult to injury, South Africa has been consistent in its disregard for United Nations resolutions which call for self-determination and majority rule for Namibia. In the event that the Government of South Africa deigned to honour one single request, it defied several others; an example is its refusal to negotiate with SWAPO, the sole spokesman for the Namibians. Territorial integrity is still an unsolved matter because South Africa wishes to divide Namibia by annexing Walvis Bay, which falls within Namibia's boundaries. International peace and security are threatened because of the illegal occupation of troops of the Pretoria régime.

147. Those and many other flagrant violations by South Africa have aroused the indignation of the entire international community, many members of which would have to agree with African leaders that "black authenticity" and "black consciousness" should and must be strongly manifested if stability is to come to southern Africa.

148. My delegation would like to recognize the initiative of the five Western Powers as a very good intervention which could help to effect early change in Namibia. My delegation also supports the United Nations Council for Namibia in its efforts to preserve the dignity of the Namibian people. The working paper submitted by the Council [see A/S-9/7] embodies a number of salient ideas with which my delegation can comply without reservation. Above all, my delegation would like to pay a special tribute to the leader of SWAPO, who has been responsible for "keeping the lid on", so to speak, thus preventing further violence and unnecessary bloodshed.

149. In the light of the recent statements by the representative of SWAPO, it seems even more urgent that concrete measures should be taken to step up serious negotiations towards a peaceful settlement in Namibia.

150. The logical question which follows all that I have said is: how long can a deprived people be patient? The length of time would depend on the speed with which the United Nations carried out its mandate. Everything has been said. History bears out the situation and, as a South African Episcopal churchman said, "the lawful authority of Namibia is the United Nations, which is pledged to help the Namibian people achieve independence as a unitary State free from foreign and minority rule". My delegation believes that failure on the part of the United Nations to act decisively could tarnish the fine name of this body and jeopardize the effective work that the United Nations is doing.

151. But I am confident that that will not happen. One may ask why. There are enough binding rules in the Charter and adopted resolutions that could be applied to the violators; there is enough goodwill and good sense in the international community which would transcend self-aggrandizement. There are enough respected leaders in this Organization who could dare to be different, dare to speak out against wrong without fear of reprisals. Those are the factors that give my delegation hope.

152. What I have said may display a sense of naiveté and optimism, but since my delegation is hardly more than a novice in these highly complex and sensitive matters, it can afford to be idealistic and look at the total picture from a humanistic standpoint.

153. Finally, my delegation feels that continued pressure has to be exerted on all nations to reconsider their interests in the region and accept the fact that benefits for all can accrue from fairness. It is a known truth that as long as there is no threat to man's economic survival, then there can be little imbalance within the system.

154. The greatest task of the Namibian people is yet to come after independence. It is then that there must be a clear mandate for nation-building. Namibians would need help in terms of finance and technical expertise. Again the States Members of the United Nations can play a prominent role here. There is little doubt but that consensus reigns regarding the responsibility of this body in guiding the Territory out of danger, and despite everything there have been conscientious attempts. What is needed now is the added impetus to move ahead against the odds and make the question of Namibia and Zimbabwe a report for the history books. Action is needed now. Independence, territorial integrity and human dignity are long overdue.

155. Mr. MEDANI (Sudan): I should like at the outset to express the great satisfaction and gratification of the Sudanese delegation at the renewed confidence which the General Assembly has demonstrated in Ambassador Mojsov by electing him to preside over the General Assembly at its ninth special session at one of the most important moments in the history of our Organization. We are certain that he will guide its deliberations with the same skill and wisdom as he did throughout the thirty-second regular session and the eighth special session just concluded.

156. We are meeting today at this ninth special session to discuss perhaps a unique case in United Nations history. It is now more than a decade since this august body terminated South Africa's Mandate in Namibia, declaring that the Territory came under the direct responsibility of the United Nations. The following year the United Nations Council for Namibia was established and vested with powers to administer the country—powers which had been legally withdrawn from the Government of South Africa.

157. Today, South Africa, disdainful of international consensus, contemptuous of the basic human rights of the oppressed people of Namibia, is still arrogantly maintaining its presence there in an unprecedented manner of defiance and challenge to the United Nations.

158. But what have we done to confront this flagrant and infamous challenge hurled by South Africa in the face of the international community? It is distressing to see that, despite our resolutions, declarations and appeals, the South African régime continues, through its notorious policies of deceit and ruthlessness, to perpetuate its illegal occupation of Namibia. The racist régime, while exploiting the natural resources of the Territory in close collaboration with multinational corporations, is at the same time conspiring to impose an internal settlement which aims at installing a puppet government excluding SWAPO, the sole and authen-

tic representative of the Namibian people, thereby prolonging its colonial control over that Territory.

159. In this connexion, it is increasingly ironical to note that, while many countries have achieved independence and freedom with some help from the United Nations, we find the United Nations helpless to deal with the situation in Namibia, a Territory which was placed in its custody and under its authority.

160. It was this very failure of the United Nations that prompted the people of Namibia—and rightly so—to resort to armed struggle, a struggle during which they have been exposed to great suffering and human sacrifice. It was also in the face of this heroic and intensified struggle that the Pretoria régime escalated its policy of repression and intensified its means of terror by imprisoning freedom fighters and murdering innocent persons.

161. We have all learned from the President of SWAPO, Mr. Sam Nujoma, whom I warmly welcome here, of this extension of terror characterized by the reinforcement of troops in Namibia and the setting up of military installations in the Territory by South Africa. Yet it is our firm belief that the international community as represented in this body will not allow this to continue. The United Nations should live up to its historical responsibility and act before it is too late.

162. We have before us a comprehensive draft declaration and programme of action in support of self-determination and national independence for Namibia. My delegation believes that this document is well conceived, and I should like here to congratulate Ambassador Konie of Zambia and the other members of the United Nations Council for Namibia, who have spared no effort to produce this comprehensive and important work.

163. However, we should like to underline the following basic principles which reaffirm our unequivocal stand regarding the future of Namibia, in conformity with General Assembly and Security Council resolutions and the Lusaka and Maputo Declarations. First, we reaffirm the principle that SWAPO is the sole, genuine and legitimate representative of the Namibian people. Secondly, we categorically reject all attempts at violating the principle of the territorial integrity of Namibia and we state in no uncertain terms that Walvis Bay is an integral part of Namibia.

164. In this connexion we should like to add that, although we welcome all sincere efforts aimed at achieving genuine independence for our brothers in Namibia, we nevertheless believe that the exclusion of Walvis Bay from the Western plan will endanger Namibia's sovereignty and not contribute to peace and that, rather, it will circumvent the General Assembly and Security Council resolutions and will deprive the independence of Namibia of all its meaning.

165. We strongly condemn the racist South African régime for exploiting the natural resources of Namibia, for its policy of nuclear adventurism, which will endanger regional and international peace, and for its brutal repression of the Namibian people, led so valiantly by its heroic organization, SWAPO.

166. My delegation calls on the General Assembly at this special session immediately to assume its solemn responsibility and see to it that every appropriate measure, including the application of sanctions provided for under Chapter VII of the Charter, is taken to ensure the unconditional withdrawal of South Africa from Namibia in order that Namibia may achieve true self-determination and independence.

167. The Sudan delegation, while recognizing the initiative of the five Western Powers in their attempt to find a peaceful solution to the problem of Namibia, strongly believes that no solution will be feasible without the effective participation of SWAPO, assuming, of course, that all pre-conditions for free and democratic elections have been agreed upon in accordance with Security Council resolution 385 (1976).

168. This special session is a unique occasion to reaffirm the responsibility of the United Nations in creating the necessary conditions for the complete independence of Namibia. Alternatively, there is no choice for the Namibian people but to continue their armed struggle for their freedom and national independence.

169. Mr. MONDJO (Congo) (*interpretation from French*): At such a crucial and decisive time for the future of Africa, at a time when the need for general peace and security is becoming ever more urgent, there are many, I am sure, throughout the world who would like to be able to discern in this ninth special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations devoted to the decolonization of Namibia the dawning of a new era heralding the spring of liberation, which will finally do away with the tragic dichotomy between the oppressor and the oppressed, the master and his slave, the colonizer and the colonized, which has brought so much suffering to millions of men, women and children, particularly in Africa.

*Mr. Mojsov (Yugoslavia) returned to the Chair.*

170. The question of Namibia is a striking illustration of the beneficent development of the rules enunciated in the Declaration contained in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) which, as we all know, enshrines in a code of international law the legitimate aspirations of all colonial peoples to self-determination and independence. The problem of Namibia has now become part of what Lein called "the inflammable matter of world politics". Since then, the time of innocence, the time of pseudo-neutrality and evasion has passed. The decolonization of Namibia entails an awakening, a resolute commitment on the part of all States represented in our Organization, not only because of the fact that the administration of that colonial Territory, juridically speaking, falls within the purview of the United Nations, but also as a point of convergence for so many different stakes, which, I am afraid, are not always in keeping with the interests of the Namibian people. Because of the exceptional dimension of its future, Namibia has today been born to the conscience of the world. That country has now become an important stake which accelerates the rhythm of certain spectacular changes of heart and sharpens the ambitions that hitherto had just been smouldering. It is not without a modicum of surprise that we witness today a covey of doctors suddenly flocking

to the bedside of the patient. Namibia is now being treated as a patient receiving "intravenous feeding".

171. That is why, Mr. President, the delegation of the People's Republic of the Congo takes extraordinary pleasure in the fact that this ninth special session of the General Assembly has convened under your dynamic and competent presidency. This Assembly bears the mark of the elevated consciousness of the international community with regard to the Namibian problem. After having shamelessly accepted the unacceptable, our Organization has finally decided to shake off its lethargy. The holding of this ninth special session thus crystallizes an impressive set of efforts undertaken by the international community in order to enable the people of Namibia to exercise its fundamental and inalienable right to freedom, independence and peace.

172. Ever since that distant time of the League of Nations, the international community has been in possession of a theoretical arsenal as exhaustive as it could be with regard to the situation in Namibia, including the taking of positions which, to say the least, one could describe as scandalous on the part of some Western Powers permanent members of the Security Council, as well as certain decisions of such sad celebrity of the International Court of Justice.

173. Perhaps, therefore, I should apologize to those who might see in what I am saying certain signs of semantic excess at a time when everybody is so busy weaving a new geography. The delegation of the People's Republic of the Congo would like to assert that it has no intention of dismissing any initiative from any quarter which has the primary purpose of hastening the end of the illegal occupation of Namibian territory by South Africa. However, this disposition on our part in no way commits us to the moral turpitude of the sell-out. Quite the contrary, we make it a point of honour to preserve our freedom of judgement in this debate, refusing to slip into the trap which can only be put to wrongful use by those who all understand the stubborn and narrow-minded nature of the fanaticism of the apostles of *apartheid*. In any case, the Namibian people themselves would never agree to wallow in a climate of timorous servility. South Africa has habituated us to its turnabouts which are skilful manoeuvres designed to perpetuate omnipresent colonialism and blind brutality against the Namibian people. One would have to be, as it were, in an infantile dotage to believe in any change in the hypocritical and perfidious character of the South African racists who have imposed, in defiance of the United Nations, their régime of racial discrimination on the Namibian people, a régime which has been and remains an uninterrupted sequence of acts of violence, depredation, gratuitous humiliation and odious crimes. It is not we but the brutal and bestial conduct of the Pretoria Fascists which has given birth to and concentrated among the Namibian masses an implacable hatred which has led that valiant African people to the clear consciousness of the shame of the condition to which they have been reduced. I beg members to have no doubt that this awakening is a tempestuous torrent, a formidable and invincible force which has led some oppressed peoples, who were dismissed yesterday as indolent and ignorant, to perform exploits of great dimensions which have been inscribed in gold in the history of mankind.

174. The Namibian people, for their part, under the unshakable leadership of SWAPO, have decided once and for all to refuse to tolerate any longer the unbearable presence which oppresses, exploits and gravely violates its personality—cruel treatment, imprisonment without trial of Namibian nationalists subjected to a humiliating and degrading régime, bantustanization and so forth. These are some of the arrogant replies which the racist Government of Pretoria has always reserved for any attempt at a settlement by negotiation of the tragic situation of the Namibian people, thus bringing to naught and with impunity the relevant decisions of the General Assembly and the Security Council.

175. That is why it is difficult for us to depart from our customary scepticism whenever we see a new manoeuvre on the part of South Africa. Perhaps, the question we should ask is whether the racists of Pretoria have by some kind of miracle of reasoning finally decided to cut the solid knots with which hitherto they have been tying up their protectors. Without attempting to be a prophet of doom or wishing to dampen anyone's expectations, I should simply like to express my apprehensions that once again, because of the intransigence and hypocrisy of the racist and colonialist leaders of Pretoria, the international community might be witnessing in impotence the final collapse of those hopes which are still being cherished in good faith, no doubt, by the allies of South Africa.

176. But the people of Namibia are no longer willing to await with folded arms the pleasure of the South African racists. Impelled by SWAPO, the powerful leadership of the Namibian revolution, and with the political, material and logistical assistance of many friendly countries, the Namibian people have not bowed before the fascist violence which was and still is aimed at imposing this racist and colonialist South Africa on it. SWAPO has succeeded in liberating its people from its conservative attitude and has led the Namibian masses to rise against the occupation forces. Today, the reputedly impregnable citadel erected around Namibia by the nazis of Pretoria is being shaken to its foundations. But we do not lose sight of the fact that this fight is long and full of pitfalls, because the tendency of régimes which oppress other peoples is to extend and sharpen that oppression even further. That is why the Gordian knot in this dramatic question of Namibia rests in the attitude of the United Nations and all peace-loving countries, which must without further procrastination shoulder their full responsibilities with regard to the problem of the decolonization of Namibia.

177. More than once in the past the proponents of a certain order, deaf to the warnings and numerous appeals of the United Nations, have shown their scorn for the liberation movement of South West Africa and, through that scorn, their determination to see Namibia governed by more docile hands than those of SWAPO. Our support for SWAPO—the unequivocal support given to that liberation movement by the whole of the OAU—in no way stems from an emotional attitude, still less from a deliberate desire to create divisions within the Namibian people. SWAPO is the sole and only force in Namibia which has had the signal boldness to present to the world a coherent programme for the national liberation struggle, the justice of which is universally recognized. SWAPO, and SWAPO alone, has

been able to lead the Namibian people to the stage of conscious mass political struggle.

178. The United Nations Council for Namibia and the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, a veritable centre of gravity for decisions which have done so much to help at other times and in other places the struggle of the colonized peoples, have without prejudice and without hesitation adopted SWAPO's platform of action. The principles of that programme appear also in the excellent Lusaka Declaration of 1978 [see A/S-9/4, para. 31] and in the important consensus of the Special Committee [see A/S-9/6, annex], which certain speakers in this debate seem to have overlooked. Those principles, which no delegation here can ignore, are capable of guaranteeing the independent national development of a future Namibian State. Indeed, the integrity of every inch of Namibian soil including, needless to say, the only deep-water harbour, Walvis Bay, which cannot on any pretext be detached from the rest of the country; the rejection of any formula of balkanization or jurisdiction based upon unreasonable criteria; the full exercise, free from threats and external pressures, by all the sons and daughters of Namibia of their right to self-determination under the guarantee of the United Nations and with the presence of the OAU; the respect for and enjoyment of sovereignty by the Namibian people over its natural resources, the essential heritage of an independent Namibia—these are some basic aspects of the principles concerning which the international community must not compromise. There can be no bargaining with South Africa on these points, which constitute the very foundation of the independence of Namibia. Furthermore, the United Nations must fully guarantee its physical presence in the Territory by sending a military contingent to replace the racist and fascist soldiery, which, as I have said, not only oppresses the Namibian people but uses the Territory of Namibia as a base for acts of provocation and aggression through the unleashing of reactionary fury against the People's Republic of Angola and Zambia.

179. If time is a blessed remedy, it can only work in favour of the true defenders of the freedom of the Namibian people.

180. SWAPO has just given the lie to one of the worst calumnies of international imperialism, which clothes the national liberation movements which are genuinely engaged in the struggle for the independence of their peoples in the most far-fetched descriptions. By agreeing to sit at a table with the five Western Powers, the allies of Pretoria, to negotiate the conditions for the accession to independence of its country, SWAPO has revealed its true stature as the historic guide of the Namibian people. But in our view dialogue can only be one part of the process of systematic global change which makes it possible to look to the future with new eyes. We were shocked, therefore, to learn that certain people are struggling to place on the same footing the people of Namibia and the South African usurpers who preserve their position in the heart of Namibia by subterfuge and violence. In those informal negotiations there can be neither a fly on the carriage wheel nor a master of ceremonies. That is why the President of SWAPO, Comrade Sam Nujoma, at the recent meeting of the United Nations



Council for Namibia at Lusaka, stated that his movement should not today be courted by those who are objectively the allies of the South African régime, that avowed enemy of civilization, for the purpose of giving credibility to some policy of rejection of the fundamental principles which aroused the Namibian people to action. For our part, we feel that it is appropriate here to recall solemnly that no settlement of the situation in Namibia can be adopted if it is not in keeping with the desire so often expressed in the relevant United Nations resolutions and with the principles underlying the action of our Organization in its active search for a peace accompanied by both justice and security.

181. It is high time for the United Nations to give up its attitude of abdication of its responsibilities. To maintain the fiction of a United Nations Council for Namibia, the legal Administering Authority of the country stripped of any real power over the structures and the actual machinery of the Territory, is not likely to enhance the prestige of the Organization. Future generations, when they have to interpret the history of our time, will, I am sure, be inclined to attribute to the United Nations the responsibility for having wilfully abstained from saving the lives of hundreds of people wantonly murdered on the soil of Namibia because of their concrete commitment to the defence of the ideals of the United Nations.

182. In conclusion, I should like to say once again that SWAPO, which has given ample proof of its loyalty to the United Nations, is the surest guarantee of the proper application by an independent Namibia of the principles of the Charter. To strengthen SWAPO is to guarantee for our Organization more effective action in favour of the Namibian people. And that gives us sufficient grounds for hoping that, instead of being an embattled land where tears and blood flow, Namibia will become a land of liberty and peace; a land where—to use the words of the President of the People's Republic of the Congo, Comrade Joachim Yhomby Opango—it will be possible to promote “the progress of humanity as a whole and to advance by every means a sole universal objective: far-reaching and constructive co-operation among all the peoples of the world.”

183. Mr. BARROS (Sao Tome and Principe) (*interpretation from French*): Allow me first of all, Mr. President, to add my voice to those of the speakers who have preceded me and who have expressed satisfaction at seeing you preside over the General Assembly at this special session devoted to the question of Namibia. We are certain that, thanks to your experience and competence, our work will be crowned with success.

184. The convening of this special session is an important and historic milestone in the process of the liberation of peoples who are still under oppression and colonial domination, in general, and of those in the southern part of the African continent, in particular.

185. For many years the African peoples, with the assistance and support of peoples who love peace and freedom, have waged a stirring battle against the domination and exploitation that prevail in that part of the world. The historical evolution of our peoples and their centuries-old devotion to freedom, peace and social justice must

bring them naturally to a decisive stage in that battle for self-determination and independence which is today reflected in an unequivocal opposition to colonialism, racism and *apartheid*—under whatever forms they appear.

186. Meanwhile, the vestiges of colonialism and racism still persist in southern Africa, contemptuous of the ideals of freedom and human dignity. Racial and national oppression, the denial of fundamental human rights to millions of Africans, the ruthless exploitation of the indigenous populations of South Africa, Southern Rhodesia and Namibia are brutal violations of the principles of the United Nations Charter and constitute a crime against humanity, thus arousing the wrath and indignation of all the genuinely democratic and progressive forces throughout the world. Seeking to prolong their existence, the racist régimes of Pretoria and Salisbury have resorted to terror and repression against the indigenous population and have embarked upon acts of armed aggression against neighbouring sovereign States and Members of our Organization.

187. No one is unaware of the fact that it is the racists and their allies which have made of southern Africa one of the hotbeds of tension in the world. That region of the world will never know peace and security unless those racist régimes disappear as a result of the determination of their peoples and of the concrete support of States Members and of international agencies in accelerating the complete application of the provisions of the United Nations Charter and of the historic Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. The elimination of that notorious hotbed of colonialism and racism will substantially contribute to the removal of the obstacles to peace in the region and improve the international situation as a whole.

188. As regards Namibia, our delegation wishes to reiterate here its total support for SWAPO, which is the sole authentic representative of the people of Namibia, our brothers, and which has been recognized by the Organization of African Unity and the United Nations.

189. Nobody doubts that the direct responsibility for the present state of affairs in that international territory rests with the artisans of *apartheid* in connivance with certain countries which pretend to condemn that odious system, unprecedented in the history of mankind, while allowing the companies under their jurisdiction to operate in Namibia and even in South Africa. This is a situation that our Organization must take appropriate measures to bring to an end, because it is the foreign economic interests that prevent the elimination of the illegal South African régime in that Territory. In this connexion, it is to be regretted that the Security Council has not succeeded in imposing an embargo on foreign investments in Namibia because of the exercise of the right of the veto by three of its permanent members. In 1976 the General Assembly, in its resolution 31/146, reaffirmed that the activities of corporations operating in Namibia were illegal, and demanded that they cease exploiting the human and natural resources of that Territory. In spite of that and so many other resolutions adopted by the most important international forums, the situation remains unchanged.

190. The gravity of the situation mounts when we realize that it is those activities, on the one hand, and the

technical, technological and scientific support given to South Africa by certain States, on the other hand, which are the corner-stone of its programmes intended to develop nuclear weapons which it proposes to use as a means of dissuasion against the peoples of Namibia and South Africa who are fighting for their freedom and independence and against sovereign African States Members of the United Nations. To that end, South Africa has built nuclear-testing plants in the Kalahari Desert in Namibia. The manufacture of nuclear weapons by South Africa would constitute a grave threat to international peace and security.

191. At this stage, we once again denounce the acts of aggression committed by South Africa against the People's Republic of Angola and its interference in the internal affairs of that sovereign country in active collaboration with puppet groups which have nothing to do with the interests of the fraternal people of Angola. Those acts of aggression were committed from Namibian territory where South Africa has a military contingent of approximately 50,000 men.

192. South Africa's unilateral attempt to destroy the integrity and territorial unity of Namibia deserves the most vigorous condemnation by the international community. Walvis Bay has always been an integral part of Namibia. South Africa has no right to alter the status of the Bay or to annex it. The South African decision is directed against

the territorial integrity of Namibia, as has been recognized by resolutions of the General Assembly and also, in particular, by Security Council resolution 385 (1976) of 30 January 1976. What is more, the decision taken by the *apartheid* régime to extend its own racist legislation to the indigenous population of Walvis Bay is a flagrant act of provocation and calls for universal condemnation.

193. For peace to be re-established in Namibia, our delegation considers it necessary that the following conditions be met: first, the withdrawal of the illegal administration, including all South African troops; secondly, the release of political prisoners who are illegally held by South Africa; thirdly, the recognition of the territorial integrity and national unity of Namibia by South Africa; and, fourthly, the organization of free elections under United Nations supervision and control.

194. In the light of those considerations, we venture to express the hope that at the present special session effective steps leading to a prompt and lasting solution to the problem of Namibia will be taken, fully respecting the territorial integrity, national unity, and the legitimate aspirations of the people of Namibia to self-determination and independence under the guidance of SWAPO.

195. The battle goes on.

*The meeting rose at 6.20 p.m.*



CONTENTS

Agenda item 7:  
Question of Namibia (*continued*)

*President: Mr. Lazar MOJSOV (Yugoslavia).*

AGENDA ITEM 7

Question of Namibia (*continued*)

1. Mr. CARPIO-CASTILLO (Venezuela) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Sir, my delegation joins those who have spoken before me in voicing pleasure at your election to the presidency of the General Assembly at its ninth special session, in which capacity you have once again displayed your excellent diplomatic abilities.

2. The Venezuelan delegation also wishes to voice its appreciation to the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, Miss Gwendoline Konie, who has demonstrated the responsibility and devotion so essential in the performance of her delicate tasks.

3. The delegation of Venezuela, in keeping with its anti-colonial and anti-racist policy of total rejection of the practice of *apartheid*, a position already expressed in various international forums, wishes to ratify that position at this session of the General Assembly, which has been especially convened, as is known, to consider one of the most delicate problems confronting the international community.

4. The convening of this special session clearly indicates the importance which the international community attaches to the question of Namibia. In that Territory, more than in any other area of the world, the very prestige of the United Nations is at stake, because of all the known circumstances.

5. The Government of Venezuela has recognized the United Nations Council for Namibia, which was set up in 1967, as the sole legal authority over that Territory, has reiterated its adherence to all the resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly and has supported Security Council resolution 301 (1971), which confirmed the direct responsibility of the United Nations over the Territory of Namibia and the illegality of the South African presence there. We would also reiterate our agreement with Security Council resolution 385 (1976), which provided for and gave impetus to measures aimed at the effective decolonization of Namibia.

6. In the case of Namibia, as in the case of all crucial problems being considered by our Organization, there is a

relationship with foreign economic and military interests, which, in complicity with South Africa, hinder the self-determination of peoples and deprive them of their most basic right, which is the free choice of their own destiny.

7. The existence of South African military bases in Walvis Bay, besides challenging the national security of Namibia, constitutes a constant threat to all countries in the region. That military presence is intended to bring about the geographical dismemberment of Namibian territory. We do not accept under any circumstances this plunder by which South Africa is trying to turn Walvis Bay into its enclave, contrary to all the norms of international law and in violation of the territorial integrity and sovereignty of Namibia. The carrying out of such plunder would constitute another inadmissible fact for my delegation, especially when some existing enclaves are now going through a process of decolonization.

8. My delegation believes that there is not even a possibility here for an internal agreement, which we firmly oppose. The South African Government has no basis for claiming that it should be considered as one of the internal elements of the Namibian population. Only the United Nations and its Council for Namibia have the right, the duty and the responsibility for the liberation and independence of that Territory. A foreign domination, such as that exerted by South Africa, can be taken into account only in negotiating with it the orderly withdrawal of its occupation forces at the earliest possible time.

9. The major Powers that colonized the African continent showed wisdom and a sense of historic and political realism in bowing to the African peoples' aspirations to independence. Unfortunately, they have not been able to bring about a similar attitude on the part of their sons, legitimate or illegitimate, in Rhodesia or South Africa, who have opposed reason and international law to such an extent that the minorities in those two countries, adopting an intransigent stand, have become a true threat to international peace and security.

10. Crimes, brutal repression and the methods of violence and discrimination used by the racist régime of South Africa are an added tragedy in southern African colonialism. For Venezuela, all those acts of aggression are a by-product of the main problem, which, as far as Namibia is concerned, is the obstinate attitude of the Government which seeks to maintain by force a situation that is within the direct purview of the United Nations. The first victim in Namibia is our Organization and its right, totally disregarded, to carry out a process of self-determination for the Namibian people leading to their independence. The process of decolonization in Africa will not be complete so long as problems such as the illegal occupation of Namibia

by South Africa exist in clear defiance of the international community which has condemned that occupation.

11. We believe that the only possible satisfactory solution of the Namibian question is the withdrawal from the Territory by South Africa, and, at the same time, we believe that once the inhabitants of the Territory have recovered the enjoyment and exercise of their political and economic rights, the Government of South Africa must compensate the legitimate Government set up in that Territory for the use and abuse committed of the improper appropriation of the country's resources during the years of its illegal occupation.

12. The delegation of Venezuela supports the measures that have been proposed by the Council for Namibia to assure a process by which the will of the Namibian people may be expressed free from outside pressures, obstacles and interference. We believe that the United Nations must play a role as guardian and guarantor of that process.

13. The delegation of Venezuela is in favour of any plan that can lead to a settlement of the Namibian question. In that connexion, we view as constructive the efforts that have been made by the five Western Powers, whose proposals will be discussed later in the Security Council. However, in our view there are basic elements that cannot be ignored, such as the recognition of the South West Africa People's Organization SWAPO as the representative of the determining majority of the Namibian people and the rejection of any territorial claims by South Africa over Walvis Bay.

14. In concluding our statement, we wish to reaffirm our trust in the results of the special session of the General Assembly and in the directives laid down by the United Nations Council for Namibia, to which we have given all the support that they deserve, and we hope that this debate will produce constructive ideas and proposals, which will serve as the basis for a favourable settlement of the colonial question of Namibia.

15. Mr. BOATEN (Ghana): Mr. President, many tributes have already been paid to you personally and to your great country, Yugoslavia, on your well-deserved election as President of the General Assembly at this special session. Nevertheless, I would like to add that the delegation of Ghana fully shares the sentiments expressed by previous speakers. In the same vein, we also pay a tribute to Ambassador Gwendoline Konie of Zambia, President of the United Nations Council for Namibia. We should like also to express our appreciation to Ambassador Salim and the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples of which he is the Chairman, for their untiring efforts in connexion with the problem of Namibia.

16. We have no intention of boring this Assembly with the historical details surrounding the status of Namibia, since they are already well known. Suffice it to recall that by its resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966 this Assembly terminated South Africa's Mandate over South West Africa, as it was then called, and placed the Territory under the direct responsibility of the United Nations. South Africa, however, was not moved.

17. At the fifth special session, in 1967, this Assembly established the United Nations Council for South West Africa (Namibia) to prepare the modalities for the transfer of control of the Territory. Just as it refused to accept the termination of its Mandate, so the Pretoria régime ignored the United Nations machinery for administering the Territory and refused to withdraw.

18. In short, South Africa's attitude towards numerous United Nations resolutions has been one of persistent refusal to co-operate with this Organization. If, therefore, the Pretoria régime has now agreed to co-operate, as this Assembly was informed a week ago by the Secretary of State for External Affairs of Canada, Mr. Donald Jamieson [*3rd meeting*], and as confirmed by later press reports, then South Africa must be sincere and must play the game as it ought to be played.

19. South Africa's response to the Western proposals made public last week gives cause for concern as regards Vorster's candour and sincerity. We are all still doubtful whether Vorster sincerely wishes to co-operate. As a condition of accepting the Western proposals, Pretoria has made a number of demands. On the transitional arrangements, for instance, South Africa insists that its Administrator-General should continue to head the administrative structure of Namibia, while the proposed United Nations special representative would work "together" with the Administrator-General.

20. The record of South Africa over the years with regard to its illegal occupation of Namibia makes one wonder what an Administrator-General appointed by the *apartheid* régime would be like. South Africa is an interested party in the whole exercise of a negotiated settlement of the Namibian question. Therefore, to allow the Vorster régime the prerogative of appointing an administrator-general for the Territory during the transition period would certainly create doubt regarding South Africa's intention. Is the South African Administrator-General willing to supervise a period of truly unimpeded transition or is he to put the brakes on when the process does not suit South Africa? In other words, is he to be an impartial administrator-general willing to advance the process towards independence without doing anything to impede it?

21. Given South Africa's lack of candour, the Government of Ghana would wish that the administrator-general be appointed by the United Nations and be given wide enough powers to maintain law and order through the United Nations forces placed at his disposal. This would ensure fairness to all parties. Furthermore, it is the view of the Government of Ghana that the administrator-general should be accountable to the Secretary-General only, so as to ensure that in the transitional period Namibia does not suffer the same disaster as befell the Congo in the 1960s.

22. Pretoria further insists, as a condition of accepting the Western proposals, that the maintenance of law and order during the transitional period should rest with its police forces. This raises the question of the role of the United Nations military personnel in the transitional period, a role which has yet to be defined. In this respect many questions spring to mind. Will the United Nations forces intervene in the event of attempts by South African forces again to seize

the reins of government? What would the United Nations forces do should there be an outbreak of violence between nationalist forces and the South African troops? Can a nationalist leader call upon the United Nations forces to intervene in the event of an attack on his supporters by an unidentified group?

23. The unfortunate incidents in the Congo are still fresh in our minds. We should therefore make determined efforts to forestall their repetition in Namibia. It is with this in mind that we would prefer to have the role of the United Nations forces spelt out in detail, to ensure a progressive and meaningful working relationship between the United Nations representatives and the nationalists.

24. This becomes even more crucial when account is taken of the fact that the Western proposals, apparently in response to Vorster's demand, envisage that the existing police forces, which belong to the *apartheid* régime, would be primarily responsible for the maintenance of law and order during the transitional period. What is worse, the Administrator-General would ensure the good conduct of the police forces.

25. Ghana is doubtful that such interim arrangements would ensure the smooth transition to independence that we all expect and hope for. As I indicated earlier, if the record of South Africa over the years is anything to be guided by, I would be hesitant about entrusting it with the responsibility of maintaining law and order in the Territory. The Government of Ghana is deeply concerned about South Africa's ability to maintain impartiality and fairness during a transitional period. Our deep concern is not without foundation. It is supported by South Africa's record over a period of about three decades.

26. Again, Pretoria demands as a condition of its acceptance that the vital question of Walvis Bay should not be included in the Western proposals. We were made to understand that the issue of Walvis Bay was being reserved to be further negotiated between a future independent Namibia and South Africa. We have also had reports that the five Western Powers are prepared to make a statement, provided that SWAPO accepts their proposal, to the effect that for geographical, ethnic and cultural reasons Walvis Bay should be part of Namibia.

27. It is quite evident that Pretoria accepts the Western proposals because they exclude the question of Walvis Bay, an area which the Government of Ghana recognizes as part of Namibia. To use an old colonial arrangement, unrecognized by the international community, to justify South Africa's stranglehold on a part of Namibia is unacceptable to us.

28. The question of Walvis Bay is non-negotiable because South Africa has no legal basis for claiming this enclave, which is recognized as an integral part of Namibia. Indeed, it may be recalled that a resolution on the prevailing situation in Namibia resulting from the illegal occupation of the Territory by South Africa was adopted on 4 November 1977 by the General Assembly [*resolution 32/9 D*]. That resolution declared that the decision of South Africa to annex Walvis Bay is an act of colonial expansion in violation of the purposes and principles of the Charter of

the United Nations and of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) and that such annexation is illegal, null and void. The resolution, we further recall, declares that Walvis Bay is an integral part of Namibia with which it is inextricably linked by geographical, historical, economic, cultural and ethnic bonds. Its provisions also condemned South Africa for the decision to annex Walvis Bay, thereby attempting to undermine the territorial integrity and unity of Namibia.

29. My Government is completely opposed to the proposal that Walvis Bay should be negotiated between the future Government of Namibia and South Africa because a postponement of this issue, in the view of the Ghana delegation, amounts to ignoring the most important part of the Namibian problem. It is difficult to think of an independent Namibia without Walvis Bay, which is the Territory's only deep-sea port and the centre of its thriving fishing industry. In fact, the proposal implies that the right of an independent Namibia to survive depends upon the benevolence of South Africa. In the view of the Ghana delegation, the Western five have an opportunity now to reassert the rights of the people of Namibia to Walvis Bay. We hope that they will not fail in this regard.

30. In making these observations the Government of Ghana is not unaware of the intense diplomatic efforts being made by the five Western Powers, including the high-level talks with all those directly concerned. We feel, however, that there is some ground yet to be covered. My delegation would therefore urge the five Powers to continue to show their goodwill.

31. In this connexion, we were pleased with reports which we received last Friday about a meeting between the Western five and the representatives of a number of African countries. That meeting was called as part of the negotiation process. SWAPO's statement distributed on the same day also shows clearly that they are prepared to resume talks on vital areas of difference. Furthermore, a report published in the issue of *The New York Times* of Saturday, 29 April, quoted Mr. Donald F. McHenry, the United States representative in the negotiating team, as saying that "my expectation is that, as usual, we will go into a smoke-filled room and come out with an agreement."

32. These are healthy indications that both sides are willing to resume negotiations to further narrow down the differences with South Africa. The Government of Ghana believes that the Western Powers have the ability to influence South Africa by reason of their trade, economic and cultural relations with the Vorster régime. The international community therefore hopes that they will not relax their efforts until an acceptable solution is found to this problem. To this end, the Government of Ghana pledges its maximum co-operation and assistance to any international effort for the realization of this goal.

33. Having said that, we should like to state that Ghana's position on Namibia has always been one of support—material and diplomatic—to SWAPO. In this regard Ghana has whole-heartedly supported the armed struggle being waged by SWAPO, for until now it had provided the only prospect of ending South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia. Should the present initiatives fail because the

Vorster régime refused to show a more flexible attitude on major areas of difference, including Walvis Bay, then the Ghana Government would have no option but to continue its moral and material assistance to SWAPO.

34. Mr. DE PINIES (Spain) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. President, I should like first of all, on behalf of my delegation and on my own behalf, to congratulate you on your well-deserved election to the presidency of the General Assembly at its ninth special session on the question of Namibia. I wish also to extend my congratulations to Ambassador Gwendoline Konie, who has been elected Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, which is a just tribute not only to the excellent work done by the United Nations Council for Namibia but also to her extraordinary dedication and that of her country, Zambia, to the cause of the liberation of Namibia.

35. When last October, during the thirty-second regular session, we took up the question of Namibia, I stated from this rostrum [*46th meeting*] that, in my delegation's view, the discussion had at least served the purpose of stressing once again the fact that there is consensus on a series of fundamental aspects of the question. I should like to recall the following points: First, that the presence of South Africa in the Territory constitutes illegal occupation; secondly, that South Africa must therefore withdraw immediately from Namibia; thirdly, that the United Nations has direct responsibility for the Territory during its transition to independence. Fourthly, that the people of Namibia must be permitted to exercise their right to self-determination and independence, while preserving Namibia's national unity and territorial integrity, by means of free elections under the control and supervision of the United Nations, in accordance with Security Council resolution 385 (1976); and fifthly, that, in this process, the participation of SWAPO is essential, since SWAPO is recognized by the United Nations and by the OAU to be the authentic representative of the Namibian people and any negotiating process attempting to exclude SWAPO or any programme for the solution of the problem which is not approved by the nationalist organization that has led the liberation struggle of the Namibian people would be doomed to failure.

36. While there may be differences among us on procedure, there is a clear consensus on the goal of United Nations action on this question, namely, the prompt establishment in Namibia of majority rule.

37. My delegation continues to believe that every attempt should be made to find a peaceful formula for attaining that goal, since, in the final analysis, the mission of the United Nations is to bring about peaceful solutions to international problems. In that connexion, my delegation has supported and continues to support all the efforts—including those of the five Western members of the Security Council and those of the so-called "front-line" countries—designed to achieve a prompt and peaceful solution to the Namibian problem.

38. Specifically, the initiative of the five Western members of the Security Council seems—after a complex negotiating process in which the Government of South Africa and SWAPO have participated—to have reached a formula that

can serve as the basis for a peaceful settlement along the lines of Security Council resolution 385 (1976).

39. In view of the conditions under which the parties directly concerned would be able to agree to that formula, it would seem that a settlement is not imminent. However, my delegation believes that it would be regrettable to give up the diplomatic battle when, for the first time in the long history of the Namibian question, a solution seems possible. My delegation would urge all the parties involved in the negotiating process to continue their efforts to iron out the last remaining obstacles to Namibian independence under majority rule. We believe that these difficulties can be overcome, and at this stage we see no peaceful alternative.

40. In any event, the delegation of Spain believes it essential, if we do not wish to wreck the possibilities of a prompt and peaceful solution, to establish a favourable political climate in the Territory, including the immediate cessation of all acts of repression; the enhanced participation of the United Nations in the entire process, both during the transitional period and during the holding of free and democratic elections; and finally, the assurance that the unity and territorial integrity of Namibia will not be compromised. That is a principle to which my delegation attaches the greatest importance and which may be crucial to Namibia's viability as an independent State.

41. Mr. AL-HUSSAMY (Syrian Arab Republic) (*interpretation from Arabic*): My delegation congratulates you, Sir, on your election as President of the General Assembly at its ninth special session, and we should like once again to emphasize the ties linking your great country with ours.

42. I wish also to reaffirm my delegation's solidarity with the heroic people of Namibia in their struggle to exercise their right to self-determination and independence throughout their national territory and welcome their sole authentic representatives, the SWAPO freedom-fighters.

43. The question of South West Africa—now called Namibia—is truly unique in the annals of the efforts of the international Organization to help those peoples still under the yoke of colonialism to attain independence, not because it is the only question that the United Nations inherited from the League of Nations but because of the racist character of the occupying Power.

44. Fortunately, the picture changed radically when the United Nations evolved as a better expression of the international reality and became more representative of the nations of the world with the arrival in its midst of many newly independent countries, in particular from Africa. It was only then—1960—that the important and historic resolution 1514 (XV) was adopted which was followed by other very important resolutions, such as resolution 2145 (XXI) of 1966, which terminated the South African Mandate over Namibia, and resolution 2248 (S-V) of 1967, which established the United Nations Council for Namibia and ordered South Africa to withdraw from Namibia and hand the Territory over to the Council; subsequently, on 21 June 1971, the International Court of Justice in its advisory opinion, stated that the occupation of Namibia by South Africa was illegal, and finally, the Security Council adopted resolution 385 (1976).

45. Logic, the principles of international law and of human rights, the historic, geographical and ethnic realities, the Charter of the United Nations, its resolutions, international legislation—all were factors on the side of the freedom and independence of the Namibian people. Nevertheless, here we are, more than half a century after South Africa was granted the Mandate over Namibia and more than 25 years after the establishment of the United Nations gathered together in a special session to consider the question of Namibia once again and draw up a declaration and programme of action aimed at helping the people of Namibia to exercise their right to self-determination and independence.

46. During the last regular session of the General Assembly, my delegation voted in favour of the resolution in which the Assembly decided to convene a special session devoted to Namibia. At that time, it was our heart-felt hope that at a special session such as this one, specific long-range steps would be taken to eradicate the colonial and racist injustices that prevail and to fulfil the aspirations of Namibians towards independence and sovereignty over their entire territory. It is with regret, however, that we find certain States determined to oppose the international community in its efforts to enforce the economic and military embargo against the racist, colonial régime of Pretoria; instead, those States insist on resorting to their own devious ways, under the pretext that they seek a peaceful solution to the problem. Since no effective results have ever been achieved, we can no longer doubt the true nature of their intentions.

47. That is why my delegation once again condemns the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa and denounces all the laws enacted and oppressive measures taken by the colonial authorities against Namibian patriots, laws that have promulgated the policy of bantustanization—all in flagrant contradiction of the goal of a united, sovereign Namibia. We also express our concern at the obstinate attitude of South Africa in annexing Walvis Bay, which is an integral part of Namibia. We denounce all attempts to deprive the Namibian people of that part of their territory, so important and vital to their economy.

48. My delegation is truly concerned to see South Africa increasing its military potential in Namibia, since that potential is far in excess of its requirements to keep the Namibian people and their revolutionary organization under control. There is no doubt today that South Africa now intends to use Namibian territory as a base for perpetrating future aggression against neighbouring African countries; furthermore, that fact has been openly proclaimed by the Government of Pretoria and represents a danger to international peace and security.

49. We cannot fail to recall the various agreements concluded between the leaders of the racist régimes of Pretoria and Tel Aviv concerning the production of heavy weapons, or to note the fact that the use of common laboratories in the Kalahari desert, intended for nuclear tests is envisaged. The possibility of the use of that Territory by both those régimes to satisfy their expansionist appetites is one more proof of their aggressive intentions against the African and Arab peoples.

50. Once again we should like to emphasize that the first fundamental steps to be taken by the international community to depend the role of the Organization and to protect the Namibian people are that its States Members refrain from any co-operation with the Pretoria régime, that the sanctions provided for under Chapter VII of the Charter be applied, that a war without quarter be declared against all international companies which continue to maintain relations with the colonial racist régime in South Africa—thus violating all international legislative rules and that all those who recruit, train or use mercenaries to serve that régime be firmly opposed.

51. The stubbornness of certain States in giving guarantees to pacify the Vorster régime after all the challenges that it has flung at the international community, at the very moment that it has imprisoned 32 SWAPO members and after it has threatened to undertake direct military intervention in neighbouring African countries, only serves to justify the apprehensions expressed by the representative of SWAPO, apprehensions that are fully justified.

52. My delegation has followed with interest the historic statement by the representative of SWAPO [*1st meeting*], and once again would like to reaffirm the determination of the Syrian Arab Republic to support the military and political action of SWAPO, in the struggle that it is waging to liberate Namibia from the South African forces, to free all political prisoners, and to permit the United Nations to fulfil its role through the effective supervision of free elections in the country that would guarantee to all Namibians their right to self-determination and independence, pursuant to Security Council resolution 385 (1976) and all relevant resolutions adopted by the General Assembly in accordance with the views that were expressed in detail here a few days ago by the representative of SWAPO.

53. However, our awareness of the delaying tactics that have been adopted by the racist and colonial régime and of its constant defiance of the United Nations and the international community, reaffirms our conviction that it is necessary, above all, to impose a military and economic embargo against South Africa so as to isolate the régime in all areas, that being the only language it seems to understand. The persistence of certain States in not applying Chapter VII of the Charter can no longer be tolerated, particularly when the United Nations is called upon to debate a matter that represents a threat to international peace and security. We reaffirm the unique and indivisible nature of the Charter which all States Members of the United Nations have espoused and that it is impossible to apply one chapter and not another. Chapter VII of the Charter is the only means of dissuasion that this Organization possesses—not only to implement its own resolutions but also to protect the principles of international law and law in general.

54. Mr. DOLGUCHITS (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*interpretation from Russian*): I should like to join in the congratulations expressed to you, Sir, on your election to the lofty and responsible post of President of the General Assembly at this special session devoted to the question of Namibia, a country whose people are entitled to expect from the world community resolute support to their lengthy struggle for freedom and independence. We

should like to wish you every success in your difficult and responsible post.

55. Today, the peoples of the world are everywhere celebrating 1 May—the day of international solidarity among the workers in their struggle against imperialism and for peace, democracy and socialism. On this red-letter day, the workers of Byelorussia and the entire Soviet people are holding demonstrations in order to express their far-reaching solidarity with the working classes of the capitalist countries in a selfless struggle against exploitation and the inroads of monopolies and for the rights of workers, for peace, for democracy and for socialism. They have also expressed their solidarity with those peoples which have attained their freedom from the colonial yoke and which are waging a valiant battle for the consolidation of their national independence and social progress.

56. We warmly salute the peoples of Africa struggling against imperialism, racism and all vestiges of colonialism in order to gain their freedom and national independence.

57. In the appeals made by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union on 1 May 1978 it was stated, *inter alia*:

“Peoples of the world: increase your support for the struggle of the peoples of Zimbabwe, Namibia and South Africa for the complete abolition of racist régimes.”

58. The consideration of the question in Namibia at the present special session of the General Assembly is taking place at a decisive stage in the struggle of the Namibian people to free themselves from South African colonial oppression, as has been said by many speakers who have preceded me here.

59. The armed political and diplomatic struggle of the Namibian people, under the leadership of their vanguard, SWAPO, is successfully developing and strengthening; the days of the colonizers and racists in Namibia are virtually numbered. However, the closer the day of liberation, the more obvious it becomes that the fascist and racist tyranny of Pretoria must necessarily be overthrown, the more feverish become the efforts of the doomed régime to maintain and perpetuate its domination over the Namibian people in a renewed, neo-colonialist form, and the more we see the colonial deprecation, plunder and exploitation of that country's natural resources, the more the South African racists and their imperialist protectors are doing to stifle the national liberation struggle of the people of Namibia. With that in view, they are sowing dissension among the ranks of those who are fighting for national liberation and are resorting to the old colonialist manoeuvre of divide and rule by inspiring and encouraging dissension and hostility among the ethnic groups of the population of Namibia.

60. Attempts are also being made to encourage illusions about the possibility of Namibia's attaining liberation and independence under conditions laid down by the Pretoria régime. As was emphasized by the President of SWAPO, Sam Nujoma, in his statement at this session on 24 April, as long as the military occupation exists, only an intensification of the armed liberation struggle by the Namibian

people under the leadership of SWAPO can create the necessary conditions for the people of Namibia to be able to enjoy their legitimate right to self-determination and genuine national independence and to bring about their social liberation.

61. In the opinion of the delegation of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, it is the duty of the United Nations and of all true and sincere allies and supporters of the Namibian liberation movement to increase comprehensive assistance to the Namibian patriots so as to create such international conditions as would guarantee the rapid enjoyment by the people of Namibia of their right to self-determination and independence, on the basis of respect for the territorial integrity of their country. Among such conditions we would include the following: termination of South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia, the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of the South African administration and of the occupying armed forces from the Territory, the dismantling of the entire repressive apparatus set up by the South Africans, and the repeal of all their racist and discriminatory laws and decrees. That would be a realistic programme for Namibia to promote its attainment of freedom and independence.

62. The year 1978, which is the year of the struggle against *apartheid*, should also be a year for celebrating the most decisive and effective measures against the criminal plans of the Republic of South Africa in its attempts to perpetuate its colonialist, racist domination over Namibia. As has frequently been stated, and has indeed been borne out at the present session by the leadership of SWAPO and by many delegations, the racist South African régime continues to maintain its domination over Namibia only because of the military, political, economic and financial assistance and support which is afforded it by the main Western countries, members of NATO. Whatever representatives of those States say here, it is well known that their help and assistance is provided in flagrant violation of the relevant decisions of the Security Council and the General Assembly.

63. The United Nations publication, *Objective: Justice*, in its fourth edition of 1977-1978, gives a long list of the main Western Powers that maintain diplomatic or consular relations with the racist Vorster Government. The economic and trade relations between those States and the Republic of South Africa are, despite United Nations decisions, growing steadily from year to year. With the direct assistance of NATO member countries, the Republic of South Africa has been armed to the teeth with a variety of modern weapons produced in the West. With their assistance, conditions have been created for the mass production of modern weaponry of various types which is now even being exported from the Republic of South Africa to other countries—and in particular to Southern Rhodesia, where it is being used to put down the local African population and to perpetrate aggression against neighbouring sovereign African States.

64. The co-operation between Western countries and the Republic of South Africa in the armaments field including the field of nuclear weapons has brought the Republic of South Africa to the threshold of possessing nuclear weapons. According to Pretoria's plans, which are so dangerous



to peace, the Namibian portion of the Kalahari Desert is to be used as a nuclear testing ground. As must be clear to all, it is precisely the close co-operation between a number of Western countries and the Pretoria racists, arising from the fact of the community of interest of the South Africans and the Western imperialist monopolies, which is the basis of the ongoing cruel colonialist exploitation of the indigenous African population, both in South Africa itself and in Namibia. It underlies the pillaging of the natural resources that by right belong to the Namibian people alone.

65. Approximately one-third to one-half of the gross national product of Namibia is exported yearly in the form of profits and dividends of the imperialist monopolies. A number of other figures have also been quoted here showing the predatory exploitation of the natural resources of Namibia by transnational corporations, which are overtly planning to go on plundering the natural resources of that country. Those plans are referred to, for example, in Secretariat document A/AC.109/L.1209. In that document, particular alarm is voiced over the increased activities of transnational corporations in exploiting the uranium deposits in Namibia, the largest company there being the Anglo-American Corporation of South Africa. In view of South Africa's nuclear ambitions, its access to Namibian uranium is fraught with serious threats to peace and security in the southern part of the African continent and far beyond its boundaries.

66. In its resolutions, the United Nations has frequently and decisively condemned South Africa for exploiting the uranium resources of Namibia and for its policy of nuclear brinkmanship and blackmail, which portends extremely serious consequences for the people of Namibia and Africa as a whole. As has been quite justly pointed out at the present session, responsibility for this must be borne by those Western countries, as well as by Israel, which continue to assist South Africa in developing its own nuclear potential.

67. While we hear excuses on the part of the Vorster régime and while a great deal is being said about the supposed advantages of the five-Power plan produced by the Western countries, South Africa is actively stepping up its military strength in Namibia and preparing for major clashes with the liberation forces that are led by SWAPO. Heavy military material has been brought into Namibia, new military bases have been built and mercenaries are being recruited. There is a South African army 50,000 strong in that country, and the direct purpose of the continual increase in South Africa's military strength is to reinforce and consolidate the position of the occupying régime in Namibia in order that it may carry out its hegemonistic ambitions, thwart the efforts of the people to attain genuine national independence and to turn Namibia into a beach-head from which to perpetrate aggression against sovereign African States.

68. As the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples stated:

"The South African régime has initiated a scheme of officially instigated and organized violence against the

South West Africa People's Organization, which is being carried out by South Africa's puppets and collaborators in Namibia. This sinister scheme is aimed at aggravating ethnic strife and hostilities within Namibia to justify the continued illegal occupation of the Territory by South Africa and the consolidation of its policies of *apartheid* and 'bantustanization'".<sup>1</sup>

69. Like other delegations, we resolutely condemn the system of repression that has been elevated by the South African racist régime into a state policy, as well as its acts of aggression against sovereign African States, all of which have created in the southern part of Africa a situation that represents a direct threat to peace and international security.

70. The General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, Mr. Brezhnev, when welcoming the participants at the World Conference for Action against *Apartheid* emphasized:

"It is the fault of the racists and their imperialist protectors that southern Africa is one of the world's hot spots. Peace and security can reign there only if the racist régimes are eliminated through the full implementation of the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations and of that historic document, the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. The elimination of this shameful hotbed of colonialism and racism would help to remove the obstacles to peace in the region and to improve the international situation as a whole".<sup>2</sup>

71. In the opinion of the Byelorussian SSR, there exist genuine opportunities to bring about an effective and speedy solution of the problems of southern Africa, including Namibia. What must be ensured is that, in full accordance with the decisions of the United Nations, all States Members of this Organization without exception strictly and unswervingly comply with the decisions of the United Nations on Namibia, the mandatory sanctions of the Security Council against South Africa and, in particular, Security Council resolution 418 (1977) relating to the imposition of an embargo on the supply of arms to South Africa.

72. The Byelorussian SSR is in favour of the immediate imposition of additional military sanctions in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter. All economic co-operation on the part of States Members of the United Nations with the racist régime of Pretoria must cease and a political and a diplomatic boycott must be established against the South African Republic. The Organization and the entire international community must counter any South African effort through military occupation to set up a puppet régime in the country and to impose on Namibia a so-called internal settlement along Rhodesian lines—a settlement which, although it has not even got under way, is already cracking at the seams. We entirely share the view of the President of SWAPO, Mr. Sam Nujoma, who at the 10th

<sup>1</sup> See A/AC.109/558, para. 5.

<sup>2</sup> See A/32/184, annex, p. 1.

plenary meeting called the five-Power proposal “a deliberate attempt to divert the attention of this Assembly from the critical situation on the ground in Namibia and from the items on the agenda of the special session”.

73. Like the overwhelming majority of those who have spoken, we understand that the convening of the present session reflects the desire of the international community to put an end to the delaying tactics that have been evidently used with regard to the granting of genuine independence to Namibia. The aims and programme of action have been discussed by the United Nations Council for Namibia, which stressed “its commitment to end the illegal South African occupation of Namibia by ensuring its complete and unconditional withdrawal to enable the Namibian people, under the leadership of SWAPO, to exercise freely its right to self-determination and independence”. [See A/S-9/4, para. 31, subpara. 6.]

74. The position of the Byelorussian SSR, like that of other socialist countries on the Namibian question, is one that is fundamental, consistent and clear-cut. The Byelorussian SSR has always favoured the immediate exercise by the people of Namibia of their right to self-determination and independence on the basis of respect for the unity and territorial integrity of that country, including Walvis Bay. The Byelorussian SSR recognizes SWAPO as the sole authentic representative of the people of Namibia and fully supports its struggle under SWAPO leadership against the illegal occupation of Namibia by the racist régime of Pretoria. The Byelorussian SSR favours an immediate and unconditional withdrawal of all occupying forces, police and administrative personnel of the Republic of South Africa from Namibia. It favours the dismantling of the military and paramilitary puppet authorities that have been set up by the racists and the transfer of all authority over Namibia to the patriotic forces headed by SWAPO. The Byelorussian SSR supports the draft declaration and programme of action that have been elaborated by the Council for Namibia as well as any effective steps that are directed towards supporting the efforts of SWAPO at securing genuine independence for Namibia and putting an immediate end to the illegal occupation of that country by racist South Africa and to colonial plundering and exploitation of that country's human and natural resources by the occupying régime of South Africa and the Western imperialist monopolies.

75. Favouring, as we do, the final abolition of colonialism, racism and *apartheid* and equally supporting the liberation of all oppressed peoples, the Byelorussian SSR is strictly adhering to the Leninist foreign policy of the Soviet State, which was reaffirmed in the programme of action for peace and international co-operation adopted at the twenty-fifth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in favour of the freedom and independence of peoples which was so eloquently reflected in the new Constitution of the Soviet Union. The new Fundamental Law of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, which was adopted by the Supreme Soviet of our Republic on 14 April 1978, has once again borne out the constant adherence of the Byelorussian people to the unshakable Leninist principles of Soviet foreign policy and their support for the struggle of peoples for their national liberation and social progress.

76. Mr. CONTEH (Sierra Leone): Mr. President, may I express my satisfaction and delight at seeing you preside over the current deliberations of our Assembly. The confident and efficient manner with which you so ably presided over the General Assembly at its thirty-second session is no doubt responsible for your unanimous election to preside over it at its ninth special session.

77. The ninth special session devoted to the question of Namibia, is most appropriate in its timing, convened as it has been against the backdrop of several important developments relating to that Territory and at a critical stage in the search for a solution to a problem that has plagued the international community for several decades. Every day that passes without a fair, just and humane solution for the Namibian problem is an eloquent indictment of the international community, especially certain members thereof, and of its indifference to the suffering, anguish and brutal treatment of the Namibian people at the hands of the South African régime, a régime whose continued presence in the Territory is now universally recognized to be illegal and unacceptable.

78. The present stage of the Namibian problem is characterized by several moves, starting with the action of SWAPO in the Territory to mobilize the people of Namibia politically and to intensify the armed struggle against South Africa's armed forces of occupation, which has resulted in South African machinations aimed at presenting the world with a kind of spurious and despicable settlement through the installation of a puppet government by means of the so-called democratic Turnhalle alliance. It is against this background that we have been made aware of proposals for a settlement put forward by the five Western members of the Security Council and contained in document S/12636

79. This current ninth special session of the General Assembly of our Organization is devoted, of course, to the question of Namibia, but I dare say that it is not only the inalienable right of the oppressed Namibians to self-determination and independence that is at stake; the very purposes and principles and, indeed, the *raison d'être* which justify and animate the United Nations itself are inextricably linked to this question of Namibia, a question of which our Organization has been seized in one form or the other almost since its very inception.

80. The United Nations has developed as a democratic organization in which international problems are discussed by all Member States before resolutions and decisions are arrived at by consensus or on the principle of a simple majority in the Assembly. This time, however, we find ourselves in a situation in which certain privileged Members of the Organization, being also members of the Security Council—the three Western permanent members and the two other Western members—have taken it upon themselves to draw up a proposal to which the rest of the international community should address itself in the search for a solution to the Namibian problem.

81. History reminds us of the three wise men from the East who brought gifts to the new-born Christ which symbolized the salvation and redemption of the greater part of mankind. We entertain the hope, therefore, that in the same manner, the proposal which the five wise men, if I

may so call them, from the West have presented, will, despite their short-comings, open a final path towards the solution of the Namibian problem and, as in the Biblical allusion, mark the true redemption of the Namibian people.

82. In taking due note of this development we recognize that this 30-year-old stalemate was made possible by the 30 years of direct or indirect economic, political and military collaboration of some of the same Western Powers with *apartheid* South Africa. For example, as recently as 1977 a triple veto was exercised in the Security Council in favour of the *apartheid* South African régime which also governs Namibia. It is perhaps appropriate, therefore, that an attempt at a solution should emerge from that quarter.

83. Having said that, I feel it is the duty of every delegation to remind this Assembly whenever possible that our Organization can only achieve useful results if all of us have faith in it. All Member States represented here are aware that by resolution 32/9 a decision was taken to convene a special session of the General Assembly on Namibia commencing on 24 April 1978. While we are here discussing the Namibian problem in a democratic manner and in an all-embracing forum, representatives of those five Western Powers have been having their own meeting in Europe on the same issue. How can an organization be effective if its members do not all appear to have faith in its system? Again, we see that the Canadian delegation has been appointed spokesman for the Western Powers. While we appreciate the fact that Member States have a right to determine what form their participation should take, it seems somewhat unusual for Members which have the privilege of occupying permanent seats in the Security Council to refrain from participating individually in this very important special session of the General Assembly. One is left wondering whether the disposition of those Powers would have been the same if the subject for discussion had been different.

84. It cannot be overstated that Namibia is the direct responsibility of the United Nations. The legal Administering Authority of the Territory is the United Nations Council for Namibia, established for that purpose more than a decade ago by the United Nations itself, and any efforts towards a solution in Namibia must take cognizance of that fact. We congratulate the Council, through its President, Ambassador Gwendoline Konie of Zambia, on all its efforts towards the attainment of the objectives of our Organization in relation to Namibia. My delegation also pays a tribute to the present Commissioner for Namibia, Ambassador Ahtisaari of Finland, for his hard work and dedication. We have followed the report of the Council's work very carefully and note all the ground covered. In particular, we welcome the Lusaka Declaration of March 1978 and commend it to Member States at this special session of the General Assembly.

85. There would not have been any cause to convene a special session on Namibia now if the recommendations, resolutions and decisions of this Organization had been implemented; Namibia would have achieved self-determination and independence long ago. But because of the intransigence of the racist régime of South Africa, which rather regrettably is still a Member of this Organization, the problem is still hanging over us. South Africa continues to

cling tenaciously to the reins of government in Namibia by all repressive and oppressive means possible, even though it has been made abundantly clear that its jurisdiction over Namibia is illegal and unacceptable. South Africa has continued to defy with impunity world opinion, the resolutions of the Security Council and the decisions of the International Court of Justice.

86. From the graphic statement of President Nujoma of SWAPO to this Assembly only a few days ago, we were informed of South Africa's continuous and unabated policies of oppression and repression of the Namibian people. A very distasteful account was given of acts of provocation and aggression leading to the loss of many lives and much property of Namibians, especially of SWAPO adherents and leaders, who are daily repressed and harassed under the brutal military régime of South Africa—all calculated to undermine the position and support of SWAPO within Namibia in an attempt to foist on the Namibian people a kind of spurious internal settlement very much akin to the reprehensible bantustan policy which *apartheid* South Africa perpetrated within South Africa itself.

87. My Government strongly condemns such official and organized violence by the Pretoria régime against the people of Namibia and, in particular, against SWAPO supporters. We strongly condemn the build-up of South African troops and deplore South Africa's continued use of Namibian territory as a springboard for aggression against the neighbouring countries of Zambia and Angola. In view of all such actions, my delegation finds it extremely difficult to believe, in spite of what we are told, that South Africa is willing to relinquish power in Namibia.

88. My delegation is fully aware that it is the policy of the racist régime to eliminate SWAPO in any negotiations regarding the independence of Namibia. SWAPO, on the other hand, has the full support and recognition of the United Nations as the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people in its struggle for the elimination of *apartheid* and the attainment of self-determination and independence. In this connexion my delegation wishes once more to reaffirm its support for SWAPO and reiterate that any settlement that does not include SWAPO as the legitimate representative of the Namibian people will not be acceptable to my Government and must be condemned by the international community. We reiterate our continued support for the armed liberation struggle led by SWAPO and call upon the international community to give SWAPO all the necessary material, political and financial assistance in these very decisive stages of the struggle. I take this opportunity to state that this position of the Government of Sierra Leone is without prejudice to a negotiated settlement that is in agreement with the principles for which SWAPO has been fighting and for which it has received the support of the international community.

89. My delegation listened very attentively to the statement of the Secretary of State for External Affairs of Canada, speaking on behalf of the Governments of France, the Federal Republic of Germany, the United Kingdom, the United States and Canada itself. From a practical point of view, my delegation is grateful to the Five for the progress they have made so far in negotiating and formulating a

proposal which represents the greatest step forward they have taken in 30 years towards solving the Namibian problem. As much as we welcome Security Council document S/12636 of 10 April 1978, it is the position of the Government of Sierra Leone that the proposal contained therein has certain inherent flaws which cannot make it, to use the proposer's words, a "final and definitive" blueprint for the solution of the Namibian problem. It must be borne in mind, in this context, that Security Council resolution 385 (1976) is pertinent and still relevant to an over-all solution of the Namibian problem and, in my Government's view, should form the indispensable basis for a negotiated settlement of the Namibian question.

90. First, we find it somewhat disconcerting that there is no reference in the proposal to the United Nations Council for Namibia in the envisaged transition process. As we all know, the Council for Namibia was established and recognized by the United Nations as the sole legal administering authority of Namibia and it has over the years, notwithstanding the physical hazards and handicaps put in its way by *apartheid* South Africa, discharged its task with commendable dedication. It is therefore our view that any final proposal must, at least in the interim process towards the attainment of full independence for Namibia, provide a significant role for the Council for Namibia. This, we believe, would reflect the fact that Namibia is a United Nations problem and responsibility.

91. Secondly, we consider that it was premature for the five Western Powers to present their proposal to the Security Council as final, even before either side—that is to say, SWAPO or the *apartheid* South African régime—had had the opportunity to give its reaction to the proposal.

92. Thirdly, the proposal as it stands lends itself to ambiguous and divergent interpretations similar to those to which an important resolution of this Organization in another equally vital context is being subjected. The need, therefore, for clarity and precision in drafting a proposal in this regard cannot be over-emphasized. It may be recalled that South Africa's response to the proposal on 25 April 1978 was given "in the light of clarifications conveyed to the [South African] Minister of Foreign Affairs on Monday, 24 April 1978". One may legitimately wonder what those clarifications were.

93. A further major flaw in the Western proposal for the settlement of the Namibian question is that it timidly avoids the issue of Walvis Bay. We are now told that South Africa holds title to Walvis Bay. What, one may ask, is the basis for such a claim? The historical fact is that Britain as a colonial Power annexed the 434-square-mile enclave in 1878 and, for the purpose of facilitating its colonial administration of the then Cape Colony, Walvis Bay was then added on to it. When South Africa gained independence from Great Britain, Walvis Bay continued to be administered from Pretoria. By an unfortunate concatenation of circumstances, South Africa, at the conclusion of the First World War, became the mandatory Power of South West Africa, within which geophysically and politically Walvis Bay is situated. It is on the basis of this dubious and tenuous state of affairs that we are told that South Africa now has legal title to Walvis Bay. This is an argument

very much reminiscent of the claim advanced by South Africa before the International Court of Justice for its total annexation of the whole of Namibia, an argument which, as we all know, was of course given short shrift by the Court.

94. In so far as my Government is concerned, Walvis Bay forms an inseparable and integral part of Namibia, and any attempt to detach it therefrom will impair the territorial integrity of Namibia, contrary to the principles of our Organization. We therefore believe that the Namibian question cannot be resolved without Walvis Bay, as Walvis Bay forms an integral part of the whole problem.

95. We endorse the six basic principles outlined by SWAPO in the statement of its President to this Assembly a few days ago, namely:

"first, the inalienable right of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence; secondly, the inviolability of the territorial integrity of Namibia and the national unity of our people; thirdly, that the legitimate interests of the Namibian people must never be equated with colonial interests; fourthly, that the administrative responsibility of the United Nations over Namibia through the United Nations Council for Namibia must not be compromised or circumvented; fifthly, the legitimate right of the Namibian people to use all methods of resistance against foreign military occupation, including the armed liberation struggle; and sixthly, the sovereign right of the Namibian people to control the natural resources of the country". [1st meeting, para. 125.]

96. My delegation firmly supports these principles as the basis of any negotiation towards self-determination and independence in Namibia. Security Council resolution 385 (1976), adopted in January 1976, is based on these principles and should be applied in its entirety to all future consultations on Namibia. Already there is an attempt to compromise the territorial integrity of Namibia by the purported annexation of Walvis Bay by South Africa, and we reiterate the view that such action is illegal and inadmissible and constitutes a threat to international peace and security.

97. In conclusion, as a member 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, my delegation took part in the consensus on the question of Namibia adopted at the Committee's 1107th meeting, on 13 April 1978 and contained in document A/S-9/6. I strongly commend to members the comments and recommendations therein, and entertain the hope that the General Assembly will give active consideration to them when it formulates its decisions at the end of our deliberations at this session.

98. Finally, equality, freedom and justice—the three basic pillars of human rights—have been non-existent in Namibia for far too long. It is the responsibility of this Organization to redouble its efforts to extend the hand of liberty to the oppressed people of Namibia. Let us individually and collectively adopt appropriate measures now to put into action all the ideas that have emanated from our deliberations on this subject over the past years. Deeds, not words, should be the watchword, as time is running out. We cannot afford to let down the people of Namibia.

99. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): Fraternal President—I think that is better than calling you “Comrade President”, as my socialist colleagues, and especially the Communists among them, do, in an attempt to monopolize you. You are our President, a universal gentleman. When I say “Fraternal President”, this Arabic proverb comes to mind: “How many good brothers I have who were not born of my mother”. You, Sir, are a brother to us all—not only a comrade to the socialist countries. So I say to my socialist colleagues: beware; do not monopolize our President.

100. We were proud indeed, Sir, to see how you conducted our deliberations during the last regular session of the General Assembly. And now we congratulate ourselves that you are again in the Chair, trying to do everything as it should be done. I have never seen such well integrated sessions of the Assembly as those over which you have presided.

101. I turn now to the Secretary-General and say that we have full confidence that he will see the process of independence for Namibia through to the end.

102. I would be remiss if I did not mention Miss Gwendoline Konie of Zambia. We are all heartened by the fact not only that the men of Africa have emerged but that the women of Africa can now set an example to us men by their poise and their perspicacity, and by the way they present a case—as Miss Konie did when she spoke here on Monday last. Miss Gwendoline Konie—what a beautiful name.

103. I do not know where that gentleman by the name of Salim is, but I must mention that he has also worked very hard, as Chairman of the Special Committee, the so-called Committee of 24—I remember when it was a Committee of 18 or so. And here we must raise our hats to the late Mr. Khrushchev, who activated the decolonization process when he made his statement from this rostrum—it seems as if it were only yesterday.

104. But do not think I am going to neglect those Powers who were the butt of my criticism from the late 1940s up till the early 1960s. I am referring to none other than the five Western members of the Security Council. They have indeed matured, to the point that they know that an anachronism, a vestige, can no longer exist in the modern world. Anyone who sees the light should be praised and commended. I have read their report and, but for one or two reservations, I think it is a very reasonable one. We should not indulge in unnecessary criticism. It may exacerbate matters if we do not give people the benefit of the doubt or show confidence that they mean well.

105. I have listened to a great number of speakers here before speaking myself. In fact, I deferred making my statement so that I could digest what has been said—although some things were indigestible. As I have said, I wished to digest the facts. Indeed, before speaking, I went to those lions from Namibia, the members of SWAPO, and checked some of the facts with them.

106. We could go on *ad nauseam* delving into the past, but that would get us nowhere. It is understandable that there is some bitterness among colonial peoples who were under

foreign domination. But let us not dwell too much on the past; let us look forward. In their report, the five Western Powers set 31 December as the target date for Namibia's total independence. I should like to take an innovative approach, as it were, to this whole question. Many of my colleagues here have dwelt on the grievances, on the tribulations, on the bitterness, on the fighting, on the sacrifices of our SWAPO friends, who have held high the burning torch of freedom, who have suffered imprisonment, who have lost their young men. No wonder we are sometimes carried away by bitterness and acrimony. But let us look forward now, not backwards.

107. We are at the crossroads on this question. It is now 1 May. There are only eight months until the end of December, the date when the five Western Powers state that Namibia should become independent—meaning sovereign. That is a great step forward.

108. I recall that in the Fourth Committee 25 years ago I mentioned that mandates were nothing more than colonialism in disguise. I recall how I worked elaborating the principle of self-determination into a full-fledged right, which figures in two international covenants on human rights. Do you know who made my task difficult in those early years? None other than my Latin American brothers. They wanted economic rights also.

109. Remember that the late Mr. Woodrow Wilson also spoke of the principle of self-determination. I found that after the Second World War it was our duty to elaborate that principle into a right, because I always recalled how people, when they spoke to you, so as to make you feel good, would say “. . . in principle, we agree with you . . . but” or “however”. That was a great struggle—the fight for the right to self-determination—and we succeeded, but it took a quarter of a century after we disposed of the first article for the “tree of freedom” in Namibia to bear fruit. But is it not better that it should bear fruit than that it should still be diseased as a result of all those pressures that were brought to bear on the international community because of conflicting interests?

110. We should now dwell on three aspects of this question—and let us not beat about the bush, as the common saying goes. The three are: first, the political, the process leading to the sovereignty of the State; secondly, the economic; and, thirdly—but no less important—the ideological. I shall be as brief as possible, knowing that the hour is late.

111. On the political aspect, we should not get lost in a “forest of details”, lest we fail to find our way and lest those who do not want to see Namibia independent find excuses. The important thing is that by 31 December Namibia, as is stated in the proposals of the five Powers, will be a sovereign State. Let us not go into certain things that may not be ideal. The important thing is to achieve our goal.

112. Here I must mention something, not in bitter criticism, about the omission of Walvis Bay. I have checked and found that Walvis Bay was a British Territory which was handed over to South Africa when the Mandate was created. The British have relinquished an empire, but as of

now South Africa does not want to relinquish its right over Walvis Bay. Why? I think the question is one of economics.

113. Remember that politics revolves around economics. I must say that time and again. Or, to put it simply, economics and politics are interdependent and interconnected nationally as well as internationally; the politicians or those in the seats of power must harmonize the interests of various groups. Take labour and capital in this the host country—every country, even including the Soviet Union, has pressure groups, although they are not identified as such, but there are people who want to get more advantages than others. And what do the good people in the seats of power do? They try to harmonize; sometimes they do not succeed and there is trouble usually when they do not.

114. Therefore I would say that the economic aspect should not be neglected. I checked and found out that there are Canadian, West German, British and American companies that operate with South African nationals and that sometimes the Government, sometimes the ministers, hold big chunks of those companies. It is natural that they want to see to it that the only deep-water port should not be made inaccessible to them.

115. And now a word to my SWAPO brothers and sons—because many of them are young, and we depend on the young: Remember that those European and South African companies have been established for some time. Do not shoo them away. Once you have become sovereign you can see that if anyone wants to become too greedy he has to be curbed. But, for heaven's sake, if you expel them, after you become sovereign, you politicians who try to run the country will have trouble on your hands. Ninety per cent of the wage-earners of today want to earn a living; they do not care who is in the seat of power. Only the activists nowadays say "this fellow is better than that one" or "this party is better than that party". So do not shoo away the corporations; learn from them, but curb them if they become too greedy.

116. Let the South Africans—we do not want to call them "foes" any more, because they are beginning to see the light—beware and be fair in their economic treatment of the Namibians.

117. One day the Namibians will learn. Do not think that because the South Africans are white and you are black they are superior to you in industry. The industrial revolution started in Europe, and later in America in the nineteenth century, followed by the technological revolution—and our African brothers have been emerging in their continent.

118. Take the Greeks: anyone who lived outside Athens was called a "barbarian", sometimes in its nefarious sense. Think of the Persians who were far ahead of the Greeks for hundreds of years yet they were called "barbarians"—of course they say now it was because they spoke a language which was not Greek and sounded like "bar-bar-bar-bar" and the word "barbarian" came from that. But it is always the rich and powerful who get so smug and stuck-up that they think they are superior.

119. We Arabs had four empires. We thought all the Europeans were barbarians—and they were at that time.

120. Take the Roman empire.

121. And, now, who is more technologically advanced than the Germans? They called them the Huns.

122. I am talking about these matters so that you may not take it to heart that the South Africans feel superior. They have more money and they have more knowledge, but you are on the road to achieving it.

123. As I said, we Arabs had four empires but now we have to depend on people with technology for our material progress. In the Arabian peninsula who was it that extracted the oil? There were some foreign companies; we had to depend on them, otherwise we would not have had any oil.

124. So do not let political independence vitiate your vision and obscure from you the fact that you have to deal with countries that have industry and technology. And once you become sovereign, treat them fairly, but take care and do not let them take advantage of you. That is the important thing.

125. Now, I spoke about the political, economic and ideological aspects of the problem as being very important. Unfortunately, I must say—perhaps for the tenth time—that the major Powers do not dare to confront one another militarily—I refer to the super-Powers, as our Chinese friends call the two of them—because they would destroy themselves and the world. So what are they doing? They are interfering in one another's spheres of influence, and the lesser Powers—the smaller Powers—ape them. Let everybody mind his own business and live up to the ideological standards he thinks are best for his own people. Who are we to say that capitalism is bad all down the line? By the same token, who are we to say that communism is nefarious? If it suits the peoples of the Soviet Union and the other Socialist States to be communists, why not? And if the capitalists think that capitalism is still solvent, if it is curbed and does not deal in collusion and kickbacks—you know what kickbacks are—why not? Free enterprise: why not? But do not let anyone say that his ideology is superior and the best in the world. We have an Arabic proverb that says: "Olive oil vendors never say that their oil is rancid: they say it is the sweetest oil, although it may not be fit to make soap with." Everybody praises himself. Well, that is propaganda for local consumption.

126. Let those two or more Powers that wield military influence beware not to interfere in the affairs of Africa and the Middle East for ulterior motives, because in the long run they will fail. Anything that is not based on fair play and justice is bound, sooner or later, to totter and fall. Let Namibia ideologically heed what I told the Koreans 10 years ago, when I unveiled the clashes behind the scenes between the various ideologies. I told the North and South representatives to opt not for communism or for capitalism, but for one "ism"—Koreanism. Do not be clients, if I may say so, either of the Western countries or of the Socialist countries. Serve your own interests; be on good terms with everybody.

127. You Namibians are going to be free by the end of this year. Full stop. I do not want to glance backward and recapitulate what I have been saying for 25 years. What for? To be repetitive and redundant? We want results. There will be some snags. Walvis Bay was a British territory. As I said, the British have given up an empire. How is it that South Africa now says this is negotiable? This is a stray thought, but perhaps our Namibian friends, once they become sovereign, will give rights not only to South Africa but to anyone who wants to use the Bay. But, territorially and geographically, so to speak, it is in the middle: the fish and the minerals all have to be shipped from there. There are also uranium and diamonds; and I hope the diamonds are not so big that the ladies will lose their heads over them, but industrial diamonds are still important in industry; so many resources can be made use of. Perhaps it should be a free port; I do not know; that is up to the sovereign State to decide. But let us not say it is not negotiable, and South Africa has no right to it unless there is a treaty between Namibia and South Africa on the use of the Bay. Look at what has happened with the Panama Canal. Look at what

has happened with the Suez Canal; it can be used by everybody.

128. And one last word. It is difficult not to be the partisan of one political system or the other. But, for heaven's sake, let Namibia, under the aegis of the United Nations, once its representative assumes authority, become a model neutral country so as perhaps to discourage any of those who want to fish in troubled waters in the African continent or elsewhere and make them think twice before doing so—because in the end they will be losing their substance instead of building up their own economies and giving their people a better living standard.

129. Now, that is my message. I hope no one will read into it anything that is not for the good of Namibia and the Western world, for, after all, we here are a community of nations, and our philosophy, as well as our behaviour and conduct, should be predicated on the brotherhood of man.

*The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.*



CONTENTS

Agenda item 7:

Question of Namibia (*continued*)

*President: Mr. Lazar MOJSOV (Yugoslavia).*

AGENDA ITEM 7

Question of Namibia (*continued*)

1. Mr. POISSON (Niger) (*interpretation from French*): On behalf of my delegation I should like to congratulate you, Sir, on your election as President of the General Assembly at its ninth special session. This is a mark of your success, and it is something of which your country can be proud. Your re-election is proof of your success as President of the thirty-second regular session of the Assembly. You have certainly warranted the confidence of the Assembly.

2. The session which brings us here today is in response to the profound aspirations of the people of Namibia and of Africa. It is a response too to the wishes of our Organization, which, in its desire to ensure the maintenance of peace in that part of the African continent, is concerned about the incomprehensible procrastination of the protagonists in a decolonization process which everyone realizes is ripe for a just and effective solution.

3. Namibia is in a war situation created artificially by a country that persists in deploying its forces of domination, in spite of the efforts of the United Nations to bring about a peaceful settlement of the problem. Namibia is going through some difficult moments, and the best intermediaries cannot by themselves settle all the problems caused by the blindness of Pretoria, determined to exploit the wealth of the country and to take over the port of Walvis Bay, the only economic lung of the Territory.

4. The latest development—that is, Pretoria's acceptance of certain concessions in regard to decolonization—in no way detracts from the responsibilities of the United Nations. Namibia cannot attain independence with a mangled territory, with a government made to measure for the evident aim of serving above all the interests of the South African racists.

5. The convening of this special session of the General Assembly could not be more timely. The pseudo-concessions made by Pretoria can mislead only those who are in fact accustomed to viewing the independence of that part of Africa solely from the standpoint of the benevolent guardianship of the Pretoria Government. The Assembly should lay down, once and for all, the conditions for immediate but true independence for Namibia.

6. The question of Namibia is sufficiently well known. The historic evolution of the Territory of former South West Africa and the very large amount of jurisprudence to which it has given rise have led to meetings and discussions with which we are all familiar. And yet, so far, we have not been able to put into concrete form the only possible solution to the problem. Hence, it is only natural that the States of Africa and the Organization of African Unity (OAU) should once again recall the facts of the situation, even though it is true that no one in our Organization is unaware of them, and even though it is true that we have been dealing with the question of Namibia for far too long now.

7. Namibia, while it enjoys a rare privilege, has been living through the most shameful of tragedies. The privilege is that it is the only Territory in the world under the direct responsibility of the international community—that is, of the States which arose, some as a result of a deadly world conflict and Hitlerian nazism and others, as a result of recovering their sovereignty from the grip of foreign domination, all of them determined to live in peace, with respect for the law and with the ideal of co-operation. The tragedy is that Namibia has suffered from the most illegal occupation on earth and from the impotence of our Organization in the face of daily insults to its purposes and principles and intolerable affronts to its Members.

8. In the light of this specific nature of the problem of Namibia, I should like to state that the Niger delegation has come to this rostrum to reaffirm vigorously the position of principle of the Supreme Military Council and Government of Niger on this question. Both on the basis of its own foreign policy and on the basis of the principles of the OAU, my country wishes, as all of independent Africa, to draw attention once again to the clearly illegal and exceptionally distressing situation that has prevailed in Namibia for many long years now. We do so in the name of law and legality, in the name of morality and justice, in the name of human rights and co-operation, in the name, finally, of international peace and détente.

9. In a statement made to this very Assembly during the thirty-second session [*35th meeting*], the President of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), our brother Sam Nujoma, emphasized the dark designs of Pretoria in Namibia and explained at length the meaning of SWAPO's struggle. The delegation of the Niger agrees with what was said in that important statement and would like now to place in the proper perspective the question of Namibia and to make known its views with regard to recent initiatives undertaken in connexion with the Territory's future evolution.

10. The wealth of Namibia is not a secret to anyone, and that fact is certainly far from being irrelevant to the many



manoeuvres that have surrounded the process of Namibia's accession to independence. It is not surprising therefore that foreign capital in the Territory has increased more than tenfold since 1946 and that multinational corporations have established a vast network of exploitation and plunder of the resources of the Namibian people. Is there any need to stress that former South West Africa is a very rich country, a veritable reservoir of raw materials: deposits of diamond, copper, zinc and lithium; indications of the presence of gas and petroleum; fisheries and livestock. Those facts obviously cannot leave indifferent the powerful financial empires in a country whose fate, it seems, is to become the greatest producer of uranium in the world for the rest of the century.

11. It was precisely to put an end to that shameful pillaging of the wealth of the Namibian people that the United Nations Council for Namibia, the only legal authority of the Territory, published its Decree No. 1<sup>1</sup> relating to the protection of the natural resources of Namibia. However, faithful to its unswerving policy of perpetual defiance to the international community, the Pretoria régime continues its unbridled exploitation of the resources of the international Territory, just as it is maintaining there a repressive, brutal and illegal administration. Furthermore, the expansionist designs and hegemonistic aims of the racists are well known, since their white Parliament long ago adopted a law whereby South Africa granted itself the authorization to intervene militarily in any African State south of the equator. In the face of that situation, it is perhaps easy to understand our scepticism with regard to a peaceful settlement of the problem of Namibia, a settlement that has brought to that situation the only possible political solution, namely, the free exercise by all Namibians of the right to self-determination and independence in a united Namibia, without the dismembering of any of its parts.

12. The objective of SWAPO, the sole authentic representative of the oppressed people of Namibia, is precisely that. Indeed, in his statement at the thirty-second regular session of the General Assembly, President Nujoma said:

“SWAPO's genesis and history . . . clearly attests to our continued commitment to all possible options regarding genuine independence for Namibia.” [*Ibid.*, para. 74.]

And he added:

“Our resort to armed struggle is a direct result of South Africa's colonial oppression and brutal repression, and also of the ruthless exploitation of our people and resources by certain foreign interests. We see no way out but to continue our political and military struggle against South Africa and its supporters until all the conditions causing our struggle are eradicated.” [*Ibid.*, para. 75.]

Those conditions persist today, even if certain apparently constructive concessions have emerged in the course of initiatives that have been undertaken.

13. Along with all the other States members of the OAU, the Niger can never overemphasize the fact that those

conditions must be totally eliminated so that the way can be open for authentic independence for Namibia on the basis of the relevant resolutions and decisions of the United Nations. To this end, the Pretoria authorities should comply with the legitimate demands of SWAPO, endorsed by the OAU at its summit Conference at Libreville. They are: recognition of the right of the people of Namibia to self-determination and independence; recognition of the unity and territorial integrity of Namibia; recognition of SWAPO as the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people; withdrawal of military and paramilitary South African forces from the Territory; liberation of military and paramilitary South African forces from the Territory; liberation of all political detainees and the return of exiles; and the organization of free elections under the supervision and auspices of the United Nations.

14. But, although they proclaim acceptance of the Western proposals, the South African racists are still very far indeed from having demonstrated their sincerity, that is, their readiness to abide by international legality. Not content with illegally occupying Namibia, they have come up with the sinister project of extending to the Territory their policy of *apartheid*, which reflects their expansionist, racist and colonialist designs. Furthermore, since 1946 all their efforts have converged in pursuit of such designs, both in terms of the increasing militarization of the Territory and of the strengthening of police terror. Only recently, since the wind of liberation has been blowing in the south of the continent, with the end of Portuguese colonialism, on the one hand, and the intensification of the struggle of the patriots of Zimbabwe, Azania and Namibia on the other, Pretoria has increased the resources of its illegal and oppressive administration. Thus, it maintains in the Territory an occupation army of more than 50,000 men; it has also embarked on a policy of large-scale terrorism against the SWAPO militants reflected in harassment, mass intimidation, persecution, arrests and imprisonment.

15. Acting always in accordance with the cynical logic of its aggressive expansionism and its hegemonic ambitions, on 31 August 1977 white power annexed the Namibian port of Walvis Bay using the specious argument that it did not fall within the original Mandate. Here the objective is clear: from the security standpoint, the régime of John Vorster proposes, by means of a colonial enclave and a strategic military base, to maintain a permanent threat to the sovereignty of the Namibian State; economically speaking, the racists want to control the future prosperity of an independent Namibia in a way dangerous to its independence, since Walvis Bay is the largest and the only deep-water port in Namibia and the centre of the fishing industry; it is in fact a vital economic outlet. Indeed, the fact that Mr. Vorster has made his acceptance conditional on the non-inclusion of Walvis Bay in the Western plan is more than significant.

16. My country, faithful to the instructions of the OAU, once again proclaims that Walvis Bay is an integral part of Namibia, inviolable and not negotiable, and that it is as a unitary State that the former South West Africa should attain independence—not an artificial independence but one that is genuine and internationally acceptable. That is why we denounce and repudiate as energetically as possible all the manoeuvres of the Pretoria régime whose only aim is to

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-ninth Session, Supplement No. 24A, para. 84.*

dismember the international Territory and to continue to administer it as a South African province, a bantustan.

17. Indeed, John Vorster's objectives are clear enough: what he wants by every possible means is to perpetuate South African domination over Namibia and to ensure for the white settlers the permanence of their insatiable privileges and their political and economic oppression.

18. We certainly appreciate the efforts of the Western members of the Security Council, but so far we have not been convinced that the Pretoria authorities have really, once and for all, abandoned their policy of homelands. What further strategy will they be able to plot so as to preserve the richest lands in Namibia for the white minority and to regroup the Africans in the poorest regions of the country?

19. The statements of the Pretoria authorities regarding the recent negotiations have been formulated in such terms that even if they do put their sinister plans for creating so-called executive and legislative councils and forming tribal armies back on the shelf, by the logic of events, they will have to keep on inventing pretexts for the maintenance of an intervention army ready to contravene any agreement. Life in South Africa can no longer be conceived without the destabilization of all the surrounding régimes.

20. The South African Government has always claimed to be acting on behalf of the so-called free world and to be defending the values of Western civilization. What an anachronism, but also what blindness! In this context, it may be understandable that the five Western members should, for a year now, have been undertaking diplomatic steps that have resulted in the plan with which we are familiar. The mediocre results obtained are astonishing. No one is unaware that, with the necessary political will essential for the purpose, the Western countries are in a position to exert pressure on Pretoria. They have turned out to be its principal trading partners; they have originated its formidable military potential; hence they could, if they wished, and if that were their sincere desire, put an end to the illegal occupation of Namibia and have the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and Security Council respected.

21. Of course, their proposals are not negligible, but on certain points they leave the door wide open to South Africa's insatiable instincts for domination. Furthermore, the very declarations of their spokesmen from this rostrum have left very little doubt about the intentions of Pretoria, which only agrees to the independence of Namibia under its exclusive control. How, in these circumstances, are we to have confidence in the negotiators when it is not clear which side they are on?

22. The weaknesses so habitually displayed by the Western Powers when it comes to dealing with Pretoria are even greater now. Mr. Vorster has undertaken the responsibility of telling the world what he thinks of his protectors. His language is the same, more or less, both before and after negotiations. In any case, he has never departed one inch from his blind, obstinate course.

23. All this leads the delegation of the Niger to repeat what it said at the beginning of this statement, namely, that

this ninth special session on the question of Namibia comes at a timely moment. It is the opportunity for the international community to reaffirm United Nations responsibility for Namibia and to draw attention to the measures that must be taken to hasten the process of independence in the international Territory of South West Africa. We therefore fully support the objectives laid down in the Lusaka Declaration, which include [*see A/S-9/4, para. 31, subpara. 35*]: the reaffirmation of the direct responsibility of the United Nations for Namibia; the determination of the conditions and steps which will ensure the immediate and genuine independence of Namibia; the reaffirmation of the territorial integrity of Namibia; the implementation of the Maputo Programme of Action for the Liberation of Zimbabwe and Namibia; the condemnation and unqualified rejection of any so-called internal settlement; and the strengthening of SWAPO as the vanguard of the struggle of the Namibian people for national liberation and independence.

24. Within the same context, we wish to reaffirm our deep conviction that no settlement can prevail unless it falls within the framework of the United Nations and is closely associated with SWAPO. The talks contemplated between the future Government of Namibia and South Africa to determine the fate of the port of Walvis Bay are a flagrant attempt to separate the United Nations from the fulfilment of its responsibilities. Many former colonial countries have succeeded in liberating countries and territories they had occupied. Colonization has really been over since the Second World War. There is no reason why South Africa, in spite of the United Nations efforts at peace and decolonization, should continue to feel authorized, because of gold and uranium, its smug Bible-reading and its ill digested concepts of racism, to perpetuate what no human conscience can tolerate any longer.

25. Furthermore, Security Council resolution 385 (1976) has laid down principles for the process that is to lead to Namibian independence, in determining unambiguously what South Africa must do, namely, withdraw its military and police forces, free Namibian patriots, abolish its oppressive laws and organize free elections under United Nations supervision.

26. In the plan which has been established, the role accorded to the United Nations is precisely one of the major short-comings that give rise to doubts about the good faith of the negotiators. As we see it, ambiguity still persists with regard to the precise functions of the special representative of the United Nations. Is he to be a simple recording machine of the decisions advocated by Pretoria and tolerated by the five? My country considers the problem of Namibia to be, first of all, a United Nations problem and then, much more an African and OAU problem than a matter to be solved by a group of Powers, no matter how powerful they may be.

27. In any case, our Organization must play a primordial role in the transition period that is to lead Namibia to independence. In this context, the figures of 1,000 civilians and 5,000 troops suggested by the President of SWAPO are a minimum below which the impartiality of the electoral process cannot be guaranteed. It is important for us that that part of Africa should become African once again,

under conditions laid down by the SWAPO leaders and not in accordance with the understanding of Pretoria.

28. South Africa's affront to the international community and the tragedy of the Namibian people will come to an end only with the total application of resolution 385 (1976). It is now for the Security Council, the only decision-making organ of our Organization, to adopt the necessary concrete measures, because we must not and cannot any longer be satisfied with half-measures and professions of faith.

29. Sir James MURRAY (United Kingdom): Sir, I should first like to offer you our sincere congratulations on your election as President of the General Assembly at this special session. We know of your vast experience and of your particular interest in the subject on our agenda, and we hope that under your guidance this important special session can make further progress towards the attainment of an internationally acceptable solution which will lead Namibia to early, peaceful and democratic independence.

30. Allow me also, through you, Sir, to congratulate warmly the distinguished Ambassador of Zambia and President of the Council for Namibia upon her election as Chairman of this session's *Ad Hoc* Committee. We can think of no one better qualified and fitted to preside over the Committee's discussions, as we are all aware of her passionate concern for the cause of freedom and justice in Namibia.

31. We are gathered here to consider one of the most important and intractable decolonization questions of our time. The outcome of this special session and of the next few weeks could well decide the pattern of events not only in Namibia but in the whole of southern Africa for a very long time to come. This is not the time for rhetoric, but for a sober assessment of where we now stand.

32. I should first like to make some comments about the proposal for an internationally acceptable settlement of the Namibian question, which the Governments of Canada, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, the United States and my own country submitted to the Security Council on 10 April this year.<sup>2</sup> At the same time, I shall offer some comments on various observations that have been made about it in the course of this special session.

33. I think that by now all delegations will be aware of the approach that our five Governments have taken during the many intensive discussions that we have held with the parties over the last 12 months. We stand firmly and squarely behind resolution 385 (1976) as the best and indeed only way of securing a fair and just solution and an early transfer of power to the elected representatives of Namibia. Our proposal addresses itself to all the elements of resolution 385 (1976), but I should like to single out the holding of free and fair elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations, and the withdrawal of South Africa from the Territory, as two of the most important aspects of that historic resolution.

34. We are convinced that our proposal is fully consistent with resolution 385 (1976), while of necessity taking into

account the special circumstances involved in the decolonization of Namibia. So far as we all are concerned, South Africa's presence in Namibia is illegal and should be ended; indeed, it should have been ended years ago. At the same time, we have had to recognize the facts of life. South Africa controls Namibia, and has done so for 60 years. We the five have chosen the path of negotiation, with all that that entails. Achievement of a peaceful settlement in Namibia inevitably requires adjustments by all parties, so long as these respect the provisions of resolution 385 (1976) and the spirit and objectives of the many resolutions that the General Assembly has adopted on the question of Namibia.

35. Before I pass to the details of our proposal, I should like to make one general point. It is all too easy to dwell on those details and to forget the main purpose of our proposal. This is a plan for a peaceful and democratic transfer of power to the elected representatives of Namibia. I venture to suggest that no such detailed and comprehensive proposal has ever been laid before the Security Council on a matter such as this, and that such a complex and responsible role for the United Nations has seldom, if ever, been hitherto envisaged.

36. A number of comments have been made about our proposal, and particular concern has been expressed about four salient points: the relationship we propose between the Administrator-General and the United Nations special representative; the role of the police; the question of the withdrawal of South Africa's armed forces and the arrangements for supervising that process; and, finally, though this is not included in our proposal, the question of Walvis Bay. On the last point, I shall be very brief. I could say a great deal about this subject, but my delegation proposes to reserve its remarks for a subsequent occasion.

37. It has been suggested here that the special representative will in some way be handicapped in his dealings with the Administrator-General, that he will be placed in an inferior and invidious position. We do not believe this to be the case. I can do no better than repeat the comments made on 26 April by my colleague, the Ambassador of the Federal Republic of Germany [*5th meeting*]. The relationship between these two officials will clearly be of crucial importance in the achievement of a peaceful and rapid transfer of power. We see the special representative as having two main roles: he will be the watchdog of the international community and the guarantor that the provisions of the agreement will be respected by South Africa and by all parties. He will have to satisfy himself at each stage as to the fairness and appropriateness of all the measures affecting the political process at all levels of the administration before such measures take effect—I repeat, before such measures take effect. It is our hope that he will build up a working relationship with the Administrator-General so that, as far as possible, disputes between the two officials can be settled informally. While the Security Council will have to remain vigilant to ensure that the agreement is respected, we believe that the United Nations special representative should be left to get on with his job, using the broad terms of reference with which the Security Council entrusted him. May I add that the special representative, once nominated by the Secretary-General, will have my Government's total support in carrying out the

<sup>2</sup> See S/12636.

many complex duties with which he will be entrusted. I speak for all my colleagues when I say that in this, as in all other questions affecting Namibia's progress to independence, we shall maintain an active interest and concern throughout the entire transitional period. We are not going to wash our hands of Namibia once the Security Council has passed its resolution, and we are absolutely determined that the prospects of a peaceful settlement in Namibia should not be jeopardized through any neglect on our part.

38. I turn now to the question of the police. It has been suggested that the maintenance of the present police force in Namibia under the authority of the Administrator-General could jeopardize or prejudice the electoral process and lead to intimidation of the electorate. Again, we do not believe this to be the case. I remind this special session of the full text of paragraph 9 of the proposal for a settlement which our five Governments transmitted to the Security Council. It reads:

"Primary responsibility for maintaining law and order in Namibia during the transition period shall rest with the existing police forces. The Administrator-General to the satisfaction of the United Nations Special Representative shall ensure the good conduct of the police forces and shall take the necessary action to ensure their suitability for continued employment during the transition period. The Special Representative shall make arrangements when appropriate for United Nations personnel to accompany the police forces in the discharge of their duties. The police forces would be limited to the carrying of small arms in the normal performance of their duties".

39. I believe that in the light of the paragraph which I have just read out, it is an incontrovertible fact that all necessary provisions have been made to make sure that the police forces will behave during the transition period, as our five Governments and, indeed, all Members of the United Nations would expect them to.

40. With regard to the question of withdrawal of South African armed forces, delegations will be aware that our proposal calls for the withdrawal over three months of all but a small residual force of 1,500 South African soldiers, who would be restricted to Grootfontein or Oshivello or both, way back from the border and who would be withdrawn one week after the certification of the election. Our proposal also calls for a military section of the United Nations transition assistance group to make sure that the provisions of the agreed solution would be observed by all parties. We leave it to the Secretary-General to decide what personnel is necessary to carry out the responsibilities that we entrust to him and to the Special Representative in the light of the requirements of their task. We have made it clear that our five Governments will support his judgement, and we shall honour that commitment. It is the considered view of my Government that such a small South African force, confined to base and closely monitored by United Nations military personnel, cannot possibly represent a threat to freedom of the election process. If we had thought it could, we would not for one moment have put this provision in our proposal.

41. It was also suggested in this hall last Friday, 28 April, that in some ways our proposal, submitted to all the parties

at the end of last month, has been modified by assurances and clarifications that are alleged to have been subsequently given by our five Governments to the Government of South Africa, and that the timing of these clarifications and of South African acceptance of our proposal were something more than a mere coincidence. This is not the case. The proposal which South Africa has accepted, and which we naturally hope others will likewise accept, is exactly the same as the proposal transmitted to the parties at the end of last month. Not a word has been changed and no separate or private arrangements have been made with any of the parties. We told all the parties last month that we had considered carefully every point that they had raised during and after the proximity talks in February; that while we had made some amendments to clarify the text, the main body of it remained unaltered; and that we were transmitting to them a definitive proposal which we sincerely believed provided the best way of achieving an internationally acceptable settlement. For further clarification of all this, I refer delegations to the statement made on behalf of the Five by the Ambassador of the Federal Republic of Germany on 26 April [*5th meeting*].

42. Representatives of some or all of our five Governments have been engaged in intensive discussions with the parties between the time of the proximity talks held in New York in early February and the opening of this special session. In the case of South Africa, most of the contacts took place through our representatives in Cape Town. In addition, Secretary of State Vance and my own Secretary of State, Mr. Owen, took the opportunity of a brief visit to Johannesburg two weeks ago to discuss among other matters the question of Namibia with the South African Foreign Minister. In the case of SWAPO, there have been regular contacts with its representatives both at Lusaka and in New York. In addition, Ambassador Young held lengthy discussions with Mr. Nujoma at Lusaka and at Dar es Salaam, Secretary Vance and my own Foreign Secretary saw Mr. Nujoma during the recent summit held at Dar es Salaam and, as delegations will know, there was a further meeting between Secretary Vance and Mr. Nujoma only last week in Washington. We have been actively in contact, therefore, with the parties, and I would not want it thought that we have seen any one party to the neglect of the other.

43. I want to take this opportunity to pay a deep and sincere tribute to the Foreign Ministers and representatives of the front-line States and other African countries with whom we have been constantly in contact, not only for the past two months, but ever since our difficult negotiations began. Without their constant encouragement we might not have felt able to pursue our initiative as far as we have done, and their continuing encouragement will, we hope, enable us to surmount the last difficult hurdle before us.

44. It has been suggested that there was some understanding that our five Governments would not submit their proposal to the Security Council until there was either an agreement between the parties or a clear understanding regarding the areas of disagreement. I should like to inform you that in transmitting our proposal to the parties last month we said that we intended to lay our proposal before the Security Council in the near future, and that we hoped the Council would act upon it. We have been urged from all sides in the past months to press ahead as rapidly as

possible with our initiative. Indeed, we should have liked to be in a position to submit our proposal to the Security Council earlier than we did. We had felt it essential, however, to do all we could to reduce the areas of disagreement between the parties as much as possible. At the same time, we had to recognize that, while we had established more common ground between the parties than we thought possible when we began this initiative, there were aspects of our proposal which would cause difficulties to one or the other party. This is an inevitable consequence of negotiation. We have acted in good faith throughout, and we have been completely honest with all parties. Indeed, our efforts would have ended long ago if we had tried to act otherwise.

45. We are also very conscious of the urgent, almost desperate, need for early action to bring about a settlement. Tension and violence have been rising in the Territory these past few months. We all recognize that the root of this tension lies in South Africa's continued occupation of the Territory and the absence so far of free and democratic elections for a constituent assembly. The only way of removing the tensions and violence in Namibia lies in inserting a United Nations presence into the Territory as soon as possible so that the transitional period can be effectively supervised and monitored. I urge all representatives at this special session to understand the need for rapid action. There has been considerable support for our proposal from churches and political parties inside Namibia. Whatever their doubts at one time about the ability of the United Nations to ensure neutrality and impartiality during the transitional period, their acceptance of our proposal represents a marked change of attitude on which it is important that we should build. We were therefore all the more encouraged by the statement of the spokesman of the Secretary-General on 30 March to which my colleague, the Ambassador of the Federal Republic of Germany, drew attention. People are now anxiously awaiting the arrival of the United Nations in Namibia, and we must not fail them. We want the people of Namibia to enjoy the right to freedom, peace and national development which has for so long been denied them. By assuring their future, our Organization will itself emerge the stronger and the more respected.

46. South Africa has accepted our proposal. We well understand SWAPO's difficulties, which have been explained to us on many occasions. We for our part have sought to explain to SWAPO why we sincerely believe that our proposal fully meets its essential concerns. Every line, every word, of our proposal has been the subject of anxious thought and prolonged discussion. We believe that it represents a balanced and attainable package which will bring about the attainment of our common objective of free elections leading to early independence. We shall be happy to clarify our proposal to SWAPO and to explain again why we believe that it meets its concerns. In this context, I am glad to say that later today our five delegations will be meeting with the representatives of SWAPO to provide any clarification that may be required.

47. We shall not fail Namibia, and we are ready to assist during the transitional period in settling any outstanding problems, if the parties so require. Our objective is the same as that of all delegations here present: the attainment of

independence by Namibia, and the ability of the freely elected representatives of Namibia to determine the political and economic future of their own country for the first time in their history. My own Government stands ready to assist in any way it can to meet the requirements of an independent Namibia.

48. I should like, in conclusion, to make a few personal remarks. I leave New York in a little more than a week to take up other duties. Thus, and with very great regret, I shall be leaving the contact group on Namibia. It is not an exaggeration to say that much of my life this past year and that of my colleagues in the contact group has been dominated by the question of Namibia. I want to thank them all for their friendship and support. Whatever the fate of our initiative, it has been an experience that I shall not easily forget. I also want to pay a tribute to all those with whom we have consulted this past year in an effort to resolve this longstanding issue.

49. And here I should like to address a few words to our friends from SWAPO who are with us today. I am sorry that I am leaving before we all reach the end of our long labours together. These have taken us to many parts of the world, from conference rooms on university campuses in New York to conference rooms in missions at Lusaka, but none of us involved will ever be able to forget the cause of Namibia and what it means to the Namibian people themselves. Above all, it is your country. We understand your hopes and your concerns. We are at one with you in wanting a settlement in which you can play your rightful part in the affairs of your country. I believe that we can build upon what we have already achieved. I appeal to you to look at the proposal in the spirit in which your friends drew it up, as a genuine and honest effort at an equitable settlement of a very difficult problem.

50. I look forward to the establishment of a United Nations presence in Namibia. I look forward to Namibia's first elections for a constituent assembly. And above all, I look forward to the independence of a free and democratic Namibia.

51. Mr. JORGE (Angola) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, the ninth special session of the General Assembly devoted to the question of Namibia is being held under your presidency, and this gives us an opportunity to congratulate you warmly on this reaffirmation of complete confidence in your eminent qualities as a leader and fighter for the cause of freedom, peace and independence of peoples.

52. I should like to take this opportunity to pay a heartfelt tribute to all the members of the United Nations Council for Namibia, as well as to the Secretary-General, for their tireless efforts on behalf of the independence of the Namibian people.

53. On 19 May 1967 the General Assembly adopted resolution 2248 (S-V), containing the decision to establish the United Nations Council for South West Africa (Namibia) and entrusting that body with powers and functions as the legal Administering Authority of Namibia until independence. Notwithstanding the firm determination of the Council to put an end to the illegal occupation

of Namibia by the racist and fascist régime in South Africa and its efforts by all means to exercise the executive and administrative tasks assigned to it, it has not succeeded entirely in carrying out its mandate, on the one hand, because of the intransigence of the régime in power in South Africa and the refusal of that régime to respect the relevant United Nations resolutions and, on the other, because of the massive support in many forms being given to that régime by certain imperialist Powers to this day. Oddly enough, it is those same Powers at this moment seeking a negotiated solution of the question of Namibia, after having prevented the United Nations Council for Namibia from playing its part or carrying out its mandate, by rejecting it or circumventing it.

54. In the interests of implementing consistently the various resolutions adopted by our General Assembly, we believe that the Council must now be enabled to assume all its responsibilities in order to ensure the transfer of power to SWAPO, which has been recognized by the OAU, the United Nations and other national and international bodies as the sole legitimate representative of the Namibian people.

55. Since the overwhelming majority of previous speakers have reaffirmed most vigorously their condemnation of the racist and colonialist régime of South Africa and have expressed the conviction, which we share, that the intensification of the armed liberation struggle led by SWAPO remains a decisive factor in all efforts to bring about the national independence of a united Namibia, it would make no sense at all merely to devote this statement to an exercise in repetition.

56. Therefore, bearing in mind Security Council resolution 385 (1976) adopted on 30 January 1976, the resolutions and the Programmes of Action adopted last year at Maputo and Lagos on Namibia, as well as the Lusaka Declaration adopted by the United Nations Council for Namibia on 23 March 1978, and considering the current negotiations between the five Western members of the Security Council, SWAPO and the Vorster régime, we believe that the time has come to carry out the decisions that have already been adopted and the measures that have been envisaged.

57. For our part, we reaffirm our complete and militant solidarity with SWAPO and we firmly support its positions as set forth in the 10 points put forward by President Sam Nujoma in his statement before this Assembly on 28 April 1978 [10th meeting].

58. However, we wish most categorically to stress that Walvis Bay is an integral part of Namibia to which it is inextricably attached by geographical, historical, cultural, ethnic and economic ties. Hence, South Africa's attempt to annex Walvis Bay, aimed at depriving Namibia of its sole deep-water port and of a vital economic outlet and maintaining there a strategic military base, undeniably poses a serious threat to the national sovereignty and territorial integrity of Namibia, as well as to international peace and security. It is therefore necessary that all the States Members of the United Nations, in particular the five Western Powers of the Security Council, formally commit themselves, in one way or another, to keeping Walvis Bay as an integral part of Namibia.

59. Once again we denounce all manoeuvres whereby recourse is had to participation in the electoral process by so-called political parties of a purely tribal nature obedient to the South African régime, thereby thwarting the assumption of power by SWAPO—a contradiction in view of the fact that SWAPO is universally recognized as the sole legitimate representative of the Namibian people—as well as all preparations to impose a so-called “internal settlement” on Namibia.

60. Furthermore, we believe that the mandate of the special representative of the United Nations for Namibia should be duly defined, that he should have broader powers and that he should be assured of the full support of the Security Council as a whole and have the close co-operation of the Council for Namibia, inasmuch as the Territory on 27 October 1966 was placed under the trusteeship and supervision of the United Nations.

61. Because of its international duty with respect to all national liberation movements, because of its proximity to Namibia and, consequently, because of the considerable human and material losses it is suffering as a result of the aggressive hostility of the South African régime, which in pursuit of its expansionist ambitions is constantly endeavouring to undermine the stability and the peace of Angola and to violate its territorial integrity—the People's Republic of Angola considers itself directly concerned and committed to supporting positive developments in the Namibian situation. In this context, it must be borne in mind that there is one country—the People's Republic of Angola—which is constantly being subjected to aggression and one aggressor, the racist and fascist régime of South Africa, that is the justification for the military apparatus which has been set up by the glorious armed forces of Angola in order to ensure the defence of our national territory and the achievements of our revolution.

62. So long as Namibia and its people have not gained independence, we shall not cease giving SWAPO all logistical facilities and all material, political and diplomatic support so that the Namibian people may win their legitimate right to be free and independent.

63. The struggle goes on; victory is certain.

64. Mr. CARIAS (Honduras) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. President, I should like once again to extend to you the best wishes of the Government and delegation of Honduras. We are very pleased that you are presiding over the General Assembly at this most important ninth special session on Namibia, convinced as we are that under your experienced leadership our work will produce the best possible results.

65. For many decades Yugoslavia has been in the vanguard of the world movement of solidarity with the peoples under colonial domination. That is a good augury as the General Assembly is about to take broad and effective action to put an end to one of the most difficult situations that has ever confronted our Organization. We are indeed pleased to see you guiding our work at this time.

66. I believe that we are all deeply grateful to the United Nations Council for Namibia for the work it has done, and

grateful as well to the Secretary-General for his valuable assistance. We wish to pay a tribute to the Secretary-General for his intelligent and effective work.

67. We think that this is a historic time for Namibia. The General Assembly at this special session must take far-reaching and effective action to rescue that Territory from oppression. As many other representatives who have spoken before me have said, the time for the complete liberation of Namibia, in accordance with the desires of its courageous people, is finally at hand; and the United Nations, the sole legitimate authority responsible for the administration of the Territory—notwithstanding the stubborn opposition and the many manoeuvres of the South African aggressor—can help to bring about in the Territory a genuine transition to the independence so ardently desired.

68. The Namibian people, under the leadership of SWAPO, began its armed struggle more than a dozen years ago, after the efforts to bring about a peaceful settlement had been time and again turned back by the intransigent and oppressive policy of the South African authorities. That struggle has slowly but surely increased; its aim is the liberation of a people and it has won the constant support of the States Members of the United Nations. It concerns a military action which has led, perhaps, to the strengthening of the occupying forces but, on the other hand, it has also resulted in the abandonment of certain administrative plans to perpetuate segregationist domination. This has had very great political significance.

69. Of course, this chain of violence, which to us is always regrettable, has taken a heavy toll in human lives, including those of civilians and non-combatants. Many persons have been deprived of freedom, have been separated from their families, have been thrown into prison, or gone into exile or underground. Insecurity has increased and economic activity has decreased. All these sacrifices have been made in the hope that a noble ideal may be achieved. We believe that the freedom fighters have endured all this suffering with the greatest determination. That is why it is our duty, when this problem is considered in the General Assembly and other relevant organs, to persevere in order to ensure an early political solution that will lead the Namibian nation to a period of progress and equality, that will lead to a period of growing friendship and true co-operation between its members and between a newly independent State and the international community. That is why, too, there can be no doubt that the General Assembly in 1978 will act with the sense of responsibility and justice required by the circumstances. That sense of responsibility and justice was demonstrated in the past—in 1966, when the Assembly terminated the Mandate entrusted to South Africa by the League of Nations and reaffirmed the inalienable right of the people of Namibia to self-determination, freedom and independence; in 1967, when the Assembly urged South Africa to withdraw from the Territory; and in the following decade when decisions were taken towards the establishment of a framework of support and a programme of action for Namibia's cause. International pressure was thus increased on the Pretoria régime.

70. The so-called sacred civilizing mission has not been carried out in Namibia. The ownership of arable land and of urban plots has been denied to Namibians of colour in their

own homeland. Namibia has been subjected to economic exploitation. The Namibian majority has not shared in the growing profits from mining, agriculture, fishing and the flourishing trade in the Territory. We know full well that economic exploitation and social oppression emanate from that cruel and inhuman form of exploitation embodied in the *apartheid* system imposed on Namibia by South Africa.

71. As Mr. Roberto Palma Galvez, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Honduras, said during his statement at the thirty-second regular session of the General Assembly, the policy of *apartheid*

“... negates the principles of the Charter and constitutes a real crime against humanity. The indifference with which the various resolutions of our Organization has been greeted should lead us to reconsider collective action against that particular odious form of segregation.” [28th meeting, para. 120.]

That strong expression, as the one we make today, is a constant of the policy of the Honduran Government in regard to the moral and material degradation which the racial discrimination organized and advocated by South Africa constitutes for mankind.

72. The United Nations Council for Namibia, in its 1978 Lusaka Declaration, adopted as recently as 23 March, reiterated “the position that South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia constitutes an act of aggression against the Namibian people and against the United Nations.” [See A/S-9/4, para. 31, subpara. 18.] It also urged “the Security Council to apply the strongest measures, including sanctions provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, as is required by the present situation”. [Ibid., subpara. 28.]

73. It is clear to us that the various plans inspired by South Africa, such as those put forward in the Turnhalle Conference, have been successively rejected by the people of Namibia and by the international community. It is clear, also, that the bantustanization policy has been totally rejected and that the settlement of local governments, as well as the arming of tribal units, can serve only to raise the spectre of civil war and, as SWAPO has vigorously stated, prepare the ground for further acts of aggression against Namibia, even when Namibia has achieved genuine independence.

74. That is why in the search for a peaceful solution we can only support the conditions for independence approved by the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity in its resolution CM/551 (XXIX) of July 1977. Those conditions were: “(a) withdrawal of all the military and paramilitary forces of South Africa . . .; “(b) unconditional release of all political prisoners and the return to the territory of all Namibians in exile; “(c) That any interim authority to be formed in the territory be of the United Nations Council for Namibia; “(d) accession of the Territory to independence in its present limits including Walvis Bay.”<sup>3</sup>

75. The Council for Namibia, in close consultation with SWAPO, has been preparing guidelines and first drafts of

<sup>3</sup> See A/32/310, annex I.

the programme for the Namibian nation and, in our opinion, it is important that with regard to those aspects also the General Assembly provide its most effective and unanimous support.

76. The delegation of Honduras reiterates its support for the principles that have guided United Nations action with regard to the problem of Namibia, and we firmly hope that a final co-ordinated effort by the international community will make it possible to win independence in the very near future. We should like to reaffirm our support for the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly, the Council for Namibia and the other bodies which have specific responsibilities in respect of Namibia; in particular, we believe that Security Council resolution 385 (1976) should be implemented.

77. Our country has followed very closely the diplomatic efforts that have been made by the five Western Powers members of the Security Council over the past few months. Their position was set forth in the General Assembly by the representative of Canada [3rd meeting]. Now, according to information that we have received, those countries have apparently encouraged South Africa to listen to reason. We should not close the doors to the dialogue, but we must stand firm, in dispelling the uncertainty and clarifying a number of matters which, in our view, still hamper the proposed electoral programme and indeed, the very future of a free Namibia.

78. The United Nations, in accordance with international law and through the Council for Namibia, has direct responsibility for Namibia. A provisional administration ensuring in Namibia a transition to independence that would involve, *inter alia*, the organization of free elections should be closely associated with the Council.

79. The plan of the five Western Powers should, in our opinion, be discussed in further detail with the representatives of SWAPO. Genuinely representative machinery should assume basic administrative powers in Namibia over the short term. The occupying forces should withdraw before elections are held.

80. Let us support these dramatic events with a sincere desire for peace. We hope that the momentum for a dialogue will not be lost but there must be no more deception, which would only cause additional suffering and postpone the inevitable independence of Namibia.

81. The adoption of a declaration and programme of action on Namibia would, I believe, not only be of use to organs within our system but also enlighten international public opinion regarding our unshakable commitment to the people of Namibia. It would also confirm our common will to see Namibia independent, our invariable condemnation of the régime of *apartheid* and our sincere and firm conviction that we are thus acting in accordance with the noble objectives that we have made those of our Organization.

82. Mr. SAMHAN (United Arab Emirates) (*interpretation from Arabic*): It is a great pleasure for the delegation of our country to see you, Sir, presiding over the General Assembly at this special session devoted to the question of

Namibia. We feel confident that at this session, the Assembly will be able to live up to the expectations of the peoples of the world.

83. Today we are meeting in the ninth special session devoted to the question of Namibia. This session reflects our determination to bring about genuine independence for Namibia. The General Assembly, the Security Council and the International Court of Justice have all considered this problem, thereby showing the importance that the international community attaches to a solution of the problem of Namibia.

*Mr. Ulrichsen (Denmark), Vice-President, took the Chair.*

84. The United Nations has recognized the justice of the question of freedom for Namibia; this has been manifested by the recognition given by the international community to the struggle being waged by the Namibian people under the leadership of SWAPO, the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people. There is no need to remind the Assembly that in 1966 the General Assembly terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia and, consequently, that Territory was placed under the direct responsibility of the United Nations acting through the United Nations Council for Namibia. On this occasion we should like to commend the Council for its efforts.

85. The resolution adopted by the General Assembly terminating South Africa's Mandate over Namibia was confirmed by the Security Council in its resolution 276 (1970), which provides, *inter alia*:

"... that the continued presence of the South African authorities in Namibia is illegal and that consequently all acts taken by the Government of South Africa on behalf of or concerning Namibia after the termination of the Mandate are illegal and invalid."

86. Similarly, the decision of the International Court of Justice of 21 June 1971 provides "that the continued presence of South Africa in Namibia being illegal, South Africa is under obligation to withdraw its administration from Namibia immediately and thus put an end to its occupation of the Territory."<sup>4</sup>

87. Thus, notwithstanding the termination of the Mandate, notwithstanding the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council adopted on the subject, the Vorster régime continues consolidating its policy of *apartheid* and deploying its military forces in a Territory which does not belong to it. It is paradoxical that an illegal Government, with no legal basis in a Namibia, which has been placed under the direct responsibility of the United Nations, should be pursuing policies based on *apartheid*, an inhuman practice so often condemned by our Organization and the international community and which have proved unable as yet to respond to that challenge.

88. To perpetuate its domination, the Government of Pretoria has, by an illegal council, enacted laws and

<sup>4</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, para. 133.*



regulations which violate human rights and fundamental freedoms. Those laws and regulations are aimed at establishing the policy of *apartheid* in all its aspects in the civilian, political and social life of Namibia.

89. The current debate on Namibia has taken place with the participation of more than 100 Members of our Organization. Everything has been said. The question has been studied in depth. What remains for us to do now is to translate all these resolutions into deeds so that the Namibian people may attain independence and freedom.

90. In debating this question we must not lose sight of the fact that the United Nations, in trying to help the Namibian people in their fight for freedom and independence, must also restore its legitimate authority over the Territory, for that would make it possible for the Namibian people to obtain their independence and freedom. That is why the United Nations has the obligation and duty, both legal and moral, to take part in the solution of the Namibian problem.

91. We support the initiatives taken by certain Powers, but we would ask: what kind of independence do we want for Namibia? Do we want complete independence in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), or independence in keeping with the wishes of the South African régime? If those Powers, in their initiative, are trying to bring about genuine independence for Namibia in accordance with United Nations resolutions, and if they are requesting the support of the international community, then they should be guided by the position taken by the international community as a whole; consequently, they should insist on the withdrawal of South Africa's military forces from Namibia and demand that Security Council resolution 385 (1976) be implemented. Those countries must also lay stress on the territorial integrity of Namibia and insist that Walvis Bay be included as an integral part of the Territory. That would prove the good will of those countries.

92. We feel therefore that great pressure on the Pretoria régime is absolutely essential if conditions are to be favourable for the independence of Namibia. Hence, we believe that measures must be taken against the Vorster régime, so as to force it to comply with the will of the international community. If the South African régime persists in its illegal occupation of the Territory of Namibia, then we feel that we have the right to expect the Western countries to support a Security Council resolution providing for the implementation of Chapter VII of the Charter against South Africa. We also believe that those countries have an obligation to implement that resolution fully.

93. My delegation supports the objectives and principles of the Lusaka Declaration on Namibia. We reject the so-called internal settlement imposed by South Africa on Namibia. We recognize SWAPO as the sole, legitimate representative of the Namibian people. We will support any solution acceptable to the Namibian people and their representative, SWAPO. Without SWAPO, there can be no equitable solution of the question of Namibia.

94. We have an obligation to stress the fact that SWAPO has made several concessions in the current negotiations

and has demonstrated flexibility. That is why it is time for the racist régime to respond to SWAPO's demands and withdraw from Namibia.

95. It is our hope that this special session will have historic importance for the Namibian people. We hope also that all constructive steps to bring about a peaceful solution of the Namibian problem will be successful, for, if there is not a peaceful settlement, international peace and security will be threatened. We support SWAPO in every way—morally and materially—so that that organization shall attain its noble objectives: liberty and independence.

96. Mr. PIERCE (Jamaica): May I begin my statement by joining other delegations in congratulating Mr. Mojsov of Yugoslavia on his election as President of the General Assembly at its ninth special session. The fact that he has been elected to this high office is a matter for particular gratification, as he has amply demonstrated, during the thirty-second session of the General Assembly and again during the eighth special session, that he possesses the necessary attributes to enable him to preside over our deliberations with skill, competence and distinction.

97. May I, in joining in the tributes paid to him, also pause to pay a tribute to the people and Government of Yugoslavia, with which the Government and people of Jamaica have such close and friendly relations. Yugoslavia's contribution to the decolonization movement, both within the context of the United Nations and within the non-aligned movement, is unparalleled and serves as an example to us all.

98. We are met at a time when events are unfolding at a quickening pace in southern Africa. We are met, specifically, to review developments on Namibia, to take stock of the situation and, in the light of our examination of the problems, to determine how best we can contribute towards enabling the people of Namibia to achieve self-determination and, in the achievement of this goal, to preserve Namibia's territorial integrity.

99. The situation in Namibia is of special concern to the United Nations, not only because it is a colonial question involving a colonized people struggling, under the leadership of its national liberation movement—SWAPO—which is acknowledged by the United Nations as the sole, authentic representative of the people of Namibia—to be free of the bonds imposed on them by South Africa, but because the United Nations has assumed a direct and special responsibility for the Territory. Over 11 years ago, at its twenty-first session, the General Assembly decided to terminate the Mandate of South Africa and declared that thenceforth the Territory was to be under the direct responsibility of the United Nations. It followed this up at its fifth special session, held in 1967, by establishing the Council for Namibia, to which it entrusted responsibility for the administration of the Territory until independence was achieved.

100. South Africa's responses since then, to these and subsequent decisions and resolutions, constitute nothing less than a shameless and wanton defiance of the authority of the United Nations. It has continued its illegal occupation and its exploitation of the natural and mineral

resources of the Territory. By repressive police measures; by attempts at balkanization of the Territory into bantustans; by suppression of political freedoms and repression of the authentic representatives of the people in favour of hand-picked puppets; by a systematic disregard for the universal values of human dignity and human rights; and by increasing militarization leading to aggression against its neighbours, the Government of South Africa has sought to maintain and strengthen its hold on the Territory.

101. The recent escalation of terror and repression against SWAPO, not only by the illegal South African administration but by its hand-picked puppets, is only one facet of its odious design to perpetuate its hold and its influence in the Territory. By employing violence it hopes to use this pretext to keep its troops in the country, to fan ethnic strife which can be used to justify the consolidation of bantustans, and promote those groupings favourable to the administration as an alternative to SWAPO.

102. The Council for Namibia, meeting in extraordinary session at Lusaka, Zambia, recently adopted the 1978 Lusaka Declaration. The Council—and here I must pause to pay a tribute to the Council under the presidency of Ambassador Konie for the valuable work it has done—has carefully examined the issues involved in the struggle and has highlighted the essential element to which this special session must direct its attention. My delegation firmly and unequivocally supports the elements contained in that Declaration. The Government and people of Jamaica continue to hold to the view that South Africa's occupation of the Territory is illegal; that its continued presence there constitutes defiance of the authority of the United Nations; that its continued use of Namibia for acts of aggression against its neighbours poses a grave threat to international peace and security, and that independence for the Territory can be achieved only by a strict adherence to the principles enunciated in the relevant resolutions of the United Nations—particularly Security Council resolution 385 (1976). It follows that we continue to uphold, as do the majority of Members of the United Nations, recognition of SWAPO as the sole and authentic representative of the people of Namibia without whose presence and active participation no settlement of the question is possible and that we regard Walvis Bay as an integral part of the Territory.

103. During the present session, we have been informed that the proposals made by the five Western members of the Security Council have been accepted by the Government of South Africa after certain clarifications and assurances had been given that Government by the five Western Powers. It is not my delegation's intention to comment definitively on the proposals. My delegation supports, in principle, the concept of a negotiated settlement, so long as it conforms to criteria established by the United Nations. Having said this, however, we feel constrained to point out that the proposals omit any reference to the question of Walvis Bay and that, despite clarifications and assurances given by certain previous speakers, they fail to clarify the question of the role and authority of the United Nations special representative vis-à-vis those of the South African Administrator-General for Namibia. Mention should also be made of the fact that they omit any reference to the role of the Council for Namibia, the body

designated by the United Nations as the legal administering authority for the Territory until it attains its independence. It will therefore come as a surprise to no one to hear that my delegation supports the position taken by SWAPO as enunciated by its President, Mr. Nujoma, in his statement made at the 10th plenary meeting of this Assembly, held last Friday.

104. My delegation is convinced that independence for Namibia is historically inevitable—not a sham or bogus independence, achieved by means of a so-called internal settlement, but genuine independence recognized as such by all. It is the role of the Assembly at this session to take the necessary steps to hasten the demise of the South African presence in the Territory. We endorse the recommendations of the Council for Namibia that the time has come for the Security Council to take the necessary steps to bring about that end. We must here repeat, as we did at the thirty-second session of the General Assembly, that the imposition of mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter is justified.

105. Among the tasks facing the General Assembly at this session is the preparation of a programme of action designed to enable the people of the Territory, once independence is achieved, to assume their responsibilities in the administration and governing of the new nation State. We would therefore urge that increased assistance be provided, whether through the Nationhood Programme for Namibia, the United Nations Institute for Namibia at Lusaka, the United Nations Fund for Namibia or other established programmes.

106. I can only conclude this brief statement by once again pledging that the Government and people of Jamaica will give continued moral and material support to the people of Namibia and to their authentic representative, SWAPO. This Assembly is met at a crucial time in the history of the people of Namibia. Let us work to ensure that the result of our deliberations will effectively and in the shortest possible time ensure that the people of Namibia are effectively removed from the yoke of domination imposed by South Africa and that they will be able to take their rightful place among the community of nations as a proud and independent nation.

107. Mr. NGUYEN NGOC VU (Viet Nam) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, permit me to congratulate Mr. Mojsov on his election to the presidency of the General Assembly at this important special session.

108. For more than 30 years now the problem of Namibia has been so often included in the agenda of sessions of the General Assembly and it is for the second time now that the General Assembly has met in special session to discuss this same problem.

109. One might ask: why have 12 years elapsed since the General Assembly adopted resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966 to put an end to South Africa's Mandate over Namibia without the Namibian people having been able as yet to enjoy its independence and freedom? Why does the Vorster administration, condemned as it is by the peoples of Africa and by all peoples that love peace and justice, dare openly to defy world public opinion, by failing to

apply the resolutions of the United Nations and continuing its illegal occupation and domination of Namibia without being willing to restore the independence of that country to its own people? Why does the *apartheid* policy, which is of unprecedented savagery and cruelty and tramples underfoot most flagrantly human rights, continue to exist as a State policy of South Africa, in Namibia and in Rhodesia?

110. In the face of the growth of the national liberation and independence movements and the forces of peace, democracy and social progress, the imperialists have found themselves obliged to change their tactics and resort to neo-colonialism, now pursuing their policy of aggression through the use of regional gendarmes and local reactionary régimes.

111. In southern Africa, imperialism has maintained and encouraged the colonialist and racist régimes of Vorster and Smith in resisting the national liberation and independence movements so as to maintain their selfish interests in that strategically important zone. This constitutes the major obstacle to the independence of the peoples of Zimbabwe and Namibia.

112. There is no other way for the peoples of southern Africa but to fight to put an end to the intervention of imperialism and to eliminate colonialism and racism of the reactionary administrations of South Africa and Rhodesia in order to attain their national independence.

113. Under the leadership of SWAPO the people of Namibia have for 20 years been waging a long, difficult but very heroic struggle against the cruel domination of the colonialist and *apartheid* administration of South Africa in order to win back their independence and freedom. That just struggle has enjoyed the sympathy and support of the socialist countries, the African countries, the non-aligned countries and progressive forces throughout the world. The development and growth of the national liberation movements in southern Africa, especially since the glorious victories of the peoples of Angola and Mozambique, have forced the imperialists to react passively. They have adopted all possible means and resorted to every kind of perfidious subterfuge, ranging from division, corruption and deceit to actual threats, in the hope of maintaining colonialism, which has already outlived its time in that part of Africa. Allowing the Vorster and Smith clique to have recourse to "internal settlements" in order to create puppet administrations in their pay in Namibia and Rhodesia and delay the return to independence of the peoples of Namibia and Rhodesia, is tantamount to maintaining neo-colonialism by resort to subterfuge and fraud.

114. In the opinion of my delegation any suitable solution concerning Namibia must be based on respect for the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Namibia. The South African administration must end its illegal occupation and domination of Namibia and restore independence to the people of Namibia, headed by SWAPO.

115. In the light of these positions of principle, my delegation believes that the Namibian problem can be resolved in a fundamental manner in keeping with the sacred and legitimate aspirations of the Namibian people only on the following bases.

116. First, the parties concerned must recognize that SWAPO is the sole authentic and legal representative of the Namibian people. We reject any manoeuvre designed to place the Namibian patriotic fighters on the same footing as the puppets and collaborators in the pay of the racist South African régime and the imperialists—a manoeuvre whose only purpose is to deny the leading role of SWAPO. We denounce all imperialist attempts to benefit from the use of the United Nations name to eliminate the national liberation movement of Namibia and supplant it by a neo-colonialist régime there. The lesson of the Congo in 1960 is still fresh in our memories.

117. Secondly, the parties concerned must respect the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Namibian people, and this includes Walvis Bay. The territorial and political unity of a people can never be subject to negotiation.

118. Thirdly, all South African troops must be withdrawn unconditionally and completely from the entire Namibian territory, including Walvis Bay.

119. Experience gained at the cost of immense sacrifices has convinced us of the truth that "nothing is more precious than independence and freedom" and the people and Government of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam are determined to support the Namibian people in its just struggle, whatever form it may take, for independence and freedom, under the leadership of SWAPO and against imperialism, colonialism, racism and the reactionaries in their pay. We are firmly convinced that the work of liberating the Namibian people, in spite of the numerous trials and difficulties which must be overcome, will inevitably be successful.

120. We hope that at the present session the General Assembly will draw the necessary conclusions and succeed in adopting appropriate resolutions on this problem which will effectively meet the aspirations of the Namibian people and the wishes of progressive opinion throughout the world. We call upon the United Nations to adopt positive measures to compel the South African administration to apply strictly the resolutions of the United Nations. We demand that the imperialist countries refrain from permitting the Vorster régime freely to oppose the resolutions of the international community.

121. We take this opportunity to reaffirm the vigorous support of the people and Government of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam for the just struggle of the people of Zimbabwe and the people of South Africa for their true independence and freedom.

122. Mr. TLOU (Botswana): That the General Assembly is meeting in special session is of historic importance because it clearly demonstrates the commitment of the international community to liberate, intact and in its entirety, the international Territory of Namibia, which is properly the charge of the United Nations. It greatly pleases my delegation, therefore, that Mr. Mojsov, a man of immense diplomatic skill, experience and integrity, a representative of Yugoslavia, a country whose unflinching support for human freedom is a matter of public record, should preside over this momentous debate.

123. Our work will also be expedited by the fact that Ambassador Konie of Zambia, whose energetic leadership of the United Nations Council for Namibia has won her universal admiration, presides over the deliberations of the *Ad Hoc* Committee.

124. Let me unhesitatingly reaffirm at the outset Botswana's unswerving support for the struggle of the Namibian people, led by SWAPO, its authentic vanguard movement. The geographic, historic and cultural ties that bind our peoples and our desire to see our Namibian neighbours acquire the freedom that the rest of us here cherish and enjoy, made Botswana readily embrace as its own the struggle of the people of Namibia for emancipation. This is so now, as it has been throughout the turbulent history of Namibia ever since the advent of colonialism to that part of our continent. Our forebears stood firmly together then; so now we, their descendants, will go forward shoulder to shoulder until Namibia is liberated.

125. Let me pay a tribute to the people of Namibia and its vanguard movement, SWAPO, for carrying on the tradition of resistance to colonialism and exploitation begun by their forefathers. Their decision to take up arms rather than submit to the perpetual domination of the inhuman *apartheid* State, combined with its astute statesmanship in prosecuting the struggle on the political and diplomatic levels, has won it universal respect and admiration.

126. Speaking so late in the day I can afford to be very brief indeed since those who have spoken before me have amply discussed the vital issues with which we are concerned here. It remains for us merely to express our solidarity with the rest of the international community on this very vital matter.

127. In dealing with the racist minority in *apartheid* South Africa we ought to proceed with great caution and maintain acute vigilance, for they have repeatedly demonstrated throughout history their utter disdain for the black man, whose rights and freedoms, including the right to his own land, they have persistently violated. Only vigilance born of historical experience can enable us to devise an appropriate plan for the liberation of Namibia, a plan that will ensure the removal of the illegal régime from that international Territory once and for all.

128. What is this historical experience that must guide our action? Throughout history South Africa has, on various pretexts, usurped the lands of the African peoples of southern Africa. In South Africa itself, today a tiny minority has appropriated to itself 87 per cent of the best land, leaving only 13 per cent of largely marginal land to the overwhelming black majority. Falsifications of history are adduced to support this usurpation, falsifications which even white South African historians do not accept, let alone black historians.

129. South Africa is behaving in Namibia now as it has always done elsewhere in southern Africa. Once again bogus legal and historical arguments are being concocted to justify the amputation of the vital deep-water port of Walvis Bay from the rest of Namibia, where it properly belongs. Thus, South Africa has not abandoned its predatory activities or its shameless designs on the lands of others. This is in fact

one of the most persistent themes that throughout history has characterized the bitter relations between the racist white minority and the African peoples of southern Africa.

130. With regard to Walvis Bay, Botswana's position remains firm and unequivocal. Walvis Bay is an integral part of Namibia, and we cannot accept any claim to the contrary no matter what the pretext. South Africa's annexation of that port, which is so vital to the economy and well-being of Namibia, must be condemned and rejected. This august body at this special session must reaffirm the decision that Walvis Bay is an integral part of Namibia and pledge to rally behind the people of Namibia in its struggle to liberate that vital port.

131. We call upon the five Western members of the Security Council, regardless of the difficulties that they may have encountered in their negotiations with SWAPO and South Africa, to declare, on their part, that Walvis Bay is an integral part of Namibia. This declaration on their part should go some way towards allaying the legitimate fears and concerns of the Namibians on this very sensitive issue.

132. With regard to the liberation of Namibia, the hour is late and we must proceed with urgency and earnestness. At this special session the Assembly must aim at preparing a programme of action which will ensure the speedy liberation of Namibia through the exertion of maximum pressure on the illegal occupying Power. To that end the Maputo Declaration and the Lusaka Declaration serve as useful guides. Such action will certainly complement any other initiatives taken to achieve the same objective.

133. The latest reports about the promulgation by the so-called Administrator-General of Draconian laws which have resulted in arrests and harassment of SWAPO followers are very ominous indeed, for those actions might be a prelude to the implementation of the Turnhalle "internal settlement". Thus the special session should reject beforehand any such so-called settlement, which is designed to undermine the authority of the United Nations. The only acceptable settlement must be one which is in line with provisions of resolution 385 (1976).

134. We have now been presented with the proposal of the five Western members of the Security Council aimed at achieving a negotiated settlement of the Namibian problem. We have taken note also of the statement made by the Secretary of State for External Affairs of Canada, Mr. Jamieson, on behalf of the Western contact group, in explanation of the said proposals. We listened very carefully to the two statements made by the President of SWAPO, Mr. Sam Nujoma, before this Assembly.

135. Botswana has from the very beginning cautiously welcomed the Western initiative as, indeed, it would any other initiative so long as it is directed towards a solution of the problem in accordance with resolution 385 (1976), for that resolution aims to protect the legitimate interests of the Namibian people.

136. From the statements referred to above, it appears that some ground has been covered, as reflected in the areas where agreement has been reached. But we note also that there are areas where final agreement has not been achieved

as yet. The President of SWAPO, Mr. Nujoma, has enumerated clearly those areas for us and, like the statesman he has always been, called for the negotiating process to continue so that final agreement may be achieved. We urge, therefore, that further consultations be carried out urgently in order to iron out the remaining differences. As long as the initiatives are taken in the context of resolution 385 (1976), Botswana will continue to welcome them.

137. We believe that the consideration of the question of Namibia by the Security Council would be in order at an appropriate time. The events which have taken place in the last several months, including the convening of this special session, are noteworthy and have helped to clarify the positions of the parties concerned. Under these circumstances, it is important that the momentum of negotiations should be maintained. It is, however, equally important that the Security Council should meet in an atmosphere that will ensure positive results. A positive outcome can be ensured only if the United Nations plays a preponderant and paramount role during the transitional period to ensure the irreversibility of the independence process.

138. In the meantime, the international community should continue to rally behind SWAPO in its liberation struggle, for the efforts of that valiant movement very significantly complement those of the United Nations. Pressure on the illegal occupying régime must be intensified until victory is won. It is our duty to support the Namibian people, to exercise vigilance at all times against the manoeuvres of the illegal colonial Power in Namibia and to ensure that a united, democratic Namibia will emerge and join the community of nations.

139. Botswana for its part will continue to lend its support to the struggle to the best of its ability.

140. Mr. EL HASSEN (Mauritania) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation and I have the greatest pleasure at seeing Mr. Mojsov once again assume the heavy responsibility of conducting our proceedings at this historic session on Namibia. His diplomatic talents and statesmanlike qualities are an earnest of the success of the Assembly at this special session. His election is a recognition of these qualities and also testimony of the esteem and respect in which we hold his country, Yugoslavia, an active Member of our Organization and of the non-aligned movement.

141. In convening this special session, our General Assembly not only decided to place the problem of Namibia once again at the centre of its concerns but also wanted to respond to the expectations of world public opinion, which is legitimately concerned at the situation which is deteriorating daily in Namibia.

142. Twelve years have elapsed since the presence of South Africa in Namibia was declared illegal by resolution 2145 (XXI) of the General Assembly, a resolution which at the same time declared that the Territory of Namibia henceforth was to come directly under the responsibility of the United Nations. One year later, on 19 May 1967, the General Assembly by a new resolution, resolution 2248 (S-V), decided to give effect to its administration of that Territory and established to that end the United Nations Council for South West Africa (Namibia).

143. In spite of those two decisions of our Assembly, South Africa, a Member of the United Nations and obliged therefore to subscribe to the principles of the Charter, refused to comply and preferred to defy the international community and resort to force in order to perpetuate its occupation of Namibia. Faced by that situation, the General Assembly took the matter to the International Court of Justice, which on 21 June 1971 rendered an advisory opinion that declared illegal in every respect the presence of the Pretoria administration in Namibia.

144. All those decisions of the General Assembly, buttressed by the opinion of the International Court of Justice and by the decisions of the Security Council, did nothing to shake South Africa's determination to maintain its domination over Namibia.

145. That persistent attitude of refusal by South Africa to comply with our Organization's resolutions and decisions has been reinforced by brutal repressive measures on Namibian territory. To this deliberate violation of human rights by South Africa we must add other measures taken by Pretoria whose purpose has been to destroy the national unity and territorial integrity of Namibia. The Namibian people have been divided into tribes, herded into reservations and condemned politically and economically to live in dependence upon the Pretoria administration. All these measures, whose scope and brutality have become more marked as the years have gone by, have been taken by South Africa to crush every possible sign of resistance on the part of the Namibian people and thus to ensure the political and military occupation and the economic exploitation of Namibia by the Pretoria administration.

146. In the face of the evident escalating repression and terror in Namibia, the Security Council adopted resolution 385 (1976) on 30 January 1976. That resolution demanded that South Africa put an end to its policy of repression in Namibia and comply with the wishes of the international community by putting into effect the following measures: first, the creation of a favourable situation for holding free elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations; secondly, the unconditional release of political detainees; thirdly, the return of political exiles to Namibia; and fourthly, the cessation of all measures of intimidation, repression and coercion of the Namibian people.

147. That resolution, adopted unanimously by the Security Council, and the unequivocal warnings addressed to South Africa appeared at one time to have prevailed upon the Pretoria administration to become less arrogant and to soften its position towards our Organization. The Government of South Africa went so far as to state that it needed only a few months to change the situation in Namibia and to make it possible for the Namibian people to pronounce itself freely upon its future.

148. But those statements by the South African administration, which of course were designed to mislead world public opinion, in fact led only to an escalation of violence because the territory of Namibia was transformed just a few months later into a base for aggression against the neighbouring African countries, while the Namibian people were subjected to even more brutal repression.

149. It was in the face of these developments so dangerous to stability in Africa and because of the repercussions that these developments might have on international peace and security that the United Nations decided to have its Council for Namibia hold a series of meetings in Zambia to take concrete and definitive measures in regard to Namibia. During that series of meetings at Lusaka, from 20 to 25 March, the Council for Namibia adopted measures designed to bring about a rapid solution of the Namibian question.

150. The special session which our Assembly is now holding and the extraordinary meetings of the United Nations Council for Namibia fall squarely within the framework of our Organization's search for a solution to the dangerous situation that has existed for years now and still exists in Namibia. We should also place within this framework the initiative taken almost a year ago by the five Western members of the Security Council, an initiative whose purpose has been to complement the efforts made by our Organization.

151. The five Powers in question, after numerous contacts both with South Africa and with SWAPO, published more than a week ago a document containing a valid approach that could well serve as a basis for a settlement of the Namibian question. But certain points in that document remain to be clarified, while others have been left pending, in order to win the endorsement of everyone, and particularly of SWAPO, the party primarily concerned.

152. The question of Walvis Bay, an integral part of Namibia, is of course one of the most important pending points within the framework of the initiative of the five Western Powers. Indeed, the question of Walvis Bay is very important, and even vital, for the political stability and economic survival of a united and independent Namibia. That is why the decision of the South African administration to annex Walvis Bay, which is an act of provocation designed to undermine the efforts under way, cannot possibly be accepted by our Organization. That too is why the General Assembly already condemned unequivocally—at its last session—the claims of the South African administration to this integral part of Namibia.

153. Apart from the question of Walvis Bay—a question that quite rightly is vital for SWAPO and the Namibian people—other cloudy points remain to be clarified in the document of the Western countries: the participation of the United Nations, the role of the United Nations, the location of the residual South African troops in the Territory. All these points should be clarified by direct negotiations between SWAPO and South Africa, through the mediation of the Western countries or of the United Nations.

154. We have to create an atmosphere of confidence and loyalty, without which all negotiations, no matter the sincerity or good faith of those promoting them, are doomed to failure.

155. South Africa's attitude on Walvis Bay, the very terms of its acceptance of the Western plan, do not encourage us to be optimistic. We think that the responsibility of the Western countries involved in this process is to prevail upon South Africa to adopt a more sincere and realistic approach to a solution of the Namibian problem.

156. With regard to the General Assembly at this special session, we think it should reaffirm our Organization's support for the legitimate struggle being waged by the Namibian people, grouped within SWAPO, for its independence, national unity and territorial integrity. To that end the General Assembly should, at the conclusion of these deliberations, reject vigorously the annexation of Walvis Bay by South Africa and solemnly reaffirm the territorial integrity of Namibia; condemn in advance any internal settlement; demand the elimination of the shameful laws of *apartheid*; and envisage appropriate measures to put an end to acts of aggression committed by South Africa from Namibian soil against neighbouring independent countries. Those, among others, are the points upon which we should lay special stress during our special session.

157. We feel that only undeviating support for the Namibian people can persuade South Africa to bow to reason and accept a peaceful solution in keeping with the requirements for genuine and authentic decolonization.

158. My country, for its part, would like to reaffirm its support for SWAPO's struggle, because it is the intensification of this struggle that forms the basis of all the progress achieved in the search for a solution to the problem of Namibia. We hope that South Africa, under pressure from the international community and its own friends, will come to understand the seriousness of the situation which, over the long term, can only be fatal for it. Our hope is that South Africa will finally bow to the pressure of law and international morality and will cease to impose upon the Namibian people so many material and human sacrifices and enable Namibia to be welcomed to our Organization this year as a free State, united and independent.

159. Mr. KEUTCHA (United Republic of Cameroon) (*interpretation from French*): It is with great pleasure that, on behalf of the Chief of State of Cameroon, His Excellency Ahmadou Ahidjo, on my delegation's behalf and on my own behalf, I join with other speakers who have preceded me in expressing to Ambassador Mojsow warmest congratulations on his election as President of the General Assembly at the ninth special session devoted to the question of Namibia.

160. I wish also on this occasion to express the appreciation of our Government to the Secretary-General, Mr. Kurt Waldheim, and to the President and members of the United Nations Council for Namibia for the special attention that they have given this disturbing problem and for their great efforts preceding this special session, in pursuance of General Assembly resolution 32/9 H of 4 November 1977.

161. Our Organization, which, since its creation more than three decades ago, has embodied the noble and lofty hopes of mankind and, reaching beyond the internal contradictions inherent in any human international institution, has devoted itself irrevocably to the historic mission of decolonization, promoting the right of the peoples of the world to self-determination and the effective enjoyment of human rights throughout the world, has had to deal, ever since the United Nations General Assembly in its resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966 put an end to South Africa's Mandate over Namibia, with one of the most insolent challenges that have ever been hurled at it.

162. The evolution of the Namibian problem has been thoroughly and ably considered by other speakers who have already made statements, but I think it is necessary to stress the importance of Security Council resolution 385 (1976), which was unanimously adopted by that body on 30 January 1976, and which, in its operative part, demands that South Africa put an immediate end to its illegal occupation of Namibian territory, release all political prisoners, abolish all discriminatory and repressive laws and practices, ensure the return of all Namibians in exile and the holding of genuinely free elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations, those elections to be held for the whole of Namibia as one political entity. That text finally calls upon South Africa to make a solemn declaration undertaking to comply with the resolutions and decisions of the United Nations and with the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of 21 June 1971.

163. At its thirty-second regular session, the General Assembly adopted by an overwhelming majority another important resolution—resolution 32/9 of 4 November 1977, which pursues the same objective.

164. As our work proceeds, the situation in Namibia, as described by Mr. Sam Nujoma, President of SWAPO, in his moving statement of 24 April 1978 [*1st meeting*], is constantly deteriorating. Indeed, there is an obvious military build-up there aimed at intimidating the Namibian people, terrorizing them, overcoming their invincible will for independence and, obstructing their revolutionary action which, under the able leadership of SWAPO, is scoring decisive successes.

165. In the same context South Africa seeks to arouse tribal hostilities within Namibian territory in an attempt to undermine the foundation of the unity of the Namibian people recognized in Security Council resolution 385 (1976) to which reference has already been made. By annexing Walvis Bay, South Africa has violated the territorial integrity of Namibia and has thus committed a clear act of aggression against the United Nations. More serious still, by intensifying research aimed at developing nuclear weapons, and by committing acts of aggression against Namibia's neighbouring countries, in particular, Angola and Zambia, South Africa maintains a constant state of dangerous tension in the area threatening international peace and security.

166. By all its acts, then, South Africa has shown that it is less willing than ever to take into account the injunctions of the international community to renounce unconditionally its policy of annexation of Namibia, subjugation of its people and plundering of its wealth. All the plans of action and all the successive deadlines set by the General Assembly and the Security Council for the withdrawal of the South African administration from Namibian territory have remained a dead letter and the object of scorn.

167. In the face of that constant provocation, it is fortunate that all the statements made here since the opening of the debate have demonstrated the firm determination of our Assembly to remove the Namibian problem from the intolerable impasse in which it has been mired for the past 12 years. In particular, the Assembly must be

guided by the draft declaration and programme of action prepared by the United Nations Council for Namibia and submitted to us in document A/S-9/7 of 21 April 1978. That document, which was prepared in keeping with the spirit of the relevant resolutions of our Organization, rightly stresses the principles that should underlie any realistic move to bring about a final settlement safeguarding the genuine independence of the Namibian people and the inviolability of the territorial integrity of Namibia.

168. Those principles, to which my delegation remains bound, may be summed up as follows: reaffirmation of the illegality of the South African presence and administration in Namibia; reaffirmation of the direct responsibility of the United Nations for administering the Territory and leading it to self-determination and real independence; reaffirmation of the territorial integrity of Namibia; definition of the conditions and measures needed to ensure the immediate and genuine independence of Namibia; condemnation and categorical rejection of any alleged internal settlement; and reaffirmation of SWAPO's primacy in the struggle of the Namibian people for independence.

169. The United Republic of Cameroon, which believes in the virtues of realism and pragmatism, cannot reject out of hand any initiative that might make it possible for the Namibian people to become true masters of their own destiny. That is why my delegation has listened with keen interest to the statement made on 25 April 1978 before this Assembly by the Secretary of State for External Affairs of Canada, which described the intensive activities of the five Western members of the Security Council to find a negotiated solution to the Namibian problem, and we have also studied very carefully the proposed settlement.

170. In spirit, this plan, because of the prestige of its authors, marks an irreversible turning point in the process of decolonizing Namibia and leading it to independence. It therefore deserves consideration; none the less, its scope remains restricted by reason of South Africa's ulterior motives. Also, the great uncertainty surrounding the fate of Walvis Bay, the economic and strategic importance of which is vital for Namibia, is significant in that connexion. The same is true of the predominant role accorded to the South African paramilitary police—the *apartheid* police which, as we know, has been trained for many years in blind and instinctive hatred of SWAPO militants and sympathizers and has grown accustomed to harassing the Namibian population with impunity.

171. Finally, the presence at the head of the administration of the Territory, during the transitional period, of an Administrator-General appointed by South Africa and of a special representative of the United Nations presents a rather odd duo, inasmuch as the two would not answer to the same authority or have the same legal basis. Practically speaking, is it really possible that the Administrator-General representing as he does a Government which has piled up a sorry record and has been notorious for more than 30 years for its racism, for its refusal to co-operate with the United Nations and for its systematic scorn of United Nations decisions, and assured of the support of an omnipotent police, in addition to the proximity of abundant South African armed forces at his beck and call, could suddenly become a loyal and sincere partner of the special representative of the Secretary-General?

172. As far as my delegation is concerned, the agreement must clearly recognize the primacy of the role of the special representative of the United Nations, the sole legal authority over that international Territory. To execute his mandate, he must have appropriate international backing.

173. Above and beyond the alterations it would require, the five-Power plan, in the opinion of my delegation, is a most noteworthy contribution to the search for ways and means to lead the Namibian people to the speedy attainment of international sovereignty.

174. The United Republic of Cameroon remains devoted to the defence of the right of the Namibian people to self-determination and genuine independence, as well as to the safeguarding of the territorial integrity and unity of their land. As in the past, we will continue to give the fighting Namibian people and SWAPO, their genuine representative, our fraternal and unreserved support.

175. Mr. KINENE (Uganda): It gives my delegation great satisfaction to see Mr. Mojsov presiding over the General Assembly at its ninth special session. The competent manner in which he guided the deliberations of the thirty-second regular session and the eighth special session of the General Assembly, together with the total commitment of the Government and people of his great country, Yugoslavia, to the liberation struggle in southern Africa leads us to believe that, here again, he will lead the deliberations of this session to a fruitful conclusion.

176. The question of Namibia has been on the agenda of the General Assembly for over 32 years. Indeed, this is the second special session of the General Assembly convened to discuss the question of Namibia. The Security Council has time and again been seized of the question of Namibia, and that question has also been the subject of decisions by the International Court of Justice.

177. The issues before the ninth special session of the General Assembly could not, therefore, have been clearer. The historical background of the problem is all too familiar to this Assembly.

178. In 1966, the General Assembly, by its resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966, decided after more than two decades to terminate the Mandate conferred upon South Africa by the League of Nations over the Territory then known as South West Africa. The General Assembly declared South Africa's continued occupation of Namibia illegal and placed the Territory under the direct responsibility of the United Nations.

179. In 1967, at a special session of the General Assembly, the United Nations Council for South West Africa (Namibia) was created to administer the Territory until it achieved full and genuine independence. That decision of the General Assembly was followed by other decisions of the International Court of Justice and the Security Council.

180. All those decisions and resolutions of the international community have fallen on deaf ears. South Africa has arrogantly continued to disregard and defy international public opinion with impunity.

181. The position of my Government on the question of Namibia has always been crystal clear. At the thirty-second regular session of the General Assembly [45th meeting], I had the opportunity to state in unequivocal terms the position of my Government with regard to the illegal occupation of Namibia by the *apartheid* régime of South Africa and to certain proposals that had been made to resolve the long-standing dispute between the United Nations and the *apartheid* régime over Namibia. I should like to state once again today that, in view of the fact that there has not been any change in the situation in Namibia, the position of my Government will remain the same.

182. We should like to state once again that the continued illegal occupation of Namibia by the racist minority régime in South Africa is a flagrant violation of the Charter of the United Nations and poses a serious threat to international peace and security. It is an affront to the international community and a serious challenge to the credibility and authority of the United Nations, and calls for immediate and decisive action. We urge the Organization to rise to the occasion and to face this challenge squarely. Namibia must be liberated from the yoke of colonialism, racism and *apartheid* by all means, including the use of force.

183. Uganda strongly condemns the colonialist and racist régime of South Africa for its continued illegal occupation of Namibia in defiance of repeated demands by the General Assembly and the Security Council that it withdraw from the Territory.

184. On this international labour day, we salute and pay a special tribute to the gallant freedom fighters of Namibia under the dynamic leadership of SWAPO, the sole and authentic representative of the people of Namibia, who, against overwhelming odds, have waged a relentless and heroic struggle against the racist minority régime in South Africa. We congratulate them on the numerous victories they have scored against the enemy.

185. Without the heroic liberation struggle that SWAPO has waged over the years, the racists would not have come crawling on their knees for a cease fire. We urge the people of Namibia to continue with the struggle until final victory is won.

186. My delegation rejects attempts by the *apartheid* régime in South Africa to impose a so-called "internal settlement" on the people of Namibia as a last-minute effort to perpetuate its domination over the Territory through puppet leaders. The right of the people of Namibia to self-determination, freedom and genuine independence is inalienable and not subject to bargaining with anybody, least of all with the racist minority régime in South Africa.

187. We see no change in the situation prevailing in Namibia today. The racist and colonialist régime in South Africa continues to harass, torture, imprison, maim, exploit and even kill the people of Namibia. Yet, this same minority régime is abetted and sustained militarily, economically and otherwise by the same Governments that are now making frantic attempts to find a negotiated and peaceful solution of the question of Namibia. The taxes and royalties their transnational corporations pay to the illegal régime further contribute to the continued illegal occupation of Namibia.



188. Those attempts are merely tactics designed to check the momentum not only of this special session but also of the gallant struggle being waged by SWAPO to liberate Namibia. We urge our brothers and sisters of SWAPO to be vigilant and to guard against such worn-out tactics aimed at hoodwinking them.

189. Uganda will never be a party to a conspiracy to partition Namibia, and for this reason we do not share the view that Walvis Bay must be the subject of discussion between the *apartheid* régime and the elected Government of Namibia, for to allow it to be so would be tantamount to asking the people of Namibia to do no less than to commit national suicide. No Government or international organization has the right to ask the people of Namibia—or, for that matter, any other people—to make such a sacrifice. The issue of Walvis Bay therefore must be settled while Namibia is still the responsibility of the United Nations.

190. We condemn attempts by the racist régime to annex Walvis Bay, which is an integral part of Namibia. South Africa must be compelled to renounce its false claims to Walvis Bay and to respect the territorial integrity of Namibia.

191. For its part, Uganda is in total solidarity with the people of Namibia, under the leadership of SWAPO, in their struggle for genuine independence. Their struggle is our struggle, and we shall do all in our power to enable Namibia to achieve final victory.

192. We demand the immediate, complete and unconditional withdrawal of all forces and military apparatus of the racist minority régime of South Africa from the Territory of Namibia. The General Assembly, the International Court of Justice and the Security Council have all been unequivocally clear in their condemnations of South Africa's illegal presence in Namibia. As a matter of fact, the United Nations is the Administering Authority in Namibia, and strictly speaking, the terms of Namibia's independence should be the subject of negotiations between this Organization and SWAPO, the sole and authentic representative of the people of Namibia, and not with the *apartheid* régime or its collaborators.

193. The United Nations has a responsibility to discharge the solemn obligation it has assumed to assist the Namibian people to achieve self-determination and independence without any preconditions—especially any conditions set by the illegal racist minority régime in South Africa.

194. We urge the General Assembly to assume its responsibility and to take concrete action to end once and for all the illegal occupation of Namibia and the naked aggression committed by South Africa against Namibia and the United Nations.

195. In closing, we should like to pay a tribute to the United Nations Council for Namibia for its tireless efforts on behalf of the people of Namibia, whose cry for freedom touches us very deeply. We fully support the draft declaration and programme of action prepared by the Council, and express the hope that the General Assembly will adopt the text as contained in document A/S-9/7 by consensus, because this is the least that the United Nations can do for the oppressed people of Namibia.

196. We look forward to the day in the very near future when Namibia will take its rightful place among our ranks as a free and sovereign member of the Organization of African Unity and of the United Nations.

197. Mr. SIMBANANIYE (Burundi) (*interpretation from French*): At this time of supreme sacrifice for the invincible people of Namibia, the international community has the moral duty to address a message of solidarity and encouragement to all the fighting masses which, under the banner of the sole and authentic liberation movement SWAPO, are carrying out a heroic resistance struggle against the criminal régime of South Africa. The delegation of Burundi welcomes, on behalf of the people and Government of Burundi, the successes achieved by the Namibian people on its road to freedom, because a people which takes up arms in its struggle is a people already free. At this decisive turning point in the history of Namibia, may I assure those freedom fighters of the unswerving support of my Government until final victory.

198. Faithful to its sacred mission of decolonization and assistance to oppressed peoples fighting for their independence and dignity, the General Assembly decided to hold a special session on the question of Namibia, the objective of which is to answer the challenge of South Africa which, with arrogance and disdain for the United Nations resolutions and the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice, maintains its illegal occupation of Namibia, intensifies its police measures of barbarous repression against the peace-loving people of Namibia and strengthens its military arsenal of aggression against independent African countries.

199. This ninth special session of the General Assembly is taking place at a crucial moment in the long struggle of the peoples against exploitation and oppression and for the establishment of an international society based on justice, freedom and equality. The resistance struggle of the Namibian people is without doubt part of the history of the liberation of the peoples of Europe, Asia, Latin America, the Middle East and Africa.

200. In recent times the world has witnessed profound changes in the map of the forces of repression and the revolutionary forces of liberation. The victory of the peoples of Indo-China, the crumbling of the Portuguese empire in Africa, the intensification of the struggle in Zimbabwe, Namibia and South Africa and the heroic resistance of the Palestinian people are important stages in the final assault which we must launch against imperialism and racism.

201. In this irreversible process of eliminating the last bastions of colonialism and racism, the United Nations must measure up to its historic responsibilities; it must be able to rise above the contradictions and the divergent interests of its Members. The genuine decolonization of Namibia is vital not only for the Namibian people but for the future of our Organization because of its direct responsibility in this matter.

202. In this delicate task the General Assembly undoubtedly needs resolute and dynamic leadership. That is why, the delegation of Burundi is particularly happy at Ambassador Mojsov's unanimous election to the presidency of the

General Assembly at its ninth special session. His outstanding qualities as statesman and skilled diplomat, as well as his commitment to the defence and triumph of the ideals and objectives of our Organization are a sure guarantee of the success of our deliberations.

203. The historic role which his country has played in the movement of the non-aligned countries, the liberation of peoples and the consolidation of their independence has made it possible for the international community to choose an eminent personality who will once again know how to translate the hopes of our Organization into the acts of solidarity which are impatiently awaited by the Namibian people, so long subjected to humiliation.

204. I take this opportunity also to welcome the presence of the leader of SWAPO, Comrade Sam Nujoma, who has provided us with useful information throughout our deliberations. A ringing tribute must be paid to the leadership of SWAPO whose high sense of responsibility and commitment to the supreme interests of their country need no further proof.

205. At a time when an unprecedented campaign to rehabilitate South Africa in the concert of nations is being orchestrated by South Africa and its allies, our Assembly must face the truth squarely.

206. In flagrant violation of the decisions of the General Assembly and the Security Council the criminal régime of South Africa is forcibly keeping millions of innocent human beings under a reign of terror and intimidation. The truth is that in Namibia that neo-nazi and fascist régime of Pretoria is carrying out, on the basis of brutal emergency legislation, arbitrary arrests, imprisonment without trial, shameful assassination and the condemnation of Namibian patriots by incompetent and illegal tribunals to sentences of capital punishment that are followed by summary executions. During this month of April Vorster's racist régime has ignited a blaze of violence by incitement to tribal hatred, the distribution of guns, rifles and machine guns to the traitors and puppets of the democratic Turnhalle alliance, the raising of tribal armies and the arrest and assassination of SWAPO members or sympathizers. The purpose of all these inadmissible measures is to create conditions of civil war, weaken SWAPO's popular base and finally establish a reactionary régime devoted to South Africa.

207. In this South African policy of escalating violence and aggression against the Namibian people, excessive militarization is achieving a disturbing pace. While the South African army of occupation has risen to 50,000 men for a population of less than 900,000, the *apartheid* régime is installing new types of heavy and sophisticated armaments; it is sending to Namibia an impressive number of tanks and fighter aircraft and building new bases, more barracks and new military airports in the strategic areas of the country. More serious still, South Africa is carrying out a programme of production and manufacture of nuclear weapons in the Kalahari Desert in Namibia in spite of the condemnation and protests of the international community and international opinion.

208. Furthermore, there is irrefutable proof of hegemonic ambitions directed against neighbouring independent States

and African States situated south of the equator, on the basis of the notorious legislation on the defence of the régime outlawed by mankind. The flagrant and unprovoked acts of aggression against the People's Republic of Angola and the Republic of Zambia are examples of South Africa's bellicose plans. While it makes a pretence of considering the proposals of the five Western Powers members of the Security Council, in flagrant violation of the United Nations resolutions, South Africa has intensified its policy of destruction of the Namibian nation by establishing bantustans and the formation of tribal armies.

209. Worse still, the Pretoria régime, blindly pursuing its colonial expansion, on 31 August 1977 decided to undertake the annexation of Walvis Bay, thus depriving an independent Namibia of its only outlet to the sea. That act, which is fraught with consequences, is intended to undermine the economic independence and the security of Namibia. That decision to plunder is part of a series of acts of thievery which South Africa is shamelessly undertaking through the systematic pillage of the natural resources of Namibia in violation of Decree No. 1 adopted by the United Nations Council for Namibia to protect the national heritage of the country.

210. As all the world knows, Namibia is the number one diamond producer of the world and will for a long time remain the main source of uranium. This exploitation of Namibian uranium is allowing South Africa to produce enriched uranium, which is necessary in the manufacture of nuclear weapons.

211. Our delegation has thought it appropriate to recall briefly the true character of the South African régime, which would have international opinion believe that it is ready to withdraw from Namibia in accordance with the proposals made by the five Western countries members of the Security Council. The Secretary of State for External Affairs of Canada submitted to the General Assembly those proposals based on resolution 385 (1976), unanimously adopted by the Security Council on 30 January 1976.

212. The initiative of the five Western countries has aroused keen interest throughout the world, for it was put forward by States which have the necessary means to force South Africa to abide by the United Nations resolutions on the question of Namibia, and, also, other United Nations resolutions with respect to the genuine decolonization of Southern Rhodesia and to the intolerable situation of *apartheid* prevailing in South Africa. The Governments of those Powers have the means to exert pressure on South Africa within the framework of their economic, commercial, scientific and military co-operation. They are also able to resort to the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter in order to enforce the General Assembly and Security Council resolutions which South Africa has thrown on to the rubbish heap of history. In this regard they are assured of the loyal co-operation of the other two permanent members of the Security Council.

213. The moral authority of the five Powers and the coercive means which they could use against South Africa have led my Government to make a thorough examination of those proposals. This study has shown that the proposal of the Five includes elements which deserve the attention

of the international community. For my delegation, the points of agreement are the following: (a) the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa, and the consequent need to put an end to that occupation; (b) the condemnation of *apartheid*, racial discrimination and the constant repression of which the Namibians are the victims under the occupation régime; (c) the rejection of an allegedly independent government formed on the basis of the so-called Turnhalle talks—and my delegation hopes that the five Powers will categorically condemn any alleged internal settlement and that those Governments will adopt appropriate measures to prevent the perpetuation of South Africa's control over this international Territory; (d) the organization of free and democratic elections under the control and supervision of the United Nations—and on this point clarification is needed in order effectively to assure that they will be free elections; (e) the persistence of this *apartheid* régime constitutes a threat to peace and security in the States of the region—it should however be made clear that the terms used by the five Powers are not identical and are very weak because they in fact say that the perpetuation of this deplorable situation sooner or later will affect the political stability of all of southern Africa.

214. On the basis of these elements, it might be thought that a considerable milestone has been passed on the road to the liberation of the Namibian people. This judgement should be slightly qualified because the five-Power plan has some important short-comings that require correction immediately.

*Mr. Mojsov (Yugoslavia) returned to the Chair.*

215. First, there is the role accorded the special representative of the United Nations. In the light of the events occurring in Zimbabwe, where the special representative is a passive spectator of the deteriorating situation, it is essential that the special representative be given precise prerogatives of some importance which will make it possible for him effectively to assume political control over the security of Namibia during the transitional period. From the very outset, it is preferable to establish a hierarchy between the special representative and the Administrator-General representing the South African racist régime. As far as my delegation is concerned, it goes without saying that the authority for decision-making or, if you will, the power of annulling decisions in case of conflict, should be vested in the special representative of the United Nations.

216. It would be dangerous to underestimate the problems which might arise during this transitional period. The South African Administrator-General would, in effect, have under his command the police forces in charge of peace and order. Furthermore, under the five-Power plan, he would have 1,500 troops stationed in strategic areas. It is also probable that the present Administrator-General, who is well known for his cruelty, would have his functions confirmed before the actual transitional process begins.

217. In this context of mistrust and tension, the delegation of Burundi firmly upholds the proposal made by the President of SWAPO that the special representative should be invested with the power of decision-making and that he should have available to him a team of civilians numbering more than 1,000 and soldiers from a United Nations

peace-keeping force numbering at least 5,000. The purpose of these measures is undoubtedly to guarantee that free and democratic elections are held making it possible for the Namibian people to enjoy genuine independence and to exercise full sovereignty.

218. A second point which needs to be elucidated is where the 1,500 soldiers representing the occupying Power will be stationed. My delegation supports the proposal of SWAPO that these so-called token forces should be stationed on the frontier between Namibia and South Africa. To have this military personnel stationed in the centre or the north of the country would only aggravate the situation within the country and undermine the already precarious security of the independent neighbouring countries. It goes without saying that the withdrawal of the South African aggressive forces, apart from the 1,500 troops, includes the withdrawal of those forces stationed at Walvis Bay as well as the dismantling of the tribal and paramilitary forces.

219. Thirdly, there is the question of Walvis Bay itself. The silence of the five-Power plan regarding the status of Walvis Bay gives rise to serious concerns as to the viability of the future independent State, which would be deprived of its only seaport. The delegation of Burundi firmly supports the just position of SWAPO which considers that enclave as an integral part of Namibia and, therefore, inviolable.

220. In view of the foregoing, the delegation of Burundi considers that the negotiations between the parties concerned should be continued in order to reach an agreement acceptable to the Namibian people, represented by SWAPO. At the same time, the international community should intensify its material and political support for SWAPO to make it possible for it to score further victories. In this context my delegation firmly supports the Lusaka Declaration and the Programme of Action adopted by the United Nations Council for Namibia during its extraordinary meetings held at Lusaka last March.

221. I should like warmly to congratulate the President of that Council, Ambassador Konie of Zambia, whose dynamism and exemplary devotion have made it possible for the United Nations Council for Namibia effectively to assume its responsibilities.

222. I should like to pay a particular tribute to the Chairman 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, Mr. Salim Ahmed Salim of the United Republic of Tanzania, for the way in which he has pursued without respite the task of genuine decolonization for Namibia.

223. On behalf of the people and government of Burundi, under the direction of Colonel Jean-Baptiste Bagaza, President of the Supreme Revolutionary Council and President of the Republic, I take this opportunity to express our profound gratitude to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Kurt Waldheim, for his untiring efforts in the field of decolonization and the maintenance of peace.

224. In conclusion, I should like to exhort the Members of this Assembly to draw up appropriate measures to put an

end to the explosive situation in Namibia. At the end of its work the Assembly should also request the Security Council to take up its responsibilities under the Charter by resorting to the measures provided in Chapter VII for the maintenance of international peace and security, so gravely threatened in that area. In that way the Assembly will ensure that an important stage will be reached in establishing solidarity with the oppressed peoples of southern Africa. It is our task to create the necessary conditions to that end. As for the Namibian people, united in struggle, it will triumph and will soon unfurl the flag of freedom.

225. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization, who will speak on the basis of General Assembly resolution 3237 (XXIX).

226. Mr. TERZI (Palestine Liberation Organization): The General Assembly has been convened in yet another special session to consider a situation arising from the obduracy and intransigence of a racist colonial régime. A few days ago, Mr. President, you presided over a special session convened to consider the financing of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon, after the racist expansionist régime of Tel Aviv had violated the internationally recognized integrity of Lebanon and attempted to annihilate the Palestinians. Two special sessions because two racist régimes are committing crimes: in Namibia, at the south-western end of Africa; and in Palestine, to the north-east of Africa. Those régimes are committing crimes in violation of the principles of the Charter, of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and of numerous United Nations resolutions.

227. The Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), the representative of the Palestinian people, congratulates SWAPO, the representative of the Namibian people, and affirms its militant solidarity with the struggle of the Namibian people.

228. With the Namibian people the Palestinian people share a tragic past of suffering and subjugation by colonial Powers and racist régimes. With the Palestinian people the Namibian people share the aspiration and determination to achieve a bright future, a future that ensures human dignity for our peoples in their own homelands, a future that ensures the attainment of our national inalienable rights, primarily the right to self-determination and sovereign independence, in conformity with the principles of the Charter.

229. It is no accident that the representatives of SWAPO and the PLO have a common status in this Assembly. The question of Palestine and the question of Namibia have been on the agenda of the United Nations since the founding of this Organization. We sincerely hope that the United Nations will solve both problems—problems created by the defunct League of Nations—and that the representatives of both the sovereign States of Namibia and Palestine will take their seats as full Members of this Organization.

230. Namibia and Palestine are two different countries that were placed under the trusteeship of the British Government. Both countries were systematically placed under the militarist, racist domination of two closely linked

régimes: Pretoria and Tel Aviv. Under the British Mandate, the seeds of racism and racial discrimination were sown. At one end it was the whites and non-whites; at the other end, it was the Jews and non-Jews. It was the small minority against the overwhelming majority, the indigenous population.

231. In Namibia the illegal forces of domination are supported and financed by multinational interests exploiting the resources, including the human resources, of Namibia. The same interests are supporting and consolidating the illegal presence of the Israeli forces of occupation in my country. In my country the support is in the amount of approximately \$700 per year per person which goes from the United States Government to Israel.

232. Racists were chosen to act as trustees over Namibia and the result—as should have been obvious—has been a series of meetings of the Security Council and special sessions of the General Assembly.

233. The Zionist racists are trying to secure legitimacy for their domination over my people by placing the Palestinian areas occupied since 1967, in particular, under their tutelage. The Zionists intend to maintain their armed forces in the area and to legitimize the oppression, repression and exploitation of my people. A similar situation prevails in Namibia.

234. The military presence of the racist régime of Pretoria in Namibia and of the Zionist racist régime in my country are illegal and an obstacle to peace. This military presence is a threat to world peace and aggravates the already explosive situation in both areas.

235. Both racist régimes have been condemned for their collaboration in the development of destructive armaments, and particularly in the field of nuclear research and tests—especially in the Kalahari desert, which is Namibian territory. Both racist régimes seized our lands illegally and demand a high price for withdrawing, despite numerous United Nations resolutions. The price they demand is that we grant them our recognition and blessing and thanks, that they may prolong their domination.

236. Walvis Bay is Namibian territory, just as the territories west of the River Jordan are Palestinian territories.

237. The Namibian people and the Palestinian people strongly and militantly reject the continuation of foreign occupation. Our two peoples are determined to exercise their right to resist foreign occupation by all means, including the course of armed struggle, until we attain our inalienable rights.

238. The General Assembly and the Security Council have prescribed remedies, but the intransigent régimes at Pretoria and Tel Aviv simply refuse to comply. So, alongside the struggle of our peoples, the United Nations is called upon to take forthright action. The Charter does prescribe a remedy. Measures are spelt out in the Charter, specifically in Chapter VII. The least this Assembly can do is to translate the provisions of Chapter VII into action. It can suggest to the Security Council that it apply such measures as a complete cessation of economic relations, and such

other measures as to isolate the racist régimes and thus restore respect for and faith in this Organization.

239. Before this Assembly on 28 April the representative of the Namibian people repeated his people's considered and long-held position. In our opinion, that is a constructive position; it is a position motivated by the sincere desire of SWAPO and the Namibian people to help achieve peace. The Namibian people have been subjected to inhuman suffering for far too long, and it is high time that that misery came to an end. It is the duty and responsibility of this Assembly to see to that.

240. Finally, permit me to convey Chairman Yassir Arafat's militant support to President Sam Nujoma and to assure him that we shall maintain our struggle for liberation and revolution until victory.

241. Mr. GUNA-KASEM (Thailand): I should like, first of all, to offer you, Mr. President, my warm congratulations on your election to preside once again over our Assembly.

242. I wish also to commend the United Nations Council for Namibia for its good work in paving the way and preparing various documents for this special session.

243. The question of Namibia has been with us in this Assembly for a very long time. We have eagerly expected to see a light at the end of the long, twisted tunnel, and it is thus timely that we have been holding a special session on Namibia for the past week. Things have at last moved to a position where, with additional efforts and co-operation from all sides, the oppressed people of Namibia under the leadership of SWAPO, which we in the United Nations regard as their authentic representative, can at long last exercise their right to self-determination, and to live a free, progressive and productive life.

244. My delegation has followed developments in Namibia with interest and concern and has always worked for the cause and welfare of the people of Namibia. We continue to support and regard Security Council resolution 385 (1976)

of 30 January 1976, which provides for free elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations for the whole of Namibia as one political entity, as a basis for a solution of the Namibian problem. In this connexion, we appreciate the efforts made by the five Western members of the Security Council to work out acceptable principles and procedures for implementing the provisions of the aforementioned Security Council resolution.

245. Last week there were encouraging developments that could be interpreted as moves in the right direction to get us nearer our goal: first, South Africa decided to accept the five Western countries' compromise proposal, which would soon lead to a free, black-ruled, independent Namibia; and then we heard SWAPO's statement of its position on 28 April which stressed that, assuming that all conditions for free, fair and democratic elections and certain conditions stipulated by SWAPO were met, SWAPO would be prepared to enter into a cease-fire agreement with South Africa.

246. My delegation joins other delegations in urging all the parties concerned to continue the process of negotiation leading towards an internationally acceptable agreement based on the compromise proposal and the latest conditions proposed by SWAPO. My delegation shares the view that the United Nations should play a primary role during the transition period in order to ensure free and fair elections in Namibia.

247. It is the hope of the Thai delegation that, with good will on all sides and keeping in mind at all times the true interests of the Namibian people, a satisfactory agreement will soon be arrived at so as to enable the Namibian people finally to achieve their long-cherished freedom and independence. If and when we succeed in overcoming that last hurdle, we can look back with pride at our contribution towards the decolonization of Namibia, while at the same time helping to strengthen the stability of southern Africa and to avert a conflagration and further bloodshed in that region of the world.

*The meeting rose at 6.50 p.m.*



CONTENTS

Agenda item 7:  
Question of Namibia (*continued*)

*President: Mr. Lazar MOJSOV (Yugoslavia).*

AGENDA ITEM 7

Question of Namibia (*continued*)

1. Mr. LOHANI (Nepal): Mr. President, allow me to extend to you the warmest congratulations of my delegation upon your election to the presidency of the General Assembly at its ninth special session. We have seen you guide the deliberations of this session with the same objectivity, efficiency and understanding to which this Assembly was witness during the thirty-second regular session and the eighth special session.

2. The decision of the General Assembly to hold a special session on Namibia under resolution 32/9 H reflected in unmistakable terms not only the seriousness of the issue but also the concern of the world community to put an end, without further delay, to the illegal occupation of Namibia by the racist régime of South Africa and to enable the Namibian people to achieve freedom and genuine independence in their Territory.

3. The question of Namibia has long been on the agenda of the United Nations, which has responded to the situation by adopting numerous resolutions aimed at bringing about an early end to colonial domination and restoring to the people of Namibia their inalienable rights to self-determination, freedom and independence. The series of activities undertaken by the United Nations through such bodies as 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 United Nations Council for Namibia, ever since this Organization assumed direct responsibility for Namibia by terminating the Mandate of South Africa on 27 October 1966, have gone a long way towards furthering the cause of the independence of Namibia from illegal racist domination.

4. The racist régime of South Africa has not only flouted the repeated appeals of the international community but has also resorted to various subterfuges to perpetuate its illegal occupation of Namibia. The racist régime, in pursuance of its obnoxious policy of *apartheid*, has sought to fragment the Territory through bantustanization or the creation of so-called homelands at the cost of a united Namibia. Arbitrary laws based on racial discrimination are

enacted to oppress the people and deprive them of their right to equality and justice. There are harrowing reports of continual arrests, detention and torture of innocent people in Namibia. We are all aware of the heroic struggle being waged by the oppressed people of Namibia under the effective leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) for liberation from the racist occupation of the Territory. SWAPO, recognized by the United Nations as the sole and authentic representative of the people of Namibia, is in the vanguard of the struggle which has now reached a decisive stage.

5. Despite the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of 1971 to the effect that the South African presence in Namibia was illegal and that South Africa should forthwith withdraw from the Territory, and despite the stern warning of the Security Council to South Africa to vacate the Territory immediately, the growing militarization of the Territory coupled with increased repression of the people of Namibia by the *apartheid* régime has outraged the international community. Furthermore, the use of Namibia as a base for invasion of the neighbouring African States has unmasked the aggressive character of the racist régime. The racist régime, with its intention of carrying out nuclear tests in the Kalahari desert, has proved to be a threat to international peace and security. Against that background, Security Council resolution 385 (1976), which calls for free elections in Namibia under the supervision and control of the United Nations and calls upon South Africa to take the necessary steps to withdraw from Namibia so as to transfer power to the people of the Territory and to release all Namibian political prisoners, takes on added significance. To our utter dismay, the demands of the Security Council have remained unfulfilled.

6. The Turnhalle constitutional conference, which was widely condemned, was another manoeuvre of the Pretoria régime to perpetuate its illegal occupation of Namibia with the help of its puppets. The racist régime and its collaborators are worried that, in the event of transfer of power to the rightful owners of the land, their relentless exploitation of the vast mineral resources of the Territory will have to cease.

7. The Special Committee has kept the question of Namibia under constant review and has exerted unrelenting efforts towards assisting the Namibian people to exercise their right to self-determination and independence. The recent consensus achieved by the Special Committee on 13 April 1978 and contained in document A/S-9/6 demonstrates its strong determination to implement fully the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples by liquidating the racist colonial domination of Namibia. My delegation is pleased to associate itself with the consensus by which the Special

Committee has, among other things, reaffirmed the need to hold free elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations in the whole of Namibia as one political entity, in accordance with Security Council resolution 385 (1976).

8. Special mention should be made of the United Nations Council for Namibia, which has, under the able and dynamic leadership of Ambassador Gwendoline C. Konie of Zambia, launched a number of activities designed to achieve the independence of Namibia and to assist and enable the Namibian people to govern their country after independence. We have noted with appreciation the recent missions sent by the Council to the front-line and other African States for consultations. These consultations and the meetings of the Council for Namibia at Lusaka which resulted in the draft declaration and programme of action for Namibia have helped advance the rightful cause of the Namibian people towards the attainment of genuine independence.

9. My delegation supports that draft declaration and programme of action contained in document A/S-9/7 and approved by the United Nations Council for Namibia on 20 April 1978. We believe that the Council has sufficiently prepared the groundwork for this special session of the General Assembly to adopt urgent measures for the early elimination of the illegal occupation of Namibia.

10. Nepal has consistently supported the measures taken by the United Nations and its relevant bodies directed towards the early abolition of the racist colonial domination of Namibia and assisting the indigenous people to realize their legitimate aspirations to self-determination and independence. We take this opportunity to reaffirm our solidarity with SWAPO, the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people, in its struggle for liberation and join the international community in calling for the strongest action against the illegal occupier to compel it to withdraw unconditionally and immediately from the international Territory.

11. My delegation would further like to reaffirm our unreserved support for the Declaration of Dakar on Namibia and Human Rights, the Maputo Declaration in Support of the Peoples of Zimbabwe and Namibia and the Programme of Action for the Liberation of Zimbabwe and Namibia, which should be implemented by all Member States.

12. We firmly maintain that the illegal occupier has no right to disrupt or tamper with the territorial integrity and unity of Namibia. The racist régime's decision to annex Walvis Bay is illegal and is glaring evidence of its sinister designs. My delegation subscribes to the well-established fact that Walvis Bay is an integral part of Namibia and that Namibian independence without it will be incomplete with a paralysing effect on Namibia's economy.

13. We have taken note of and examined with interest the proposal put forward by the five Western members of the Security Council.<sup>1</sup> My delegation appreciates the initiative of those States for a peaceful settlement of the problem of Namibia.

14. It is reported that the racist Prime Minister of South Africa has accepted the proposal. But according to SWAPO, the authentic representative of the Namibian people, there are still areas of disagreement in the proposal. It is pertinent to point out that SWAPO has always exhibited a co-operative spirit and a willingness to assist in efforts or initiatives towards a peacefully negotiated settlement of the long-standing problem of Namibia. To quote Mr. Sam Nujoma, SWAPO's President, SWAPO has "always regarded negotiations as an essential part of the struggle". This policy was reiterated by the President of SWAPO in a statement made before this Assembly on 28 April, when he categorically said:

"Let the initiative of the Five be clarified and brought back into perspective. Let the Five, SWAPO, and South Africa engage in further talks to resolve the outstanding issues in order to reach an agreement so that the settled matter can be brought before the Security Council for its consideration". [10th meeting, para. 58.]

15. Against SWAPO's continued preference for settlement through dialogue, the callous intransigence, dubious motives and brutal tactics of the illegal occupier have led the international community to call for the application of the strongest measures against the racist régime.

16. As far as the settlement of the question of Namibia is concerned, SWAPO has repeatedly made it clear that the authority of the United Nations to have effective supervision and control of the transition process, including the running of free, fair and democratic elections in Namibia, can in no way be compromised and undermined. It is indeed difficult to conceive of a proposal in which the indispensably pivotal role of the United Nations in Namibia has not been sufficiently recognized. We regard SWAPO's willingness to let 1,500 South African troops remain in Namibia during the transitional process as a mighty concession. Furthermore, any proposal must take full cognizance of the fact that the territorial integrity and national unity of Namibia including Walvis Bay are inviolable and non-negotiable. It can therefore be said with all justification that the illegal racist régime should in no way be allowed to engineer any move towards a so-called internal settlement propped up by its military and police henchmen.

17. As stated earlier, the liberation struggle in Namibia has reached a crucial stage. It is high time for the United Nations to reassert its legal authority over the Territory and to take decisive steps to expedite the transfer of power to the Namibian people. The failure of South Africa to comply with Security Council resolution 385 (1976) has made it imperative for the Council to take all appropriate measures including economic sanctions against South Africa so that the racist régime is forced to withdraw from the international Territory of Namibia thus enabling the United Nations to hold free elections for the establishment of an independent and united Namibia.

18. In conclusion, the people of Namibia are looking to the present special session of the General Assembly with high hopes. We have no doubt that this Assembly will come up with a concrete and action-oriented programme to ensure the speedy attainment of genuine independence in a united Namibia.

<sup>1</sup> See S/12636.

19. Mr. BOTERO (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. President, my delegation wishes to join in the congratulations which all delegations have offered you upon your election to the presidency of the General Assembly at its ninth special session devoted to the question of Namibia. Your intellectual capacity and thorough knowledge of international problems, which you have already demonstrated, confer great authority on you and guarantee that our deliberations will be crowned with success.

20. Our appreciation goes also to Ambassador Gwendoline Konie, President of the Council for Namibia, for the excellent final document containing the draft declaration and programme of action on Namibia—a document which is the fruit of patient deliberations in the course of which the members of the Council showed a willingness to co-operate in the quest for a final solution to the long-standing problem of the occupation of the Territory of Namibia by South Africa.

21. Colombia is a member of the Council for Namibia and has participated enthusiastically in its deliberations. That is why we have been keenly and emotionally involved in the heroic struggle of the people of Namibia for freedom. We have not been misled by the false claim that we here are gratuitously granting freedom to the Namibians. No; we know that it is they who, struggling at a material disadvantage but with admirable courage, are taking their history into their own hands. Here at the United Nations we have only wished to avoid a bloody and painful conflict and, also, the shame of living with an infamous régime based on racism and social inequality—the Government of South Africa.

22. We have heard certain voices in this Organization making reservations on the document prepared by the Council for Namibia when it expresses its full support for the armed liberation struggle of the Namibian people, and arguing that this Organization should advocate the peaceful solution of disputes. It is true that this Organization has adopted that principle, and my delegation upholds and defends it. But the Charter also talks about self-defence in the event of armed attack against a Member of the United Nations. Here we have the case of a Government using violence against a Territory which is under the direct responsibility of the United Nations, a Government which has defied our Organization and denied the Namibian people its inalienable right to self-determination and freedom. Self-defence, the struggle for national independence, are different from violence in itself. When we review the history of the independence of the Latin American nations, we recall that their liberators used weapons, and no sensible person could have condemned them. We cannot say or do less than praise that struggle for freedom wherever oppression obstructs the independence, freedom and security of a people.

23. My delegation believes that a solution to the problem of Namibia must be found immediately. The arrogance of the Pretoria régime cannot be allowed to frustrate the United Nations indefinitely, for the question of the right of peoples to freedom could easily turn into a rhetorical exercise, or a theme with more or less literary declarations. This Organization, born as a reaction to fascism, cannot

allow crimes to continue to be committed against mankind; it must once and for all put an end to the persecution and humiliation of human beings and to the pitiless and irresponsible plundering of the natural resources of a people. My delegation believes that these crimes must not go unpunished and that, at the very least, the transnational corporations, on whose behalf the South African Government is exploiting the Namibian soil, must pay due compensation to the Namibian people for the plunder of their natural resources.

24. My delegation believes also that the solution to the Namibian problem must be found within the framework of Security Council resolution 385 (1976) and the document which was presented by the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, Ambassador Konie, on behalf of that Council. The full independence of the Namibian nation and its right to self-determination and territorial integrity have been recognized in those documents. These are indeed the minimal juridical conditions on which the existence of any State is based. In order to create these fundamental bases, no concessions of any kind must be made to the Pretoria régime, for what the Namibian people is struggling for has been recognized by one and all as the common heritage of mankind. Namibia's sovereignty over Walvis Bay cannot be questioned in exchange for meaningless concessions. Walvis Bay is an integral part of its territory, it is indissolubly linked to it, and no one but the Namibian people has any claim to it. Furthermore, Walvis Bay is Namibia's major natural resource, its outlet to the sea, its means of communication with the rest of the world, which is vital to its existence. It is incredible that anyone could for a moment imagine accepting the capricious and arrogant desire of the Government of South Africa to keep this strip of Namibian territory. We in the United Nations cannot be party to the injustice of converting Namibia into another land-locked State without any outlet to the sea, depriving it of a right belonging to it, let alone oblige the new State of Namibia, in the establishment of which the United Nations is taking such an active part, to accept a colonial enclave on its own territory.

25. My delegation condemns the repressive policy of the South African Government against the Namibian people, a policy that today is being imposed against the unanimous will of the population which has committed itself to the struggle for freedom. We condemn also the use of the territory of Namibia for launching attacks against neighbouring countries. The South African Government has not shown any special inclination towards peaceful settlements; on the contrary, it has maintained an arrogant and belligerent attitude vis-à-vis decisions of the United Nations and is pursuing a cruel policy against the Namibians. It has stopped at nothing in order to hire mercenaries, who are sowing death and destruction in the villages of the peasants; it imprisons and tortures any it considers as enemies—a category comprising in fact an entire people aspiring to independence; it has plundered the natural wealth of Namibia. And now it is shrewdly trying to create a spirit of division within the United Nations itself, by placing two of its main organs in danger of conflict.

26. We believe that a solution to the problem of Namibia, that has been created by the Government of South Africa and by certain transnational corporations, is possible only



within the framework of the provisions adopted by the Security Council and the General Assembly. There must be recognition of the full sovereignty of the Namibian people over their entire territory, and in particular, over Walvis Bay; SWAPO must be recognized as the sole representative of the nation; South African troops and mercenaries must withdraw completely from the territory; and there must be free elections after all Namibians are released from South African prisons and are in a position to express themselves freely. A solution can be found only when the Namibian people, after so many sacrifices, are completely free and have full control over their destiny.

27. Finally, my delegation wishes to express the confident hope that the talks under way will continue with the aim of achieving the independence of Namibia, without sacrificing the legitimate rights and aspirations of the Namibian people. Although the proposal by the five Western Powers is a step forward towards the independence of Namibia and although it is within the framework of the spirit of Security Council resolution 385 (1976), it has encountered certain obstacles and rightly so because it does not mention Walvis Bay. However, we heard the President of SWAPO, Mr. Nujoma, state that he is willing to continue with the talks knowing full well the political costs involved. My delegation listened to that statement with satisfaction and it is our earnest hope that those negotiations will bring about, without any delay, the independence which we all want Namibia to enjoy.

28. Mr. ABOUL-NASR (Oman) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Mr. President, my delegation is indeed pleased to take part in this debate of the ninth special session of the General Assembly on the question of Namibia. We are very pleased to see you conducting the work of this special session with your well-known competence and efficiency.

29. This special session devoted to the question of Namibia is taking place today at a critical turning point in the history of the United Nations and in the history of the struggle to achieve justice, freedom and human rights in southern Africa. We believe that convening this session at this time reflects the determined support which exists for that struggle and for hastening the independence of Namibia.

30. Notwithstanding the important changes which have taken place on the map of the African continent and the fact that many peoples have achieved independence since the General Assembly adopted its very important resolution 1514 (XV) on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples, certain regions of Africa are still occupied and in those regions the racist minority continues to commit the most cruel types of crimes in defiance of mankind and its hopes to see justice triumph in the world.

31. This special session could be our last chance to take decisive measures aimed at the true independence of the Namibian people, which for so long has borne the illegal occupation of its territory by South Africa. We hope that all our efforts will eventually lead to a peaceful and just solution which will be in keeping with the legitimate aspirations of the Namibian people for independence and territorial integrity. If such measures are not taken, the only road open will be the continuation of the armed

struggle which could have repercussions not only in the neighbouring African countries but also on international peace and security.

32. There is no need to reiterate the direct responsibility of the United Nations for ensuring the complete withdrawal of South Africa from Namibia. Our Organization must assume that responsibility and exercise all the powers which are conferred on it by the various provisions of the United Nations Charter in order to realize that aim.

33. Much time has passed since the General Assembly in 1966, at its twenty-first regular session, adopted resolution 2145 (XXI) which reaffirmed its direct responsibility over Namibia and terminated the Mandate of South Africa. Notwithstanding that resolution which was adopted nearly 12 years ago and the circumstances with which we are all familiar, South Africa procrastinates and continues its manoeuvres so as to perpetuate its unlawful occupation of that Territory. In disregard of the consensus of the entire world, which has been reaffirmed by an advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice and by various decisions adopted by our Organization, by other regional organizations and by the non-aligned movement, South Africa continues its manoeuvres to perpetuate its occupation of Namibia, a position which threatens world peace.

34. The delegation of Oman can only concur in the consensus which has clearly emerged in the debate which has taken place during this special session and denounce the manoeuvres designed to divert our attention from the work of this session in order the better to undermine the territorial unity of Namibia and to divide it into small tribal entities, thus keeping it in a state of permanent subjugation to South Africa.

35. All the attempts by South Africa to bring about a so-called internal settlement or to use the name of the United Nations in order to conceal its territorial designs will only provoke more bloodshed in that region. There is no other course of action to follow but that of granting to the Namibian people the right to self-determination, independence and sovereignty as provided by the decisions of the United Nations, the Declaration of Maputo last year, the recent Declaration of Lusaka and the draft declaration and programme of action, which was adopted by the United Nations Council for Namibia at its meeting on 20 April 1978. We consider the draft declaration and programme of action to be the proper framework for a solution to this problem, the prolongation of which could have unfavourable consequences.

36. In requiring that solutions to the various problems and international differences be sought by peaceful means, as stipulated by the Charter, we, at the same time, call for an end to the various manoeuvres employed to gain time and to delay independence.

37. The delegation of my country fully supports the statement made here [*10th meeting*] by Mr. Sam Nujoma, President of SWAPO, to the effect that SWAPO would be prepared to observe a cease-fire if favourable conditions were created to implement Security Council resolution 385 (1976). SWAPO, therefore, is willing to negotiate, exchange views and does not reject the various peace efforts which have recently been made.

38. The demand of SWAPO for complete clarification of all the proposals which have been presented to it is a legitimate demand. Experience has taught us that to accept terms which are not clear may lead to short-term results, but, over the long term, there may be complications. At this stage, we must take into consideration the negotiations which are currently under way.

39. We support all peace initiatives designed to help the Namibian people to attain their aspirations, but we feel that those efforts should complement the role of the United Nations, and not be a substitute for it. Indeed, the responsibility of the United Nations as regards Namibia is quite clear and is recognized by all. In order to discharge that responsibility, the Organization must contribute directly and effectively to the withdrawal of South African troops from the territory of Namibia; it must supervise the process of accession to self-determination and of the transfer of power to the rightful owners, the people of Namibia; it must ensure that the territorial integrity of Namibia is safeguarded, including Walvis Bay, which is an integral part of Namibia.

40. Time is passing very quickly and I hope that our various efforts will be successful in arriving at a just and acceptable solution which will allow the Namibian people to realize their legitimate aspirations to the dignity and independence of which they have been so long deprived, for it is high time that they join other sovereign and free peoples in order to participate with us in building a better world.

41. Mr. JAMAL (Qatar) (*interpretation from Arabic*): It is a great pleasure for me, Mr. President, to transmit to you the warm congratulations of my delegation on your unanimous election to the presidency of the General Assembly at this special session devoted to Namibia. Your long experience, the competence with which you directed the work of the thirty-second session and the outstanding role which your country, Yugoslavia, plays in supporting the struggle of oppressed peoples, such as the people of Namibia, for their right to self-determination and independence guarantee that the work of this session will be crowned with success.

42. I must not fail to convey my delegation's feeling of sincere gratitude to the Secretary-General, the United Nations Council for Namibia and the Special Committee against *Apartheid*, for their continuing efforts to ensure true independence for the people of Namibia.

43. To enjoy equality, freedom and justice has been the essential right of mankind ever since the human race was created. It is when people have been deprived of that right that history has seen revolution. In southern Africa the white régimes continue to treat brutally, humiliate and oppress the indigenous peoples, in violation of all legal and moral principles, thus committing a crime against mankind and human dignity.

44. The priority accorded by the General Assembly to consideration of the question of Namibia reflects the growing interest in this problem of the international community, in the face of the persistent defiance shown by the racist régime of Pretoria. The occupation of Namibia by

South Africa and the threat this represents to the peace and security of the African continent has made it necessary for the United Nations to convene a special session of the Assembly in order to resolve this problem.

45. For more than a quarter of a century the international community has been discussing this important question in one way or another. The problem of Namibia has been on the agenda of the General Assembly for many years, and more than 10 years have passed since the United Nations revoked the Mandate of South Africa over the Territory and assumed direct responsibility for Namibia and its people, thus reaffirming that henceforth the presence in Namibia of the South African racist régime was illegal and contrary to the United Nations Charter and the Organization's resolutions on the subject. In spite of this, during all these years the Pretoria régime has taken no serious steps to end its illegal administration and occupation of the Territory and to allow the people of Namibia to exercise their legitimate right to self-determination and independence.

46. Despite all the efforts which the international community has made and continues to make, despite the adoption of more than 130 resolutions and decisions by the General Assembly, the Security Council, the United Nations Council for Namibia and the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, in which the United Nations proclaimed its whole-hearted support to the struggle of the Namibian people for the liberation of its country, the South African racist régime continues to occupy the Territory illegally, to oppress its people and to defy the authority and the responsibilities of the United Nations as regards the Namibian people. It also persists in its colonialist manoeuvres and the consolidation of its unjust and racist legislation in order to subjugate the Territory. Suffice it to mention in this connexion the Terrorism Act of 1967, by virtue of which hundreds of innocent people have been thrown into prison without trial and subjected to torture, to point out that the policy practised by the Pretoria régime makes it the cruellest most terroristic régime in the modern world.

47. South Africa exploits and plunders the natural wealth of Namibia in collaboration with foreign economic interests in order to increase its profits, and those foreign interests stand beside it in the dock and must answer for the crime committed against the Namibian people.

48. As regards the decision to annex Walvis Bay, this should be considered null and void because Walvis Bay is an integral part of the territory of Namibia. The international Organization must react to this attempt vigorously and firmly, for that annexation violates one of the essential principles of the United Nations Charter, that of respect for territorial integrity.

49. The military build-up being undertaken by South Africa on Namibian territory, its policy of aggression, the implementation of the system of *apartheid* and bantustanization in order to dismember the Namibian territorial and national entity and destroy the territorial integrity of Namibia, the nuclear tests in the interior of the Territory, the development of nuclear weapons in constant co-

operation with the racist régime of the Zionist entity in every field, military, economic and technological, are all acts in defiance of the international community and represent a threat to the peace and security of the African continent, the Middle East and the entire world. That dangerous and criminal alliance is nothing but an imperialist-colonialist plan aimed at terrorizing and oppressing the peoples of the region. The international community must shoulder its full responsibilities and take the necessary measures to impose deterrent sanctions against those régimes, in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter.

50. Qatar vigorously condemns those countries which co-operate with the racist régime of South Africa and offer it assistance, either military or economic. It condemns the South African régime for its illegal occupation of Namibia, its failure to respect all the United Nations decisions calling for the withdrawal of its forces, the cessation of its illegal occupation, the granting of independence to the people of Namibia and the recognition of its right to both independence and self-determination. My country also condemns the various attempts by the Pretoria régime to perpetuate its illegal occupation of Namibia and to intensify its cruel oppression of the Namibian people. My country endorses and supports the demands of SWAPO presented to us by the representative of that organization in this Assembly concerning the total and unconditional withdrawal of all South African military and paramilitary forces from the whole of Namibian territory and the requirement that any solution arrived at must be by means of negotiations, with SWAPO's consent and within the framework of the relevant resolutions and decisions of the United Nations, in particular, Security Council resolution 385 (1976).

51. The General Assembly must also undertake effective initiatives to enable the United Nations to assume its responsibility fully; it must, furthermore, take the necessary steps to force South Africa to end its illegal occupation of Namibia; and it must consider, as soon as possible, the application of Chapter VII of the Charter until the attainment by Namibia of self-determination, national freedom and independence.

52. We earnestly call upon the international community not to approve any system imposed by the illegal South African administration upon the Namibian people. My country's delegation also attaches a great deal of importance to the convening of this special session and believes that it is necessary for the international community to shoulder its historic responsibilities to remedy the deteriorating situation in Namibia and to take effective measures rapidly to help and support the people of Namibia to enable them at last to exercise their inalienable right to self-determination and freedom on the basis of the principle of territorial integrity.

53. In the difficult conditions which the people of Namibia are experiencing, faced with oppression and crime, we consider it our duty to support SWAPO, the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people, and to afford it all possible aid, particularly in the light of the political manoeuvres in various areas being attempted by the racist régime of South Africa and those who support it. We must also denounce, condemn and reject all attempts aimed at weakening that legitimate organization and hence the

right of the people of Namibia to fight by all available means, including armed struggle, in order to attain genuine independence for their country.

54. The defiance of the international community by the racist régime in Namibia is very dangerous. Any further delay in finding a peaceful and final solution of the problem on the basis of Security Council resolution 385 (1976) will undoubtedly lead to a deterioration of the situation in that area which could endanger international peace and security.

55. My country reaffirms its support of and solidarity with the people of Namibia in their lawful fight under the leadership of SWAPO against colonialist oppression. It also supports the position taken by SWAPO with regard to the proposals of the five Western Powers members of the Security Council for finding a just solution that will enable Namibia to attain freedom and independence. My country offers to do everything it can to help that people, who are fighting to exercise their right to self-determination and independence. On the basis of that support, His Highness the Crown Prince of Qatar signed a decree in 1973 placing an embargo on deliveries of petroleum to South Africa, Southern Rhodesia and any other country having a racist régime, thus putting an end to all commercial and economic relations with them.

56. Finally, the delegation of my country hails the heroic struggle being waged by the people of Namibia under the leadership of its sole authentic representative, SWAPO, and congratulates them upon the successes achieved in their national struggle to achieve independence and freedom. We should like also to express our profound conviction—and our good wishes in this connexion—that the people of Namibia will very shortly be able to enjoy freedom in their territory and see the withdrawal forever of all the forces of evil.

57. Mr. GAUCI (Malta): Mr. President, please accept once again my very sincere compliments on your deserved election to preside over the General Assembly at this important session. Your election gives me particular pleasure for many reasons.

58. It would be presumptuous on my part if, in discussing the question of Namibia, I were even to attempt to match the depth of feeling and the eloquence of the many speakers who have preceded me, particularly those from African countries. I therefore do not propose to try to do so. The hour is late, the list of justified complaints against South Africa is sufficiently complete, and it would only be weakened by excessive repetition.

59. But I must at least say how impressed I was at the sincerity and restraint with which feelings long pent up against the twin evils of colonialism and *apartheid* as practised in Namibia have been expressed. The abhorrent system has, for far too long, insensitively defied our repeated censure; it has remained inflexibly applied, through repression, in a vain effort to buy borrowed time for selfish interests.

60. The President of SWAPO, Mr. Nujoma, gave us a grim, factual and detailed account which reminded us once again

of the insidious way in which an infamous policy can be implemented and maintained. But despite the savage methods brutally enforced, and all efforts at distortion or suppression of news, no society can trample on human dignity in such an organized and systematic fashion without attracting the spotlight of world condemnation. The policy of the unrepresentative South African authorities, at home and in Namibia, outrages not only their victims but the whole international community. Condemnation and efforts to promote change cannot cease until the policy is abandoned.

61. More than to anyone else, this special session belongs to the long-suffering people of Namibia, who need our consistent backing. I warmly salute the able and dynamic President of SWAPO, as the authentic representative of his people, and as an ardent advocate of racial equality. He enjoys the support not only of Namibians and the front-line States but also of countless nations and millions of people throughout the world. To him, to his associates and to his people the convening of this special session represents a climax to the effort of the United Nations in the cause of Namibia. But the brunt of the sacrifice has been borne by the Namibians; the unyielding resistance, the suffering and courage to achieve liberation in the face of superior forces and systematic harassment has been theirs. For them, then, this is an auspicious occasion; hopefully it is a prelude to better things to come.

62. The history of this Organization in support of Namibia is well known. Many present here today have played a commanding role, and we owe them our thanks and appreciation for continuing the efforts made by others before them. They are too numerous to mention individually, but the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia and the Chairman 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 deserve special mention for the work accomplished, and for the proposals they and their colleagues have submitted for our consideration at this special session. The drafts presented contain a comprehensive list of principles and guidelines which spell out highly relevant considerations to help us to advance towards the desired objectives.

63. The thankless, delicate and time-consuming task assumed by five members of the Security Council—well-placed to carry out intense diplomatic contacts with South Africa—in attempting to negotiate a just, peaceful and acceptable settlement of the question of Namibia, deserves our most careful consideration. Their proposals provide a constructive basis for negotiations, although certain points appear to have been left open to different interpretations. We appreciate the detailed analysis contained in the statement made by the Secretary of State for External Affairs of Canada [3rd meeting] and subsequent additional explanations given by other speakers, which my authorities will want to study carefully.

64. The flexibility shown by SWAPO in these contacts is very encouraging. The 10 points listed by the President of SWAPO in his statement made at the 10th meeting are genuine preoccupations which deserve sympathetic consideration. Perhaps the explanations given to them privately

yesterday may have helped to ease some of these concerns. We hope that further progress will be made in subsequent contacts until, as we recommend, an internationally acceptable solution can be negotiated. That would be a fitting tribute to the collective efforts. There can be no greater satisfaction than that of securing the attainment of independence of a people through a peaceful solution under United Nations auspices.

65. For its part, Malta has played a modest but resolute and consistent role in this world effort. Only two short years after our own formal independence, while we were still trying to cope with our new responsibilities, we joined in marking the first historic milestone when the United Nations, faced with irrefutable evidence of South African disregard of the real interests of Namibia, decided to terminate the Mandate. Subsequently, we refrained from establishing contacts or relations of any kind with South Africa. Over the past decade and a half not one cent has enriched the coffers of South Africa through commercial relations with Malta, nor has a single bullet from my country helped the repressive actions of the South African régime against the majority of its own people or the population of Namibia.

66. We have missed no opportunity to denounce the policy of *apartheid*, either here or in any other forum open to us, the latest occasion being the recent official visit of my Prime Minister to your country, Mr. President. Through the Commonwealth Secretariat we have made scholarships available to students. Only a few days ago, our own students protested against recent events in South Africa and Rhodesia. We have officially denounced the internal settlement proposed under the so-called Turnhalle programme for Namibia just as strongly as we have criticized the mock independence proposed by Ian Smith for Zimbabwe. We have made facilities available for the talks which were held on the future of Zimbabwe and will do so again at any time and on any related question if necessary.

67. At this stage, my delegation will support all rational efforts to advance significantly towards genuine Namibian independence with the least delay.

68. The convening of this session, then, as many have stated, is crucial; it assumes tremendous significance and places a heavy responsibility on all of us as we grapple with the important questions posed. Even now, it is possible to discern some portents deriving from the cumulative efforts made here and on the spot; for even the most short-sighted must eventually see the writing on the wall. Unless it is a matter of a deliberate smoke-screen, the former delaying tactics of South Africa now appear finally to be yielding under the overwhelming pressure of concerted international action to end the colonial situation in Namibia.

69. Cautious and reluctant as the recent statements from the South African régime may be, they nevertheless represent a factor of considerable relevance in a complex equation. As detailed negotiations evolve further, a peaceful, internationally acceptable solution does not seem to be beyond reach, provided that goodwill prevails. This could be a credit to all concerned and, if endorsed by the people most directly involved, would be a solid contribution to the prospects for better international relations in a sensitive

region. We would welcome any further concessions that may be made as the negotiations and detailed discussions proceed. It is, at this stage, too early for my delegation to pronounce a definite judgement on the detailed proposals submitted. It is primarily for the parties concerned to assess the contents and the significance of the statements and explanations that have been given and will be forthcoming as negotiations are pursued. A solution that has eluded this Organization for several decades cannot be subjected to a quick verdict as soon as it surfaces. The question is too important. It is a complex matter which requires adequate time for full consideration and further consultation, without diminishing its urgency, between the parties most directly concerned, and particularly the people whose future is at stake.

70. Nevertheless, an important choice faces the Assembly at this special session: we either take the first significant steps in a move towards a solution through a negotiated settlement by peaceful means, or else we involuntarily encourage the continuance of intransigence by the colonial Power, which regrettably would only prolong the cycle of violence and endanger peace. We require decisions that will enhance the credibility of the United Nations and consolidate its prudent and patient role in the process of decolonization; we do not favour decisions that severely shake the foundations of the United Nations through negative or indifferent action on a question in which our Organization has a clear legal responsibility, as confirmed by an opinion of the International Court of Justice. In brief, and at the very least, at this session we have to insist that any negotiated solution would constitute a genuine expression of popular will in Namibia, a real application of the principle of self-determination of peoples. Only the Namibians themselves have the right to determine their own future free of any constraint, and an appropriate basis for this choice to be exercised is furnished by the provisions of Security Council resolution 385 (1976), on which the proposal of the five countries is based. Agreement on these fundamentals constitutes progress; we need to advance further.

71. The United Nations clearly has a continuing role to play before its aims on Namibia are achieved, and full account has to be taken of South Africa's miserable record of reluctant and recalcitrant attitudes towards the United Nations over the past decades, including the most recent and ominous increase of its military presence in Namibia. Because of this past history, a strong United Nations presence in Namibia—to facilitate and to exercise unambiguous overriding authority during a peaceful, orderly transition of the administration, and to oversee the expression of the will of the people through free and democratic elections—is a minimum requirement. The territorial integrity of Namibia must also be fully preserved as well as the rights of the Namibians over their own natural resources and all their national territory. Anything less would not safeguard the legitimate interests and the complete economic and political independence of Namibia.

72. Today, we are putting the theory through the difficult process of transformation into practical implementation. The cause of freedom cannot be denied. This time, we would do well to subordinate high-sounding resolutions to realistic steps and act in such a way as to facilitate the

practical realization of the oft-repeated theoretical parameters of Namibian independence. In this, the views of the people directly concerned are of paramount importance. We therefore await the unfettered expression of these views in the exercise of the right to self-determination under United Nations auspices and by peaceful means. Facilitating the realization of this right is not only our hope; it is our clear, collective responsibility, which we must express now in unequivocal terms so that the South African authorities may know that the world community means what it says. If the response of the South African authorities remains dilatory, then the Security Council must reconsider its residual powers, which so far have been kept in reserve. The South African authorities have no one but themselves to blame if their declared intentions are treated with considerable scepticism, but we should, in the interests of peace, give them the benefit of the doubt, while expressing the hope that this time the opportunity will not be lost.

73. Mr. DIEZ (Chile) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. President, first permit me to convey to you the congratulations of the Chilean delegation on your election to the presidency of the General Assembly at this special session.

74. The delegation of Chile is taking part in this general debate on the colonial question of Namibia to testify to the solidarity of its Government and people with the just cause of the people of Namibia who aspire to determine their own destiny in a sovereign and independent fashion.

75. Chile has been a member of the United Nations Council for Namibia since its creation in 1967, and throughout the 11 years of its participation in the work of that Council it has maintained a position of support for the people of Namibia in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter. Similarly, throughout its eight years of participation in the work of the Special Committee on decolonization, my country has contributed to the creation of an international understanding of the urgency of the need to put an end to the colonial situation in Namibia.

76. There is an old and wise Chinese proverb which says: "It is better to kindle a light than to curse the darkness". That is why today we view with satisfaction the possibility, glimpsed on the horizon, of finding a solution that will put an end to all the injustice and suffering with which the people of Namibia have been afflicted. We are pleased particularly at the possibility that Namibia may come into independent and sovereign existence through negotiation and peaceful means, thus avoiding great bloodshed and disruption of civil life in the Territory.

77. The delegation of Chile has studied carefully the proposal of the group of five Western countries, members of the Security Council, which appears in Security Council document S/12636. Similarly, we have taken note of the comments and additional explanations given by spokesmen from that group during the past few days, as well as the views of SWAPO, the representative of the people of Namibia. All the parties have acted with wisdom and flexibility. With regard to the proposal which seeks to reconcile the interests of all the parties concerned and which, therefore, is the result of negotiation and compro-

mise, it can be improved and, above all, clarified in certain areas. My delegation believes that at this stage of events it is essential to adopt a very practical approach if we want to avoid the mistakes of the past.

78. In the proposal of the five Powers we are pleased to find reference to the participation of the United Nations in the preparations for the electoral process that is to lead to the independence of Namibia and in the supervision of the transition period until the new government that emerges from the elections has been firmly installed. Furthermore, the world Organization is to have the role of guarantor of the legality of the elections and is to be provided with clear and sufficient authority in this regard.

79. My delegation regrets the omission from the proposals of the five Powers of any reference to the role to be played by the United Nations Council for Namibia throughout this process. It is obvious that at this time we cannot ask that the proposals should contain provisions for every single problem that might arise. It is for the Security Council and the parties concerned to agree on the details of the implementation of the proposals. In any case, it is the position of the delegation of Chile that the Council for Namibia, which has for 11 years embodied the hopes of the people of Namibia and which has been doing excellent work, not always under the most favourable conditions or with the co-operation of all countries, should be allowed to play an important part at this time of decision.

80. The delegation of Chile would like, at the risk of repeating ourselves, to state once again the essential points of Chile's policy with regard to Namibia:

81. First, we regard as illegal the South African presence in Namibia, and we have taken that position since the very day that the United Nations put an end to the Mandate.

82. Secondly, we condemn all attempts on the part of South Africa to apply to Namibia its policy of *apartheid*, a policy that is contrary to the essential dignity of the individual and in violation of the Charter and of resolutions of this Organization.

83. Thirdly, we condemn South African attempts to impose internal solutions behind the back of the United Nations and the people of Namibia, whose right to self-determination and to territorial integrity we recognize.

84. Fourthly, we support resolutely all attempts to solve the colonial situation in Namibia by means of diplomatic negotiations, in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter, and in this sense we welcome the action taken by the five Western Powers in the Security Council.

85. And lastly, we affirm that in the transitional period and in the preparations for the election of an independent and sovereign government, the ultimate authority should belong to the peoples of Namibia and also to this Organization, which should shoulder its legal and historical responsibility.

86. Mr. AKHUND (Pakistan): Mr President, on behalf of my delegation I offer you congratulations and good wishes on your election to preside over the General Assembly at its

ninth special session. The skill and tact with which you guided the proceedings of the thirty-second regular session will help this session to conclude its task successfully. The subject with which we are concerned is of great, indeed crucial, importance to the welfare of all the people of southern Africa and to the peace and security of the world.

87. The struggle of the people of Namibia has reached a critical stage. The United Nations, which has throughout given support to this struggle under the leadership of SWAPO, must at this special session take action which will avert further turmoil and needless bloodshed and facilitate Namibia's transition to full and genuine independence.

88. The question of Namibia has been on the agenda of the United Nations for a long time and its basic elements are well known. Equally well known is the reason why, at a time when almost the whole of the continent of Africa has emerged from colonialism to freedom, the vast region of southern Africa remains under colonial rule or in the hands of a minority. Not only are the indigenous majorities denied their basic political and economic rights but the existing régimes in South Africa, Namibia and Rhodesia practise, in one form or another, abhorrent systems of racial discrimination.

89. In the case of Namibia, a Territory which came into the possession of South Africa by virtue of a now defunct League of Nations mandate, South Africa's very right to be a party to negotiations concerning the Territory's future has no justification other than that, in the words of the Secretary of State for External Affairs of Canada, it is a fact of life that "South Africa controls and remains in Namibia and has done so for 60 years" [*3rd meeting, para. 102*].

90. The legal position, after the General Assembly formally terminated South Africa's mandate over Namibia, is that South Africa's presence in the Territory is illegal and constitutes a defiance of international law and an act of aggression. The United Nations would be fully justified in taking all necessary action, including measures under Chapter VII of the Charter, to bring about the evacuation of the Territory by South Africa. We consider as a step in the right direction Security Council resolution 418 (1977), of 4 November last, by which an arms embargo was imposed against South Africa.

91. In stating the case for firm, and if necessary punitive, action against South Africa if it persists in defying the will of the world community and the clear prescription of international law, we do not rule out the usefulness of further efforts to achieve these ends through diplomacy and negotiation. We have followed with interest the efforts deployed to this end during the last 12 months by the five Western members of the Security Council. We listened with great attention to the account given by the Secretary of State for External Affairs of Canada of the evolution of this five-Power initiative and of the results achieved so far. We have studied with care the proposal he put forward on behalf of his colleagues for a definitive settlement of the question.

92. We do not question the motives which have animated the five Powers in their search for a peaceful outcome of

the Namibian problem. But, in order to judge the merits of the proposal they have put forward, it is necessary to measure it against the fundamental elements of settlement which are embodied in Security Council resolution 385 (1976) of 30 January 1976 and which have the sanction of the world community and the approval of the party most directly concerned, namely, SWAPO. These are: fair and free elections for the whole of Namibia as one political entity under the direct supervision and control of the United Nations, without any form or possibility of coercion and intimidation; unconditional release of all political prisoners and the return of all exiles under conditions which will enable them to participate fully in the campaign preceding the elections; a halt by South Africa to any actions designed to undermine the territorial integrity and unity of Namibia; full compliance in spirit and in practice with the provisions of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights; and abolition of the application in Namibia of all racially discriminatory and politically repressive laws and practices, particularly bantustans and homelands.

93. Speaking here three days ago, the President of SWAPO, Mr. Sam Nujoma [10th meeting], set out with clarity the reactions of SWAPO to the Western proposals. In SWAPO's view these proposals will still leave too many South African forces, in the shape of troops as well as police forces, in the Territory; the question of where the remaining 1,500 regular troops will be stationed is not clearly defined. The proposed United Nations force will not be large enough for the tasks to be performed; the overriding nature of the authority of the United Nations special representative is not clearly established; and, finally, the question of Walvis Bay is left unresolved.

94. In our view, the doubts and reservations expressed by the President of SWAPO merit the most serious consideration. Although South Africa has accepted the Western proposal, there are reports of continuing political repression in Namibia. The action taken by South Africa to retain possession of Walvis Bay even after Namibia becomes independent casts serious doubt on South Africa's real intentions. My delegation is unable to agree that the Western proposal as it stands provides a basis for the implementation, in letter and spirit, of the settlement set out in Security Council resolution 385 (1976). We believe that there is justification for the fears expressed by Mr. Nujoma concerning the role and number of South African forces which will remain in the Territory during the period of transition and at the time of elections. We support his demand that the United Nations have overriding authority during that period to ensure that elections are indeed freely held and that the transfer of power takes place without difficulties. Above all we are unable to share the view of the Western Powers that there is no way of settling the question of Walvis Bay in the context of the present negotiations.

95. Despite South Africa's acceptance of the Western proposal, we see little sign of change in South Africa's real intention, which seems to be to maintain its control over the Territory and its rich resources under one guise or another. Against the background of South Africa's past policies and present actions it is difficult not to share the concern of the people of Namibia that leaving open the question of Walvis Bay and providing any other loopholes

would enable South Africa to nullify, as Mr. Smith is doing in Rhodesia, the effect of the proposed agreement and defeat the objective of genuine independence. If the Vorster régime seems today to be softening its intransigence over Namibia, it is only because of the success attained by the heroic liberation struggle of the Namibian people led by SWAPO, and mounting international pressures against the South African régime, including those from its important supporters and trading partners in the West. We consider that it is the representatives of the people of Namibia, the eventual triumph of whose cause is inevitable, who have made the most important concessions for the sake of attaining a peaceful settlement. We believe that it is our duty in this Assembly not only to reaffirm the international community's support for their cause but to take such practical measures as will speedily bring to an end South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia and ensure the emergence of the Territory to full and genuine independence.

96. The eventual outcome of this struggle cannot be in doubt. However, we consider, particularly after having listened to Mr. Nujoma here the other day, that the way to a negotiated settlement is still open. The task of this special session of the General Assembly is to seize this opportunity, perhaps the last, for a peaceful settlement.

97. I should like to conclude by urging that the Assembly discharge its historic responsibility by facing all outstanding issues and clearly setting out a programme of action which will ensure the effective achievement of genuine independence and freedom for the people of Namibia in peace and before the year is out.

98. Mr. ALBORNOZ (Ecuador) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. President, I am pleased to offer you my Government's congratulations on your well-deserved election to preside over the General Assembly at this special session, an election that reflects credit on your country and will be of benefit to the United Nations.

99. For Ecuador the question of Namibia is of fundamental importance not only because it involves basic principles which are at the very core of our international policy but also because it is inseparable from the functioning and the prestige of the system of the United Nations, whose resolutions we abide by and respect as a founding Member of our world Organization, while the Government of South Africa has remained indifferent to them for many long years. Our country, which is closely identified with its traditional anti-colonialist principles, believes, furthermore, that Namibia and its inhabitants concern us all because they are the direct responsibility of the United Nations. Such basic principles include support for the self-determination of peoples and for the elimination of colonialism in all its forms; the peaceful settlement of disputes and the non-recognition of the occupation of territories and the maintenance of that occupation by the use of force.

100. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Ecuador, in his statement at the thirty-second regular session of the General Assembly last year, stated:

"Ecuador is concerned at the tense situation prevailing in southern Africa, which makes for a permanent state of

insecurity and anxiety, not only in the whole area, but even at the world level. The continued illegal presence of South Africa in Namibia flouts the principles of the Charter and defies the resolutions of the world Organization. Ecuador therefore stresses once again the urgent need for strict compliance with Security Council resolution 385 (1976).” [9th meeting, para. 21.]

101. Namibia is an anachronism that is being perpetuated solely by the power of the economic and military apparatus of South Africa, with the support of those countries that have strong interests and big investments to defend in Namibia. However, as the result of the sufferings of its martyred people which has been marching towards independence for the past 60 years, it would seem that we are witnessing the dawn of a free and sovereign country.

102. Thirty-two years of debates in the United Nations, a whole series of General Assembly and Security Council resolutions, various advisory opinions and one ruling of the International Court of Justice—none of that has yet served to put an end to the state of dependency in which Namibia finds itself under the administration of South Africa, which has extended to the indigenous population of the Territory the same policy of racial discrimination and massive humiliation inherent in the infamous policy of *apartheid* and which, at this very moment, is maintaining an inadmissible régime of repression precisely when we are talking about new prospects.

103. In this context we should like to recall that, when it terminated the administration of South Africa over Namibia 12 years ago, the General Assembly declared that South Africa had no right to administer the Territory, that the continued presence of the South African authorities in Namibia was illegal and that, consequently, that Government’s actions were illegal and invalid. Therefore, the discriminatory legislation will have to be totally rescinded when South Africa withdraws. Furthermore, under the Charter the States Members of the United Nations have the obligation to recognize the illegality of South Africa’s presence in Namibia and the lack of validity of the measures it takes there on behalf of that long-suffering nation, as well as the obligation to refrain from any action and, in particular, any relations with the South African Government which might imply recognition of its presence and domination or constitute help or assistance in this connexion.

104. Having initiated this special session of the General Assembly—in which so many hopes have been placed not only by the inhabitants of Namibia but also by all the States Members of the United Nations and, especially, the developing world—we have now witnessed certain events which have cleared the way for prospects for the realization of those hopes, existing differences on the question having begun to lessen.

105. We should like first to point to the persevering and imaginative action of the five Western countries that have taken the initiative of engaging in negotiations with a view to reconciling points of view and achieving the implementation of Security Council resolution 385 (1976).

106. We wish to praise the restraint, maturity and firmness of the spokesman of SWAPO, who stated before the nations

of the world that he was willing to enter into a cease-fire agreement with South Africa. Any negotiation leading by peaceful means to results satisfactory to SWAPO will be supported and applauded by world public opinion. Our country is a fervent supporter of the peaceful settlement of disputes and it has never suspended any negotiation nor taken action to alter a climate propitious to the success of such negotiations. We have been much inspired by the statement of the representative of SWAPO to the effect that, after a long period of darkness, we are beginning to discern the light in the distance.

107. We must recognize that South Africa has taken a step in the right direction by accepting the proposal of the group of Five for beginning to deal with the modalities of the transition period, once South Africa has completely withdrawn from the Territory of Namibia.

108. We must applaud the work of the United Nations Council for Namibia, which has represented the world Organization in the process and which must fully carry out its task until the total independence of the future State of Namibia has been achieved, for that is precisely the reason why the Council was established. But in order to achieve this, while offering our best wishes for the success of any steps aimed at ensuring compliance with the relevant resolutions of the United Nations, especially Security Council resolution 385 (1976), on which the final solution must be based, we must energetically insist upon the following conditions which are not only desirable but fundamental to the preservation of world law and order and the basic principles of the international community to which we belong:

(a) When the new independent State comes into being, there must be absolute respect for its territorial integrity. Therefore, Walvis Bay, an integral part of the Territory of Namibia for geographical and economic reasons and because of the traditional claim that it is part and parcel of the territory in which it is situated, a claim that is recognized by South Africa itself, must be brought under the new authority of Namibia without reservations or limitations;

(b) The elections to define the institutional and political future of Namibia must be entirely free and democratic under the authority of the United Nations, without any element of pressure or coercion, and all political elements absent from the country must be allowed to return as must all Namibian political prisoners now held by South Africa;

(c) The withdrawal of South African armed forces must be complete, and United Nations forces must occupy positions in such a way as to ensure law and order in the electoral process; all remaining South African armed forces, during the transitional period before independence, acceptable to the Security Council and SWAPO, must be under the corresponding authority of the United Nations and must withdraw immediately after the attainment of independence by the new State.

(d) The United Nations special representative must be a genuine spokesman of the world Organization, that is to say, his authority must be not only advisory in nature but decisive; he must exercise full authority over the South



African commissioner and over the military and civilian contingents which remain, as well as over those of the world Organization and must fully supervise the authenticity of the voting in the electoral process.

109. In the matter of free elections, the position of Ecuador is perfectly clear. Under our Constitution, which provides for a free referendum on the part of the citizens of our country, free from any pressure by political parties, the vote is a right and duty of all citizens, and guarantees full representation of minorities in elections as a fundamental principle of our democratic system. Electoral tribunals have complete immunity and the participation of political parties must be guaranteed and defined by the law. We should like to see those same principles applied to the elections in Namibia under the supervision of the United Nations.

110. But, ultimately, we must look beyond the period of transition and beyond independence itself. We believe that there must be a spirit of détente to remove present resentments and tensions. People must think in terms of coexistence, economic co-operation and co-operation of

other kinds with bordering countries, linked by geography to a common destiny. These are thoughts which should inform our deliberations as we prepare important resolutions which will have a fundamental influence on a country we welcome as a brother in the difficult process leading towards its freedom.

111. If all this bears fruit, the long suffering of an entire people, which is anxious—with every justification, as is universally recognized—to exercise its right to freedom and the full enjoyment of its natural resources, a people whose sons have shed their blood over a number of decades, will be the most worthy prelude to Namibia's incorporation in the concert of free peoples. The United Nations will then find itself strengthened in a historic era where the consistency and justice of a course of conduct pursued in conformity with principles of international coexistence will be finally elevated to the level of international law and modality embodied in the existence of a new sovereign State.

*The meeting rose at 12.45 p.m.*



CONTENTS

Agenda item 7:  
Question of Namibia (*continued*)

*President: Mr. Lazar MOJSOV (Yugoslavia).*

AGENDA ITEM 7

Question of Namibia (*continued*)

1. Mr. MATANE (Papua New Guinea): Mr. President, my delegation joins previous speakers in congratulating you on your unanimous election to preside over the General Assembly at its ninth special session on the question of Namibia. With your vast experience and skilful leadership we should be able to arrive at some workable solution of this Namibian problem.

2. The fact that this special session was convened is a true indication that the Namibian question is of great concern and importance to the international community.

3. General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI), which was adopted on 27 October 1966, terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia and called on South Africa to withdraw its administrative and military staff so that the Namibians themselves could move forward, under the supervision of the United Nations, to build their own nation. But South Africa did not withdraw. Instead, it increased the number of its troops, expanded its commercial activities and moved into other areas of activity in pursuit of its own interests.

4. In 1971 the International Court of Justice declared that the continued South African occupation of Namibia was illegal. Here again, South Africa turned a deaf ear to this international call.

5. Concerned about the continuing presence of and occupation by the South African régime in Namibia, the need for the Namibians to determine their own future as a united independent State, the withdrawal of South African troops from Namibia, and all the other well-known related matters, the Security Council adopted resolution 385 (1976). As could be expected, South Africa brushed this aside and formulated its own plan for decolonization: the Turnhalle plan.

6. Despite the Security Council call, other relevant United Nations resolutions and the pressure from the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO)—which we recognize as the legal representative group of the Namibian people—the South African régime continues its illegal occupation. It

would appear certain, then, that South Africa has been making a mockery of such calls. One may ask why South Africa continues to ignore these international calls. Obviously, people will come up with many and different answers.

7. My delegation believes that the main reasons are: First, security. They are afraid that should Namibia become independent soon, it would become a military threat to South Africa's safety.

8. Secondly, economics. They do not want the Namibians to benefit from the rich mineral and fish resources in Namibia. We find this rather difficult to understand because these resources are in Namibia, not in South Africa.

9. Thirdly, the colonial mentality. South Africa still feels that the Namibians are not yet ready to be their own masters. Of course, we know that this belief is wrong. South Africa should now realize that colonialism is a dying issue.

10. What is the best plan to make Security Council resolution 385 (1976) become a reality for Namibia? Some major plans or proposals or declarations have been formulated by various groups. Among these are: first, the Turnhalle plan of the South African régime; my delegation strongly and categorically rejects this because it is one-sided; it is planned in such a way as to favour South Africa and not the Namibian people; secondly, the Lusaka Declaration; thirdly, the Western proposal. The last two plans point in the right direction.

11. My delegation feels that the most important thing for the representatives to this special session of the General Assembly, the Namibian people and all other people concerned to bear in mind is the practicality of any plan. It is of paramount importance that any plan must reflect the views of and be accepted by the Namibian people. Without that, it is certain that more problems will be created. As for the South African régime's views, they should be put aside. An important question is: why should South Africa's views be sought? After all, Namibia is legally administered by the United Nations, not by South Africa.

12. My delegation's view on Walvis Bay is that it should be considered as part and parcel of the whole Namibian question. This is only logical, because Walvis Bay is in Namibia, not in South Africa. If Walvis Bay is considered separately, it will only further delay an urgent solution to the Namibian question. That is not what we want to see.

13. Very briefly, my delegation's views are: first, Namibians have an inalienable right to self-determination and

independence; secondly, Namibians have the right to their historical and traditional land; thirdly, South Africa must at once withdraw all its troops from Namibian soil; fourthly, only United Nations troops should be used in Namibia, in case internal conflicts arise; fifthly, all political prisoners, both in Namibia and in South Africa, should be released immediately and be permitted to return to their homes; sixthly, a free election for independence, in which all Namibians should participate, should be held at an early date. This should be supervised by United Nations personnel; seventhly, a constitution should then be drawn up by the Namibians themselves for which legal assistance could be given through the United Nations; eighthly, Walvis Bay must be considered as part and parcel of the whole Namibian package. It must not be treated separately; ninthly, all major foreign businesses in Namibia should continue to operate. After the new government has been formed, it should devise a system to enable the citizens of the country eventually to become part owners, either immediately or gradually, until such time as they can run and own the businesses themselves.

14. My country congratulates SWAPO on its just struggle for freedom, dignity and self-respect. It is one thing to be dominated by outsiders, who are always in a country for their own selfish interests. It is another thing to be free, to make one's own decisions and to carry them out. Namibia, through SWAPO, should be nearer to the attainment of its goal. After so many years of foreign domination, it will become its own proud master once again.

15. Mr. KARUHIJE (Rwanda) (*interpretation from French*): The thirty-second session of the General Assembly, which was rightly regarded as one of the most positive ever held by our Organization, had the great benefit of your wisdom, dynamism and diplomatic talent, Sir, as you presided over its work.

16. My delegation is happy to see you again presiding over the General Assembly, this time at its ninth special session, which is inspired by the noble spiritual and human principles to which your country and people have repeatedly demonstrated their attachment.

17. The position of my country and its Government on the question of Namibia is clear and unequivocal. It is summed up as follows in a statement made recently by General Juvénal Habyarimana, President of the Republic of Rwanda and Founding President of the National Revolutionary Movement for Development:

“We have condemned and continue to condemn categorically the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa, which, put in the dock by the international community and harassed by the freedom fighters, has now decided to divide the people on the basis of clans and tribes in order to be able more easily to dominate them in the future, after having weakened them sufficiently. We think that the genuine independence of this Territory can be guaranteed only by a truly national party. And such a party already exists: SWAPO.”

18. My country is all the more sympathetic with regard to the fate that the South African tormentors are still inflicting on the Namibian people, since the history of the

early colonization of both our countries was linked with Berlin, the capital of the colonizer of that time. As a result of the vicissitudes of the First World War, the two countries, among others, found themselves without a “master”. At that time the Allied Supreme Command first, and the League of Nations later, proceeded to a redistribution of territories. Were it not for the distance between the two countries and the concern for an “equitable” sharing between the colonial Powers, the fate of our Namibian brothers might have been ours today. We indignantly refuse to accept the perpetuation of colonialism as anachronistic as it is illegal in an African country, even were it not as racist and violent as we know it to be.

19. Since the General Assembly terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia more than 10 years ago, the leaders of that country have shown only arrogance and disdain for the decisions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. None of those who from this rostrum have sharply reminded South Africa of its obligations have even stirred the conscience of the racist and recalcitrant leaders of Pretoria. Thus far, those leaders have simply replied no: no to the idea of changing their criminal policy, no to the idea of leaving Namibia, no to their conscience, no to reason.

20. On the contrary, during that time they have striven to set up and to perfect a coldblooded and implacable apparatus of repression against the Namibian people, who are only seeking to regain their legitimate rights to dignity and freedom. The clear and internationally recognized claims of the Namibian people and of their authentic representative, SWAPO, have been met with systematic and organized violence: arbitrary arrests and imprisonment without trial, torture and executions for the true sons of Namibia. The description given by the President of SWAPO, Mr. Sam Nujoma, here in his statement of 24 April last [*1st meeting*] of the reign of terror imposed on Namibia by the colonial, racist and fascist administration at the orders of Pretoria has shattered all illusions with regard to the possibility of any change in the policy of repression by the South African leaders themselves, unless forced to it by the struggle of the patriots and by the international community.

21. Without the slightest feeling of guilt, the South African leaders would undoubtedly have liked to see the Namibian people and the international community welcome their rule as undisputed and beyond all question.

22. No, it is South Africa itself that is the instigator, South Africa that carries out an aggressive and repressive policy by means of its police, its troops, its armoured vehicles and its aircraft. Its criminal aggression is not confined to Namibia; it is just as brutally carried out against neighbouring independent States, such as Angola and Zambia, sowing death and destruction everywhere and flouting every concept of international law.

23. Pretoria's game is like a dangerous brush fire which will eventually set fire to the entire African continent, particularly southern Africa, thereby threatening international peace and security. No one can still doubt the aggressive and belligerent intentions of South Africa, given the strengthening and improving of its military arsenal to the point where, according to reliable sources, it will soon

possess the atomic bomb. The South African authorities are gleefully contemptuous of rules for the control of the proliferation of nuclear weapons, albeit inflexibly applied in other cases. Despite all this, South Africa actually plays the role seriously of the victim. And, unfortunately, there are some who feel sorrow at the prospect of the forthcoming fall of a régime the basis of whose policies is in direct contradiction with the ideals of our Organization.

24. To support such a régime by any means—whether economic, political or diplomatic—or for any motive at all is once again to threaten international peace and security as well as being disloyal to the United Nations Charter. The imperative duty of all the members of the international community is unreservedly to support the just claims of the Namibian people and of its representative, SWAPO, for total freedom and sovereignty.

25. In order to mislead international opinion, the Pretoria Government invented the masquerade of the Turnhalle Constitutional Conference with the complicity of puppet tribal chiefs. The characteristic perfidy of South Africa is manifest there, for that was an attempt to consolidate its disgraceful “homelands” policy under a pseudo-independence that would have guaranteed for it even more uninhibited exploitation of the enormous wealth of Namibia, and that with the consent of the international community. Unfortunately for the Pretoria leaders, no one was misled by that scenario. Namibia is one and indivisible, and it is for the Namibian people themselves to determine their own future through free and democratic elections under the supervision of the United Nations and without excluding any Namibian from this process.

26. My country unreservedly condemns any attempt by Pretoria to “bantustanize” Namibia. I wish again to quote the President of Rwanda on this point:

“We reaffirm our opposition to bantustanization, which is for the racists of South Africa a way of perpetuating their domination over our brothers by dividing them up and then imprisoning them, tribe by tribe, in concentration camps, to which they claim to be giving independence but within which there has never been and could never be genuine freedom. The only way for our brothers to become free will be by way of a resolute struggle to destroy those camps of shame and humiliation.”

27. While the fragmentation of the Territory of Namibia is inadmissible, the amputation from Namibia of part of its territory is a criminal act of piracy. The unilateral decision of South Africa purely and simply to annex Walvis Bay is illegal and null and void. The so-called legal arguments involved have no basis other than barbaric and unjustifiable imperialism and colonialism. The General Assembly, as well as our organization, the Organization of African Unity (OAU), has made this quite clear. Those who are ashamed or try to measure their words when they speak of this are hiding other intentions.

28. The way towards the total independence of Namibia has been clearly shown by our Organization, to which has been entrusted all responsibility over that Territory.

29. In this connexion one need only recall General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) terminating South Africa's Mandate over Namibia, as well as Security Council resolution 385 (1976) outlining the process of Namibia's accession to sovereignty. The excellent reports of the United Nations Council for Namibia together with the draft declaration and programme of action proposed by the Council [*see A/S-9/7, annex*] are clearly the basis on which our Organization may fully discharge its responsibilities. Since the only reply of South Africa has been repeated defiance, severe sanctions should be applied against that country, in particular those provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter of our Organization.

30. My country does not encourage violence, although that is the only language which the racist devils understand, but my country is convinced that, unless new prospects can be rapidly brought into play, hope for a peaceful settlement will be almost exhausted. On this subject, my delegation has learned of the recent “Proposal for a settlement of the Namibian situation” submitted by the five Western countries members of the Security Council in document S/12636, dated 10 April 1978.

31. The Republic of Rwanda has always been on the side of those who bring forward positive and constructive initiatives for the peaceful settlement of disputes, so long as they fall within the appropriate framework. This proposal, therefore, gives rise to hope, but, at the same time, causes my delegation some concern. It gives rise to hope because it constitutes a response, still partial none the less, to Security Council resolution 385 (1976) on the question of Namibia. It arouses concern because it resembles rather a rescue operation which would meet a short-term policy situation, leaving aside fundamental contentious questions. Traditional attachments can still be discerned. While noting the good faith and sincerity which underlies the proposal, we none the less have the right to ask whether it does not derive from a concept of political necessity with no alternative. Hence there should be no surprise that it has not received the euphoric welcome which was expected. None the less, it does merit all our consideration.

32. With respect to the reaction of the South African Prime Minister, Mr. Vorster, to the Western proposal, the information media have given it considerable coverage, perhaps to impress or distract our Assembly, but the Assembly must measure the sincerity of that reaction for itself.

33. Since South Africa wishes to withdraw from Namibia, it should do so immediately because that is what has been requested of it for more than 10 years. But that should not constitute blackmail to lead the international community and the Namibian people to capitulate on the primary objective of guaranteeing the rights of the Namibians to self-determination and to freedom in a united Namibia.

34. Our Assembly must adopt a decisive attitude to break the colonialist and racist grip in which the infamous Pretoria régime has our Namibian brothers.

35. My delegation firmly hopes that this special session will be recorded as one of the most positive of our Organization. We cannot accept failure on this question.

36. Mr. MAOUI (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, the thirty-second session of the General Assembly gave each of us an opportunity to experience gratification in the felicitous choice of President of our Assembly, for it was you who directed our proceedings with as much competence as experience. We are therefore very pleased to see you presiding over the General Assembly at this special session at a time which is so important for the destiny of a people and for the very future of the African continent.

37. If the United Nations is so urgently concerned with the problem of Namibia, it is because its whole history is dotted with the numerous decisions it has taken and recommendations it has made on the subject and which, notwithstanding, have not prevented the situation in Namibia from deteriorating to the point where today it threatens international peace and security.

38. In devoting a new special session to this problem, the General Assembly wanted to demonstrate its continuing interest in a rapid solution, in keeping with the deep concerns of the whole international community in the face of the aggravation of repression in the Territory and the obstacles placed by South Africa in the way of decolonization in accordance with the aspirations of the Namibian people.

39. It is clear, however, that the historic process of national liberation which has begun in Africa and which has brought about the collapse of colonial empires, can only be brought to a conclusion by the elimination of the last vestiges of colonialism and racism which are still rife in southern Africa. How then can we fail to see that in this concentration-camp world organized by South Africa, inspirer and concert master of this colonialism and racism, an extraordinary war machine has been set up to try, on the one hand, to stem the tide of the powerful current of the liberation struggle of peoples still dominated in southern Africa and, on the other hand, to call into question the real accomplishments of an independent Africa?

40. It is not without reason that the successes of the heroic peoples of Angola and Mozambique in snatching their national independence have been seen in Pretoria as so many breaches opened in the citadel of *apartheid*, of which the former Portuguese colonies were the bridgeheads that ensured the maintenance and consolidation of the Pretoria régime.

41. That explains the furious effort with which the South African régime has fought simultaneously the independence of those two fraternal countries and the coming to power in Angola and Mozambique of revolutionary leaders who have been able to wage a long victorious war of liberation against colonialist occupation. It explains also why Vorster and his allies continue to commit aggression from Namibia and Zimbabwe against the national unity and territorial integrity of neighbouring countries like Zambia, Mozambique and Angola, and to hatch plots to destabilize those independent and sovereign States.

42. Such a situation is fraught with danger not only for the African people, who are exposed to the attempts to call into question the independence that they have won, but

also for peace and security elsewhere in the world. This only increases the role incumbent upon the United Nations precisely by virtue of its clearly defined responsibilities in this matter.

43. The relevant provisions of the Charter and, in particular, the cardinal principle of the right of peoples to self-determination, do in fact apply all the more to the people of Namibia since our Organization has in its case assumed a historic mandate and direct obligations. Indeed, the United Nations has constantly declared the illegal character of the presence of South Africa in Namibia and the necessity for its unconditional withdrawal and for the transfer of power to the people of the Territory, with the co-operation of the United Nations. Our Assembly will undoubtedly recall the decisions which the United Nations has taken and which reflect the constant concern to hasten the accession to independence of the Namibian people.

44. Thus, in 1966, by its resolution 2145 (XXI), the General Assembly ended the Mandate of South Africa over Namibia. In 1967, on the occasion of the first special session devoted to this problem, it set up the United Nations Council for South West Africa (Namibia), which was charged with the administration of the Territory until independence. For its part, the International Court of Justice, in its advisory opinion of 21 June 1971 indicated that: "the continued presence of South Africa in Namibia being illegal, South Africa is under obligation to withdraw its administration from Namibia immediately and thus put an end to its occupation of the Territory."<sup>1</sup> In that same year, the Security Council made that opinion binding [*resolution 301 (1971)*] by stressing that the maintenance of the South African presence in Namibia constituted an illegal act and a breach of its international obligations.

45. In 1972 the Secretary-General was authorized, again by the Security Council, to get in touch with the authorities in Pretoria with a view to finding a solution to the Namibian problem, but those contacts clearly established the fact that South Africa had no intention of complying with the decisions of our Organization. In fact, its reply to the injunctions addressed to it took the form of a new defiance of the international community. Taking shelter behind what it cynically described as self-determination, it has been trying to put into practice a policy of balkanization of the Territory through the creation of tribal units isolated from each other and closely dependent on the racist authorities, with the aim of perpetuating the grip of the racist authorities on both the people and the resources of Namibia.

46. The pursuit of a policy of destroying the national unity and the territorial integrity of Namibia by the creation of bantustans thus, not surprisingly, is part and parcel of the colonial rationale. In this regard, Walvis Bay is an illustration of the complete arrogance of the attitude of the Pretoria régime towards the Namibian people. Unable to stem the strong tide of freedom in Namibia, Pretoria, in a rearguard action the ridiculous character of which is manifest, wishes to amputate a part of the territory of the

<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, para. 133.*

new State which is all the more vital since it is its only deep-water port and since rich deposits of uranium have just been discovered there.

47. The history of decolonization is fresh enough in our memories for us to recognize that it is not by dismembering a colonial territory and taking over its resources and infrastructure that one can ensure the future viability of an independent State. Within the designs of Pretoria on Walvis Bay we thus see more than delaying tactics by South Africa, although in objective terms the result is to slow down the efforts of the international community to bring about the independence of Namibia. By this unacceptable condition for its withdrawal from the Territory, South Africa demonstrates, above all, its desire to prevent the future free State of Namibia from maintaining its territorial integrity and ensuring its survival by depriving it of a port which is essential to its trade and of capital resources for its development.

48. However, the Security Council has never failed in its decisions, in particular resolution 385 (1976), and within the framework of its responsibilities concerning the Territory and the people of Namibia, to express regularly its twofold concern to safeguard the territorial integrity of Namibia and guarantee its national unity, while categorically rejecting any measure aimed at its dismemberment.

49. The constant concern of the United Nations regarding the future of Namibia has led our Organization, inspired by the wish to affirm its authority and discharge its responsibilities, to explore all ways and means of promoting the decolonization of the Territory. Thus, the United Nations Council for Namibia, whose mandate is to bring the Namibian people to independence, has spared no effort to attain that objective. However, it has found itself unable to act because of systematic obstruction by South Africa and the obstinacy of certain Powers in seeking solutions by means other than those laid down by our Organization. Algeria, which is a member of the Council for Namibia, believes that that body should find in the obstacles put in its way an additional reason to strengthen its determination, and that it is for our Organization to prevent the work of that body being superseded by initiatives which thwart the accomplishment of its task and can only be prejudicial to the guarantees which the United Nations framework offers for safeguarding the rights of the Namibian people in this crucial phase of their destiny.

50. Is it not a strange paradox that South Africa, which by the very nature of its régime is in grave contravention of the Charter, the decisions and the very ethics of the United Nations, is acting today as a broker in the search for a solution to a problem which its past and present action is designed to preserve in colonial status? Is it not at least singular to see the Pretoria régime, which is the source of all the difficulties connected with the decolonization of Namibia, being provided with a screen behind which it can continue, by means of reprehensible manipulations, to strengthen the bases of its domination and exploitation? All this is happening as if certain initiatives had been designed initially to absolve South Africa of its crimes against the peoples of the region and to confer on it the title of architect of decolonization.

51. What is the reason for the arrogance, for Pretoria's disdain of international law and for its challenge to our Organization? The answer lies only in the close collusion between the interests which South Africa obstinately defends against all legality and all right and the interests of certain Western Powers in which it finds both acquiescence and collusion, if not outright encouragement to repression and violation of the national rights of the Namibian people. Despite the unanimous condemnation of the international community and the numerous warnings of the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity, those Powers continue to lavish considerable financial, economic, commercial and military assistance on the South African régime. It is thanks to the colossal investments of those countries and the facilities they grant to that régime in terms of the transfer of high-level technology, of which, furthermore, they cruelly deprive the countries of the third world, that South Africa has succeeded in substantially strengthening its military apparatus of repression and in introducing nuclear weapons into Africa.

52. It is quite clear that the approach to the Namibian problem which is being made outside our Organization does not ring true and ill conceals the ties of privilege between certain Powers and South Africa, the reprehensible linking of their interests to the *apartheid* system and their strategic calculations in opposition to the aspirations of the Namibian people and of other African peoples to a future of dignity, freedom and progress. Those are revealing signs of the desire to weaken and contain the vigorous upsurge of the forces of liberation in Africa. At the precise moment when the era of colonial and foreign domination is drawing to an end in the continent it is the very nature of imperialism to respond with new plots both in rearguard actions designed to halt the inexorable movement towards liberation and in attempts to call into question the achievements of independent Africa. These actions, which are represented as a search for a peaceful settlement, cannot possibly delude the international community or catch it unawares in its vigilance. Its responsibility is to see to it that the principles laid down for the settlement of the question of Namibia are not undermined for the benefit of another driving force with motivations and plans contrary to the letter and spirit of the Charter and the relevant decisions of our Organization. This means that the United Nations, through the Council for Namibia, remains the only guarantor of a just solution to the Namibian problem and that it alone is responsible for the task of concluding the work of decolonizing Namibia, free from interference and greedy outside interests.

53. The problem that we are considering at this session is one of decolonization. There is no authority better qualified than the United Nations to deal with this, and none better placed than the OAU to determine the nature and scope of it. That is why it is appropriate to recall that the Namibian people, mobilized under the leadership of SWAPO for the realization of their national aspirations, depends today more than ever on the support of an Africa which has fully awakened to the situation and which, in spite of pressure on it and entreaties that pull it in one direction or another, has remained faithful to its principles and its peoples. The last ministerial conference of the OAU demonstrated that once again at its thirtieth session at Tripoli. Indeed, the OAU was unanimous in reaffirming the

legitimacy of the armed struggle being waged by SWAPO and has reassured it anew of its total support. It condemned the South African régime for its intransigence, its divisive manoeuvres and its refusal to withdraw unconditionally from Namibia. Furthermore, it denounced the attempt illegally to annex Walvis Bay. While rejecting agreements that might be concluded without SWAPO and outside the framework of the United Nations, the only Administering Authority of Namibia, the OAU made a point of warning the international community against any contacts with the South African régime or its agents of the Turnhalle alliance.

54. That African standpoint must be decisive in the assessment of any settlement plan for Namibia. Political wisdom dictates that it should be applied to the evaluation of the manoeuvrings at present under way in connexion with this question, particularly when we know the fate, which is recent and fresh in our memories, of the attempt at a settlement of the problem of Zimbabwe without the participation of the Patriotic Front.

55. Quite clearly, the so-called initiative of the five Western Powers does not fall within the context of a true settlement which takes account of the interests and aspirations of the Namibian people. We fear, in fact, that the plan of the five Powers might end up as a substitution of responsibilities without offering any political and moral guarantees, as advocated by the OAU and provided for by United Nations decisions. We also fear that, in the process elaborated by the five Powers, the authority of the Council for Namibia might be seriously weakened and that it might be reduced to a simple recording body.

56. In fact, the production of a settlement scenario based neither on the OAU nor within a United Nations context can, in principle and in its formulation, only give rise to considerable apprehension and a great number of questions. A move which departs from the framework of our Organization and falls outside its control can only lead to a fictitious solution. In leaving overshadowed some specific problems, particularly that of Walvis Bay; and in refusing to recognize SWAPO as the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people, it amounts only to a mere attempt to protect the alliance of interests which has been forged in the past between South Africa and its distant partners for the exploitation of Namibia.

*Mrs. Gbujama (Sierra Leone), Vice-President, took the Chair.*

57. If the five Powers do not share the views of the Pretoria régime on the question of the territorial integrity of the Territory and the role which the United Nations should play in the process of attaining independence, why this silence, these ambiguities and these equivocations? The submission of the plan of the Five as an over-all and definitive offer constitutes intolerable pressure on the Namibian people for it to agree to negotiate, and only after independence, the principle—which in any case is intangible and prior—of its territorial integrity.

58. In a more general sense, it is certainly easier for countries involved in intensive and multifaceted co-operation with the *apartheid* régime to prevail upon it—taking advantage of the fact that it depends upon that

co-operation for its survival—to follow the path of legality. For it is not possible to arm the murderers of Pretoria, giving them every resource for the exercise of power, and at the same time claim to be acting in the interests of the Namibian people. Unless it is conceded that one can be judge and a party to a case, one cannot at the same time protect the racist régime of South Africa by sheltering it from an international policy of sanctions and proclaim oneself an ardent champion of the objectives and principles of the United Nations Charter. Indeed, if the decisions of our Organization designed to compel the Pretoria régime to withdraw from the Territory of Namibia and aimed particularly at its economic interests have remained a dead letter, it is because the solidarity of interests of the Western Powers with that régime has never been denied.

59. Now, on the particular subject of the action of the five, it is clear that, without a commitment to the Namibian people, to its national unity and territorial integrity, and without firm support for United Nations action, it could only have the effect of reinforcing South Africa's intransigence in its opposition to decolonization. That move, in the final analysis, stems from a strategy which aims to perpetuate colonial domination in other forms in Zimbabwe as in Namibia, and to expand and strengthen zones of influence the better to serve, by means of establishing submissive and non-representative authorities, the political and economic objectives of imperialism in the area.

60. It is because the problems of southern Africa are so closely linked both in their essence and their consequences that the imperialist riposte, whatever forms it assumes and whatever its underlying intentions, is dictated by a global vision in which our continent in its various parts is the main target. Thus, a correct approach to the problem of Namibia must take account of the context and political environment in which this question is evolving.

61. The situation in the southern part of Africa is today too serious to allow us to acquiesce in half-measures or subterfuges and to lend ourselves to manoeuvres that are liable both to make more remote the chances for a true solution and to lead to irremediable deterioration by damaging the prestige and authority of our Organization.

62. It is high time for the Western Powers, allies of the proponents of *apartheid*, to put an end to this tragedy for all the peoples of the region and sincerely associate themselves with the efforts of the international community and unrestrictedly apply the measures sanctioned by the various bodies of our Organization. The framework of a solution has already been outlined, the principles have been laid down and the parties to it have been indicated. If, as we believe, Pretoria persists in its obstinacy in refusing to apply decisions taken and so often reaffirmed with regard to a settlement of the Namibian problem, it will be time for the United Nations to impose an effective sanctions policy which will compel it to comply with our Organization's decisions. In this regard, the decision to deprive Pretoria of the right to participate in the work of the twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations constituted an initial and eminently positive measure which would benefit from being supplemented by other sanctions more coercive and more capable of ensuring respect for international legality.

63. By having recourse to the possibilities offered by Chapter VII of the Charter, we may still be able to spare the peoples of southern Africa the risks of a grave confrontation. Recourse to those possibilities of action should not therefore, be subordinated to the political will of certain Powers which, primarily in the Security Council, have paralysed United Nations action and rendered it inoperative. Those Powers should recognize that, by their systematic recourse to the veto, they have assumed heavy responsibility for the negative attitude of the Pretoria régime, thus imposing additional suffering upon the people of Namibia.

64. From the great epic of the liberation struggle, the peoples of Africa have always been able to draw, in their thirst for freedom and independence, the necessary will and the faith to achieve their national aspirations. The armed struggle which the Namibian people have been waging under the aegis of SWAPO has been decisive in accelerating the decolonization process in that important part of Africa. It represents, therefore, an important contribution to the achievement of the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter. That is why it is now the duty of our Organization to make sure that the inalienable rights of the Namibian people, confirmed in that Territory by the failure of the South African régime's policy of domination, are not now prejudiced by last-minute manoeuvres and dilatory tactics aimed at creating buffer States around the *apartheid* system, in the service of its interests.

65. In Africa the freedom struggle has never been a lonely one, and SWAPO knows of the duty of solidarity which binds us—all African peoples—to it in its struggle. Hence it is high time that those who continue to doubt Africa's determination to conclude the work of decolonization stopped erecting obstacles to a liberation process that is historically inevitable.

66. For its part, the United Nations has a clear mandate and, vis-à-vis the Namibian people, has contracted precise obligations. This special session gives it an opportunity to reaffirm those principles and to fulfil its commitments, because it is by fully assuming its proper role in this final phase of the decolonization of Africa that it will be living up to the principles of the Charter and the hopes placed in it by the whole of mankind.

67. Mr. BLACKMAN (Barbados): Madam President, at the outset, my delegation wishes to request you to transmit to the elected President of this ninth special session our congratulations upon his election to preside over the deliberations of this body. We have watched with admiration how he guided the proceedings of the thirty-second General Assembly session, as well as the eighth special session of the General Assembly, and we are persuaded that this world body is indeed fortunate to have a person of his skill, sensitivity, experience and patience to guide our work on one of the most complex and critical issues of which it is seized.

68. Almost two decades after the General Assembly adopted resolution 1514 (XV), an enormous amount of work still needs to be done to achieve the objective of total and complete decolonization, and in this connexion, the question of Namibia remains one of the most intractable on the agenda.

69. The complexity of the Namibian question derives from the fact that Namibia is a microcosm of all the major problems within the world today. In Namibia can be found the phenomena of imperialism, colonialism, racism, the plundering of the resources of a third-world country, an escalating arms race, hunger and a deadly chess game based upon the anachronistic concept of the balance of power. In this maelstrom of competing interests, the African people of Namibia have become hapless victims.

70. The Government of Barbados believes that primary responsibility for this situation must rest with the illegal régime of South Africa, a régime which does not reflect the political will of the majority of the people within its borders, a régime composed of primitive racists who, finding themselves now with widespread rebellion at home and the collapse of the white buffer States around them, panic-stricken, desperately try to hold on to privileges that they have illegitimately enjoyed for decades.

71. Recently that pariah régime has expressed a desire to see implemented in Namibia the proposal of the five Western countries which have used their good offices to resolve the Namibian question. But the Government of Barbados has never had any confidence in the Pretoria régime, because the Government of Barbados believes that that régime is made up of liars and criminals who are responsible for untold murders, torture and corruption in southern Africa; nor do we concur in the assumption that, if the so-called Prime Minister of South Africa, Vorster, is scratched, underneath there will be found an honourable gentleman who will ultimately carry out the aims of racial justice in South Africa.

72. However, Barbados wants to register its appreciation to those Western countries for endeavouring to bring the problem of Namibia to an expeditious conclusion; but it would also like to assert that those countries have a moral responsibility for seeing this problem through to the end, and it is our belief that they must take the necessary steps to put an end to all forms of economic assistance, direct or indirect, to South Africa; only then will they have completed the cathartic act necessary to expiate the historical guilt they share with South Africa for the plight of black people in the entire region.

73. Barbados calls on those countries to implement complete economic sanctions against South Africa without delay and to follow the trail blazed by Barbados since 1948, when the Government of Barbados, under the distinguished leadership of the late Sir Grantley Herbert Adams, ended our not insubstantial trade relations with South Africa following the Milton King affair.

74. The Government of Barbados believes that a solution of the Namibian question must be found within the context of Security Council resolution 385 (1976) and therefore urges a solution which recognizes Walvis Bay as an integral part of Namibia. Barbados believes that Namibia's claims to Walvis Bay, which rest on political, economic, ethnic and geographical grounds, are unassailable. The specious legal argument adduced by South African desperadoes and their fellow conspirators must be rejected out of hand. To talk of a legal argument that is not grounded in any concrete considerations arising out of politics, economics, geography



or demography is to engage in the useless pastime of chasing abstractions, a luxury we can ill afford when Africans in Namibia find themselves in the toils of grinding poverty and suffering. This is no time to indulge in the luxury of the splitting of hairs or the metaphysics of neo-scholasticism. An independent Namibia without Walvis Bay would be a truncated area totally at the mercy of South Africa and would not be capable of pursuing a viable independence.

75. Imperialists faced with forces that compel them to give up direct rule invariably latch on to the technique of identifying native puppets to carry out tasks for them which international opinion could never tolerate if they themselves performed them. In this connexion, the South African régime has attempted to export its heinous policy of bantustanization to Namibia by seeking out pliable Namibian Sambos from different tribes to carry out its bidding.

76. The Government of Barbados is unalterably opposed to the establishment of a Government of Namibian Uncle Toms living in balkanized fiefdoms, and supports the proposition that a legitimate Government can only be brought into being on the basis of the full, fair and free participation of all Namibian adults. Until this process is completed, Barbados regards SWAPO as the only legitimate organization to speak on behalf of the people of Namibia. No elections in Namibia can be deemed authentic without the full and fair participation of SWAPO.

77. At the same time, the people of Barbados demand the total and complete withdrawal of all South African troops from Namibia and support the proposed United Nations transition assistance group. The transition group, however, will not be able to perform the duties envisaged for it unless there is an adequate number of personnel recruited for this purpose. SWAPO's recommendation of a civilian team of 1,000 persons as well as a United Nations peace-keeping force of no fewer than 5,000 soldiers seems eminently reasonable. At the same time, the Government of Barbados supports the proposed appointment of a United Nations Special Representative to superintend the transitional period leading to independence. The special representative must not be an excrescence but must have total control of the Namibian governmental apparatus that now exists. Any South African functionary, such as the proposed administrator-general, must be totally subservient to the special representative.

78. Barbados considers these conditions as minimally necessary to ensure the early granting of independence to a free Namibia which can exist without pressure or intimidation from the colonial régime of South Africa.

79. The demon of a South African presence must be exorcised from the affairs of Namibia, as the Council for Namibia, as established under General Assembly resolution 2248 (S-V), is the sole legitimate authority to administer Namibia. All other solutions are either fraudulent or self-defeating and cannot command the support of Barbados.

80. Mr. DA LUZ (Cape Verde) (*interpretation from French*): Madam President, may I first of all beg you to

transmit our warm congratulations to President Mojsov on his election to the presidency of the General Assembly at his ninth special session. The Cape Verde delegation is very happy at this unanimous decision not only because of his qualities as a statesman and his experience in international affairs but also because of the wisdom which he showed in presiding over the General Assembly at its thirty-second regular session and the militant commitment of his country, Yugoslavia, to the cause of the people of Namibia.

81. I wish also to take this opportunity of paying a tribute to our Secretary-General, Mr. Kurt Waldheim, for his dedication and his untiring efforts to ensure the total liberation of Namibia. I also wish to congratulate the United Nations Council for Namibia for its remarkable work and for the efforts it has made as Administrator of the Territory during the 10 years since its establishment.

82. It is comforting to note in the current world situation, and in particular with reference to our continent, that the international community, justly concerned by the multiplication of conflicts and the worsening of tensions in certain parts of the world, is applying itself with perseverance and seriousness to the successful conclusion of an enterprise of peace and security, which does honour to our Assembly and to the United Nations as a whole and which consists, in the present circumstances, of making every effort to ensure the attainment by an entire people of full and complete sovereignty. That is the reason for our session; it is the will of the States represented here, and it is the hope of the people of Namibia.

83. In our view, at this special session we should, in the light of recent events in that Territory, and in keeping with the relevant resolutions adopted by the General Assembly on various occasions, produce the definitive guidelines that would allow the Namibian people, under the leadership of its sole authentic representative, SWAPO, to recover its legitimate national and international rights, for we owe it to the truth to say that in reality the essential conditions have long existed that would make possible, or at least promote, the rapid accession of the Territory to independence. Indeed, within the framework of the Organization a number of specific activities mark the evolution of the problem and indicate—at the same time as its seriousness in the context of the political development of the southern region—the increased responsibility of the international community on this subject. Among these may be noted resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966, by which the General Assembly decided to assume responsibility for Namibia; the establishment of the United Nations Council for Namibia in May 1967; and the adoption since then of various relevant resolutions reaffirming, in particular, the illegality of South Africa's occupation of that Territory, recognizing SWAPO as the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people and supporting the just armed struggle being waged by that national liberation movement for self-determination, freedom and national independence within the framework of a united Namibia, as recalled in resolution 32/9 D, adopted at the last session of the General Assembly.

84. It goes without saying that, internally, the long struggle for national liberation waged by SWAPO, has been the decisive factor in the development of conditions in the

Territory to the point where today we can foresee with more tranquillity the outcome consistent with the true aspirations of the people of Namibia of a conflict that is still going on, a conflict that has been on the universal conscience for almost three decades.

85. Nevertheless, taking the facts strictly into account, we see that the Maputo and Lusaka Declarations and, more recently, the analysis made by the United Nations Council for Namibia of this conflict which remains an ulcer in a very sensitive region of Africa, reveal more than one element of concern which, if not correctly interpreted and remedied, could seriously hamper our work and have a negative effect on the development of the situation on the spot.

86. Indeed, while independence seems to be approaching rapidly, the activities of foreign economic and other interests, far from encouraging this historic trend in the development of the Territory, run counter to the international community's efforts by systematically violating the decisions of this body, by perpetuating an iniquitous situation that has been made intolerable by its criminal abuses, and by promoting a systematic policy of domination and exploitation the only purpose of which, in the present circumstances, is to undermine in advance the political and social structures of the future State and the constitutional authority of an independent Government.

87. At the same time, the policy of racism and repression carried out by the South African authorities, and the declared plan of the South Africa régime to replace the normal process by a solution that would prejudice the future sovereignty of the Territory and any genuine independence, constitute a grave threat to future peace in that area, a threat that must be judged in the light of recent events in the Territory. The unilateral decision to make Walvis Bay a permanent racist enclave in the very heart of the future independent State and the determination to perpetuate the bantustanization policy reveal the true intentions of the racist South African régime, and this certainly does not allow us to renounce our distrust and vigilance about any action or decision taken by that régime.

88. The recent diplomatic initiatives to bring the parties concerned closer together—initiatives designed to encourage a rapid and peaceful conclusion of the process now under way—can achieve satisfactory results only if they are in accordance with the basic aspirations of the Namibian people, repeatedly expressed by SWAPO, to true and unconditional independence and total sovereignty in a united land.

89. We have come almost to the end of the discussions at this important special session of the General Assembly, which has taken place at a unique time, a critical time for the African continent and in particular for southern Africa. Many distinguished representatives who have already spoken, and especially President Sam Nujoma, have analysed the situation in that part of our continent in the light of recent developments and have made very helpful proposals which, if they are put into effect without any ulterior motives, will no doubt lead to a peaceful settlement of the problem which has been with us for so many years, like a wound in the conscience of the international community.

90. The delegation of Cape Verde, for its part, thinks that the present session must lay down the guidelines of an effective and concrete programme, and make clear the intention of the international community to implement Security Council resolution 385 (1976) to bring about a peaceful settlement of the problem of Namibia.

91. However, we would add that we must reject in advance any manoeuvre designed to prevent the people of Namibia from acceding to national political independence in a united Namibia and from maintaining the country's territorial integrity, including Walvis Bay. We must also reject any pseudo-agreement reached without the knowledge of the Namibian people, for that would only aggravate the situation in the area. Moreover, South Africa must withdraw its troops from Namibia, under the conditions proposed by SWAPO. All political prisoners must be freed, and the Namibians who wish to return to their country must be allowed to do so freely. The elections must be free and under the effective control of the United Nations without pressures of any kind.

92. In conclusion, I should like to pay a whole-hearted tribute to the Namibian freedom-fighters, with SWAPO at their vanguard, and to assure them that the Republic of Cape Verde has feelings of militant solidarity with them. From the very beginning of our own struggle for national liberation, we have shown them fraternal and revolutionary support. I take this opportunity to express once again this unshakable and unconditional support for all the actions they may take to bring their just struggle to a victorious conclusion and, thus, to build in the very near future a strong, united and totally independent country.

93. Mr. KABEYA WA MUKEBA (Zaire) (*interpretation from French*): I wish at the outset to extend to the President and officers the warm congratulations of the delegation of the Republic of Zaire on their election for the ninth special session of the General Assembly. The qualities which distinguish Ambassador Mojsov and the competence with which he guided the work of the thirty-second session and the eighth special session guarantee that the results that all Member States expect from this special session devoted to the question of Namibia will be achieved.

94. The problem of the international territory of Namibia has been of constant concern to the United Nations since its establishment. My delegation does not intend to recount the background of the Namibian question; other delegations have already done that most eloquently. My delegation wishes to set forth its impressions and define its position, in the light of the present situation with regard to the problem of Namibia.

95. The Republic of Zaire is a profoundly African State, and that is one of the fundamental principles of its foreign policy, as laid down in article 77 of its Constitution, which provides that: "In order to promote African unity, the Republic may conclude treaties and agreements of association entailing the partial renunciation of its sovereignty". That presupposes also moral and material support by my country for the liberation movements, because the true unity of the continent is not totally conceivable without the total liberation of Africa from colonialism and *apartheid*. It is within this context that Zaire welcomes *a priori*

any effort from any quarter to find a solution to the Namibian problem which falls within the framework of Security Council resolution 385 (1976).

96. In this regard, although the new Western proposal is not entirely satisfactory, they none the less constitute a solid basis for discussion. Like any human enterprise, the Western plan contains serious imperfections which give rise to grave concern on the part of my delegation. Firstly, we should point out the silence of the Western plan on the future of Walvis Bay. Although the legal status of Walvis Bay is somewhat complex, the delegation of Zaire would recall that the General Assembly in resolution 32/9 D of 4 November 1977 stressed the indivisible nature of Namibia and considered Walvis Bay an integral part of Namibia. The Western Powers should reassure international opinion about their formal and unequivocal position with regard to the fact that Walvis Bay belongs to Namibia. Secondly, it should be noted that the maintenance of public order during the transition period should be the responsibility of United Nations forces and not the existing police force, so as to create conditions of security and tranquillity for all the parties. Lastly, we should like to stress that the maintenance of the South African administration for the transition period is only allowable to the extent that a hierarchy is established among the leaders of Namibia, by making the Administrator-General of South Africa subordinate to the special representative of the United Nations, the only legal authority in the international territory of Namibia.

97. However, the great merit of the Western plan is to have placed the settlement of the Namibian problem under the aegis and control of the United Nations, as provided for in this regard by many resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. The essential element of this plan is the military presence of the United Nations in the territory of Namibia. This presence will, in my delegation's view, create an irreversible state of affairs in connexion with the future independence of Namibia, because it is understood that this international force cannot withdraw from the Territory until it has performed its task, namely, that of bringing independence to Namibia. Furthermore, it constitutes a guarantee for the local population which need no longer have any doubts as to the fact that the process of its independence has begun.

98. The efforts made by the five Western Powers of the Security Council over the last 12 months deserve our appreciation and encouragement. Zaire has always felt that an internationally acceptable solution to the problem of Namibia should be found with the support of all those fighting in Namibia, of whom those of SWAPO deserve particular consideration.

99. The Lusaka Declaration and the Western plan may constitute solid bases for a solution to a situation that has lasted only too long. But whatever the plan presented for a settlement of the question of Namibia, it cannot entirely satisfy the parties concerned. They should make an effort to accept a compromise. In this connexion, my delegation would venture to appeal to SWAPO to accept the Western plan as a basis for discussion, while reaffirming its reservations on certain essential points, such as the question of Walvis Bay and the maintenance of order during the

transition period. This is after all in the very logic of negotiations. If one wants everything at once, one sometimes risks losing everything. We must give thought to the enormous sufferings and sacrifices of the people of Namibia, and it is imperative to do everything possible not to prolong those sufferings indefinitely. Whatever the various statements made by the members of the international community, the solution to the Namibian problem depends and will always and wholly depend on the Namibians themselves.

100. The delegation of Zaire would like to take this opportunity to convey to Miss Gwendoline Konie, President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, its most sincere congratulations for the scope and the quality of the work done for the cause of Africa. The Republic of Zaire, which has always believed in the United Nations, is convinced that the General Assembly, under the enlightened guidance of its President and all the other officers of the Assembly, will take important decisions on the subject of Namibia for the sole purpose of alleviating the innumerable sufferings endured by this heroic fraternal people, which really deserve to enjoy the benefits of freedom in human dignity.

101. Mr. OWONO ASANGONO (Equatorial Guinea) (*interpretation from Spanish*): First of all, on behalf of my delegation, I should like whole-heartedly to congratulate Ambassador Mojsov on his election to the presidency of the General Assembly at its ninth special session. There is no better opportunity to express to him how pleased we are at seeing him presiding over our discussions. On the one hand, his country, Yugoslavia, which we recognize as one of the countries of great modern achievements, and my country are closely linked by common points of view on foreign policy; on the other hand, we are pleased to see him presiding over the Assembly at this session because his recognized diplomatic ability and the tact which he showed during the thirty-second regular session, as well as his long experience with the problems of decolonization and the policy of *apartheid*, assure us that this special session devoted to the question of Namibia will be crowned with success.

102. The ninth special session of the General Assembly is being held at a crucial moment when events in southern Africa, and particularly in the Territory of Namibia, require that the international community in all conscience reconsider the prevailing situation with a view to adopting new specific and objective measures aimed at putting an end to the unjust and ignominious policy of domination, racial discrimination and *apartheid* practised by the Pretoria régime in South West Africa, now called Namibia.

103. The resolutions adopted by the General Assembly last year and by the OAU at its summit conference held at Libreville recommended the convening of this special session and are self-explanatory regarding the strong opinion of the international community that the Namibian people should no longer be left the victim of the criminal régime of Pretoria which is subjugating it, ruthlessly pillaging it and depriving it of its most fundamental and inalienable rights.

104. The eloquent statements we heard here on 24 April 1978 [*1st meeting*] by Miss Gwendoline Konie, President

of the United Nations Council for Namibia and Mr. Sam Nujoma, leader of the Namibian people and President of SWAPO unequivocally show a pattern of persistent violence, the flouting of the fundamental and inalienable rights of the Namibian people and the diabolical plan for expansion of the South African régime, an aggression which constitutes a visible threat to international peace and security.

105. The international community believed at one time that it had taken a decisive step towards the construction of a democratic, prosperous, united and independent Namibia, but today we are reaping the harvest of an error the consequences of which have meant the ruin and exploitation of the Namibian people. Now that we are gathered here again, let us give proper compensation to the oppressed people of Namibia. I say that we should make just reparation because we consider that the situation now prevailing in the Territory of Namibia is due exclusively to the indifferent attitude which many States Members of the United Nations have adopted towards their own decisions. We have talked enough about negotiations, for all Namibia's rights are recognized and that country has nothing to negotiate with the Vorster régime. Let us be logical in accordance with the requirements of the Charter and let us devote our political will to observing and seeing to it that the decisions adopted by this world Organization are observed.

106. We do not think that it is necessary here again to enumerate all the resolutions and decisions adopted on the problem of Namibia, because we assume that everyone is aware of them. None the less, it is worth recalling that on the basis of General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966, later confirmed by Security Council resolution 276 (1970) of 30 January 1970, any South African presence in the Territory of Namibia is to all intents and purposes, illegal, in accordance with the judgement of the International Court of Justice, and constitutes open aggression against the Territory and its population. Many other resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly have repeatedly, since that time, condemned the illegal occupation by South Africa and its policy of balkanization, terrorism, racial discrimination and *apartheid* carried out in Namibia, and demanded the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of its administration to enable the United Nations Council for Namibia to lead the Territory to independence.

107. Despite this energetic condemnation, the criminal régime of Pretoria has by every means available strengthened its diabolical system by mass repression, the assassination of innocent persons, arbitrary detention, the legalization of the *apartheid* system and the bantustanization of the population, the ruthless exploitation and plundering of natural resources, and armed attacks against sovereign States. Indeed, the Pretoria régime has deprived the Namibian people of all of its most fundamental political, social and economic rights.

108. On the assumption that we accept the inescapable basic fact that Namibia is a colonial territory under international administration, that it is illegally occupied by South Africa, and that as such it must without delay accede to independence, then we should consider here how this

Territory can achieve independence and sovereignty, keeping in mind the diabolical system of occupation and aggression which exists there.

109. We feel that the objective of the General Assembly at this special session is to see what means are available to attain that independence and, as has been so wisely stated by the eminent speakers who preceded me, to consider three possibilities: the path of peaceful negotiation, diplomatic pressure and, unfortunately, the use of armed force.

110. In our opinion, any of these means could serve to achieve the independence of Namibia if South Africa were ready to concede it. But the question of Namibia is an anachronism which for more than 30 years has been on the agenda of the General Assembly; it would be illusory, therefore, to dream of a negotiated solution, bearing in mind the quibbling and evasiveness employed by the Pretoria régime since the time that the United Nations demanded its withdrawal from the Territory. If we were to place hopes in such a solution, it would indeed be illusory, in view of the bantustanization policy carried out by South Africa with the aim of making the Territory politically unstable and in view of the fact that the South African police are pouring into Namibian territory and the Pretoria régime is trying by every means available to dissociate SWAPO and the United Nations Council for Namibia from any solution, with the clear intention of installing a puppet government in Namibia. On the other hand, in view of the illegal status of the occupier and taking into account all the fundamental and inalienable rights of the Namibian people, the terms of negotiation are totally unacceptable to my delegation. We must face the truth and require South Africa to withdraw unconditionally from the Territory.

111. While the initiative of the five Western members of the Security Council seems at first sight one means for a solution of the problem of Namibia, even though my delegation has serious doubts about its effectiveness, we believe that a solution based on those terms would only be acceptable if SWAPO, the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people, were to accept it in its entirety. But even then, we cannot but express our concern because over the last few years we have from this rostrum condemned the close co-operation which exists between those very countries and the Vorster régime.

112. My delegation would like to stress the fact that this special session of the General Assembly offers an opportunity to consider thoroughly the means and terms which could rapidly lead to the independence of Namibia. We should have no illusions about tendentious proposals which are no more than delaying tactics aimed at setting up a puppet government in Namibia which would serve only to guarantee the perpetuation in Namibia of the ambitious and selfish interests of the South African régime and its allies. We automatically oppose any so-called internal settlement.

113. As regards diplomatic pressure and the use of force—because in default of any other recourse, we would unfortunately have to adopt the latter course—my delegation places its hopes in having the United Nations seriously consider using these means as the most feasible in achieving the objective of the liberation of Namibia, in

unity and with territorial integrity. If today we favour diplomatic pressure and the use of armed force it is because experience has shown very clearly what can be gained from South Africa by negotiations and what can be gained by the use of force.

114. The maintenance of more than 50,000 South African soldiers in Namibian territory who are committing barbaric acts against the innocent African population, and the aims of the régime to annex Walvis Bay, which is an integral and inseparable part of the territory of Namibia, are irrefutable proof of the diabolical intentions of the Pretoria régime. In this respect, no solution could be acceptable while such a force continued to occupy Namibian territory illegally and while South Africa hoped to annex Walvis Bay illegally and by force. Any attempt to gain independence for Namibia in the circumstances would be purely Utopian and would mean that the Namibian people would be the ones to suffer the consequences. Therefore, we condemn unequivocally the occupation of Namibia by South African forces and the annexation of Walvis Bay.

115. General Assembly resolution 2248 (S-V) of 19 May 1967, which established the United Nations Council for Namibia, ended the South African administration of Namibia, thus making the Territory the direct responsibility of the Council. Since that date the United Nations Council for Namibia has made unceasing efforts to secure independence for Namibia. However, everyone is well aware of the many difficulties which the Council has found in trying to carry out its mission, difficulties raised by the South African régime, which has tried to ignore its authority and is attempting to dissociate it from any solution of the problem. The Government of my country believes that at this session the General Assembly will adopt effective measures which will strengthen the authority of the United Nations Council for Namibia. The Council, which has a special responsibility for the administration of the Territory, must feel it is able to determine the conditions which would ensure genuine independence for Namibia and guarantee its unity and territorial integrity. The Council must not be kept out of any solution of the problem.

116. The diabolical tendency towards balkanization of the territory of Namibia constitutes the basic element in the South African policy of domination. The Namibian people must not be the victims of that barbarous policy of segregation, and the international community, which is aware of the right of the Namibian people to unity and a life of peace, cannot permit those divisive tendencies, which are based on tribal considerations and the sole aim of which is to provoke useless conflicts among the population. In this respect the OAU, like the United Nations, has rightly recognized SWAPO as the sole representative of the Namibian people, able to decide the destiny of Namibia, and for that organization any attempt to negotiate the future of Namibia with a tribal group or tribal groups would simply mean undermining the rights of a united and independent Namibia. The Government of the Republic of Equatorial Guinea, in expressing its full recognition of moral, political and diplomatic support for SWAPO, the organization of the living forces of Namibia, is aware that it is fulfilling the obligations and responsibilities implicit in international morality and, in particular, as a member of the African community of independent States.

117. The Government of my country, led by His Excellency the President of the Central Committee of the Single National Workers' Party and Constitutional Life President of the Republic, the great Comrade Masie Nguema Biyogo Negue Ndong, works untiringly, day and night, to put an end to colonialism in the African continent. Thus, legislative and administrative measures have been enacted to bring about the end of the colonialist and racist régimes of Pretoria and Salisbury. Those measures complement and ensure the application of the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. The foreign investment Law of the Republic of Equatorial Guinea, in article VI, provides that:

“Investments by physical or legal persons of South African or Rhodesian nationality are prohibited, as are investments by persons of Guinean nationality who reside habitually in either of those countries.”

118. Similarly, the basic laws of the Republic of Equatorial Guinea and its Single National Workers' Party legalize the struggle of the people of Guinea against colonialism, racism and racial discrimination.

119. For this reason and taking into account the line of conduct which my country follows, we believe that responsibility for eliminating colonialism in southern Africa is directly incumbent on all States Members of the United Nations, which must apply and ensure the application in their entirety of all the sanctions imposed against South Africa. My delegation not only solemnly accepts all the decisions of the United Nations concerning sanctions against South Africa, but is in favour of the extension of those sanctions until they are in accordance with the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter.

120. It is our view that if it is impossible for all Member States to apply sanctions against South Africa because of the negative attitude of some States which collaborate with the Vorster régime, then it is essential that armed force be used despite the serious consequences that will involve. We condemn unequivocally that collaboration, which is not only economic, political, social, scientific and diplomatic but also military, and even nuclear.

121. My delegation, as it has stated on many occasions previously, resolutely supports all the decisions already adopted by the United Nations. We reaffirm the principles set out in the Maputo Declaration in Support of the Peoples of Zimbabwe and Namibia and Programme of Action for the Liberation of Zimbabwe and Namibia, the Lagos Declaration against *Apartheid* and the Dakar Declaration on Namibia and Human Rights. We support resolutely and unreservedly the recommendations of the United Nations Council for Namibia adopted at its recent meeting at Lusaka on 23 March 1978, which have been submitted to this session.

122. We are confident that this special session of the General Assembly devoted to the question of Namibia will not be just another conference; we are convinced that it will mark a change in the process of decolonization in Namibia and that it will mean the end of the South African

presence in the Territory. We are optimistic that, after all the sacrifices imposed on them by the liberation struggle, the people of Namibia, led by SWAPO, will soon achieve the inevitable victory, and that the forces of reaction will never prevail.

123. Mr. McHENRY (United States of America): The need for convening a special session of the General Assembly on Namibia was first broached last summer. The special session is a part of the effort, waged on all fronts, by all Members of the United Nations to achieve the resolution of the Namibian question which has evaded the United Nations since the founding of this Organization. The planners of this special session were aware that, in addition to their efforts, the Governments of Canada, the Federal Republic of Germany, France, the United Kingdom and my own country, the United States, were also embarked on an initiative, unprecedented in the history of the United Nations, to see if through intensive co-operative effort they might develop a basis for a settlement of the Namibian question consistent with United Nations Security Council resolution 385 (1976). In the summer of 1977, we could only hope that our efforts might meet with success, but then we had no assurance.

124. This meeting of the General Assembly in special session occurs at a time when our own initiative has reached an important and decisive stage for the people of Namibia, for the people of the region of southern Africa and for the United Nations. This coincidence having occurred, we thought it important that the Assembly act in the full knowledge and understanding of the details of our work. Therefore, beginning with the statement by the Secretary of State for External Affairs of Canada, the five Governments have sought to explain our efforts as clearly as possible. We have done so, not with the objective of detracting from the work of this special session, but rather in an effort to enrich, to round out, and to make our discussion more realistic. The people of Namibia desperately want their own Government, not competition among those of us who share a similar objective to see who has the best solution or whose political or social ideology is best.

125. We have not sought, nor do we seek now, action by this Assembly on the proposal which we have placed before the Security Council. We recognize that the Security Council is the body which must act on our proposal. On the other hand, we are mindful of the crucial role which the General Assembly and other organs of the United Nations must play in any resolution of the Namibian question.

126. After a week of debate, most of the issues relating to the current situation in Namibia have already been raised in this Assembly. My colleagues have already responded to most of the questions regarding the initiative of the Five. In my remarks today, therefore, I do not wish to address the substance of the issues before us, but rather to describe the factors which we believe should guide us in our considerations. I wish to state, however, that the five Governments stand ready to provide any additional information which Members of this Assembly might wish. In addition, we remain ready to hold additional discussions with SWAPO in order to discuss further some of the concerns raised in its

communications to us last week and in its statements before the Assembly. Today, in response to a proposal by SWAPO, we have formally communicated to it our willingness to meet with a representative group from SWAPO, including those who may join them from Lusaka, starting on Friday of this week. We hope that those discussions will provide a further opportunity for that important group of Namibians to engage in an objective and searching analysis of the issues; to clarify further those provisions about which uncertainty exists; and, in the end, for us to allay some of the concerns which they have expressed about provisions of the proposal which we intend to put before the Security Council for its consideration.

127. We have listened carefully to the comments made during this debate, alert to any suggestions or proposals that we have not already weighed in the course of our year-long discussions with all the concerned parties on the Namibian question. It will come as no surprise to any representative here if I say that we have heard no new issues and no new proposal which had not already been raised by the parties and interested groups and considered by us during the course of the last year. But the difficult task before us is not the identification of the issues, but the development of a practical means of reconciling differing and frequently conflicting positions.

128. We would be the first to state that the proposal presented by the Five is not perfect and that it does not in every respect meet the maximum or even the minimum demands originally put forth by the parties. In the end, we found it necessary to make a determined effort to bridge the remaining gaps; those gaps were, in our view, sometimes substantial, but our effort was to find a solution that was fair and an equitable basis for a settlement. In no instance have we departed from the principles laid down in resolution 385 (1976).

129. We do suggest, however, that in its current form the proposal provides the best framework for a settlement. Others may speculate whether under changed circumstances—more time, for example—a more favourable proposal could be developed which was still capable of being acceptable to all the parties. In our view, the likelihood of developing such a proposal was not great given the constraints within which we worked. On the other hand, while the potential advantages were not significant the likely effect of failure loomed large.

130. It is our hope that the proposal will be considered as a whole, and not in its parts. It would be a mistake to single out those aspects which may not fully meet a desired objective or language description, while ignoring those aspects of the proposal intended to provide the necessary balance. It has always been our hope that the parties would weigh carefully all aspects of the proposal and decide that on balance it represents the best that can be put forward at this time under the circumstances.

131. Our considerations here do not take place in a vacuum. In recent weeks the cycle of repression, violence and the resulting bitterness and distrust has continued in Namibia at a disturbing pace. The level of fighting along

Namibia's borders has increased markedly and from all indications it will increase more. There is an increasing tendency to resolve differences within the Territory through the barrel of a gun, rather than through democratic processes. Scores have been killed.

132. In addition, while the South African Government is commendably engaged in discussions which might lead to a peaceful settlement, it has once again resorted to the deplorable practice of politically based arrests without charge or trial, so that today virtually the entire leadership of SWAPO in Namibia is in detention.

133. It is of little value to engage in sterile arguments over which of the parties should first cease its actions. We can and should call upon all parties to exercise restraint and to give the forces of peace a chance. However, it is clear that the cycle of repression and violence, violence and repression and the inevitable hatred to which they give birth will not end until a comprehensive resolution is found. We in the international community must therefore redouble our efforts to find a solution if we are to avert the addition of further complexities to an already complex task.

134. We are among the first to admit that there are inherent risks in the proposal we have put forth, and indeed there are inherent risks in any proposal which might provide a practical path to agreement. But no solution is fail-safe. We can only minimize the possibilities of failure by ensuring that the necessary safeguards are an integral part of the proposal. That, we believe we have done. It is our view that once these changes take place, the process of Namibian independence under internationally acceptable conditions will proceed to its inevitable conclusion, whatever reservations or desires regarding the outcome the parties may secretly harbour. Certainly, a Territory free of South African military forces and with a substantial United Nations civilian and military presence provides a better opportunity than at present to accomplish our goals.

135. In the final analysis, the parties must not only consider the proposal before us; they must also consider the alternative. They must consider the alternative, not with the bravado of revolutionary and ideological sloganeering, but in the harsh light of practical political realities—in the light of 30 years of resolutions which have yet to remove South Africa's now illegal control over the Territory.

136. The alternative is clear. We can continue with the current situation, content to pass paper resolutions while South Africa effectively retains control of the Territory and while the cycle of repression and violence continues unabated. That is the path about which there can be no illusions and no uncertainties. It is the path of prolonged violence, of increased hatred and of unacceptable delay in the ability of the people of Namibia to govern themselves and to chart their own course for the future.

137. The alternative which we have proposed has the clear possibility of ending the cycle of repression and violence and of obtaining Namibia's independence peacefully and in the near future. What is in question is not Namibia's independence, but the modalities of transition to that independence. The proposals provide the first opportunity

to place explicit controls on the currently unchecked South African administration of the Territory.

138. There is an understandable concern among Namibians not to rush into agreements which in the end might simply add an international stamp of approval to an unjust system. Their suspicion and caution are understandable; for they are born out of their own experience. It is our hope that that caution will lead to a careful examination of the proposal. But it is equally our hope that the people of Namibia have not and will not become captives of their experience and will not so act as to let this opportunity to resolve the Namibian question at an early date and without further conflict slip past, perhaps not to recur for some time in the future.

139. The United Nations, as each Member of our Organization, bears a special responsibility at this time. There is a need to resolve the remaining issues in southern Africa so that the people of the region can get on with the task of development and thus themselves meet their own needs. A settlement of the Namibian question would have a salutary effect on the problems of the region.

140. Unlike Rhodesia, Namibia is a direct responsibility of the United Nations. It is our responsibility to ensure that the people of Namibia achieve their independence. That is our primary task and it cannot be subordinated to ideological differences, or to any special relationship which any of us may hope to have with an independent Namibia.

141. Finally, I wish to touch on what no doubt is the most important consideration of all as we consider how to move forward towards a settlement—as we consider how to accept the risks, how to seize the opportunities before us. This is the elusive question of faith, of belief in the motivations and commitment of all concerned. The long and frequently frustrating effort of the Five has encountered this question at every turn. We have attempted to be faithful in our perseverance, in our attempt to retain a balanced approach to all aspects of the problem, and in the openness with which we have laid out the issues for the parties and for this Assembly. We want settlement of the Namibian question—and we want it now. And for that we are willing to work within the terms of Security Council resolution 385 (1976).

142. I wish to affirm to the Members of the United Nations that my Government is committed to this goal—to an internationally acceptable settlement of the Namibian question. We accept and support the aspirations of the Namibian people. We are committed to this objective and to the effort which we are engaged in as a major undertaking of the United States Government. And it is our intention to see it through until the end.

*Mr. Mojsov (Yugoslavia) returned to the Chair.*

143. Mr. FERNANDES (Guinea-Bissau): Mr. President, allow me to take this opportunity to congratulate you on your election as our chief in the deliberations of the General Assembly at this ninth special session. It is a fitting tribute to your country, which has done so much for the cause of Africa and its freedom. Moreover, Yugoslavia has been a member of the United Nations Council for Namibia

from the very beginning in 1967, and has played a very important role in the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. I do not think there is a man better qualified than yourself to be President of the Assembly at this historic special session. Your face, Sir, has been very familiar in the halls of this institution. At the closing of the thirty-second session last year, our dean, Mr. Baroody, stated that you were one of the best Presidents, if not the best President, this Assembly has ever had. Ambassador Baroody is highly qualified to make such a statement since he has been here longer than anybody else. I fully share his opinion.

144. Ten years have elapsed since the International Court of Justice at The Hague ruled that South Africa was occupying Namibia illegally.

145. Eleven years have elapsed since the General Assembly met in a special session to create the Council for South West Africa (Namibia), in an attempt to get South Africa to relinquish an international trust which it had transformed into a mandate for brutality. It has now been 12 years since the General Assembly voted, with only two dissenting votes, that the Mandate should be terminated.

146. For 30 years, the General Assembly has been besieged by this question, and here we are again, trying to find a solution to the question of Namibia—meeting again in an attempt to find a just solution to a problem for which the international community bears full responsibility. It is thus the responsibility of each and every one of us in this hall.

147. For three generations, South Africa has been plundering the resources of Namibia, mining its mineral wealth for the benefit of a minority and, in many instances, with the active participation of multinational companies. Thus, the international Mandate has been transformed into international plundering.

148. The natives of Namibia have become aliens in their own nation. The whole country has been transformed into a handsomely profitable enterprise for the benefit of a few. But matters did not stop there. *Apartheid* was brought in to regulate the daily life of Namibians. In Namibia the owners of the Territory found themselves in a position whereby they were told where to go, whom to see and where to live—in other words, the Namibians themselves became the property of the ruling clique. To complete the dominance of their trusteeship, the Mandate became a vicious circle of torture, oppression, imprisonment and confinement to remote areas. The inhuman concept of pass laws was introduced, and bantustans and homelands were established to complete the domination. Only a few days ago, on 18 April to be exact, the South African administrator in Namibia announced that legislation applicable under the law for the prevention of violence would be enforced and authorized the security forces to arrest anyone considered to be disturbing the peace for whatever length of time they felt like.

149. The Territory of Namibia has been turned into a military camp for aggression against neighbouring African countries, especially Angola. Still fresh in our minds are the incursions of thousands of South African troops into

Angola, using Namibia as a springboard. Lately we have seen that the Kalahari Desert is to be used as a testing ground for the development of nuclear weapons by South Africa.

150. But fortunately this arrogance of power, this wanton plundering of Namibian wealth and dignity and these naked acts of aggression are coming to an end. They are coming to an end thanks to the struggle waged by the peoples of the former Portuguese colonies and, above all, thanks to the tenacious struggle of the people of Namibia led by SWAPO, which is the only party in the country that cares for the interests of the Namibians. To bring about these changes, a significant role was also played by the United Nations in general, and by the past and present High Commissioners for Namibia, and I take this opportunity to congratulate the President of the Council for Namibia, Ambassador Konie, on a job well done.

151. South Africa is aware of all the changes that are taking place and is therefore trying desperately to counter them, resorting to more oppression and fostering tribal strife to justify an even greater repression. Only last year we were treated to a political charade called the Turnhalle talks. Under that scheme, South Africa tried to rob Namibia of the fruit of years of struggle and to replace SWAPO with a handful of political appointees in a vain attempt to perpetuate its presence in the Territory. That charade was an all too obvious exercise in futility and eventually had to be abandoned by South Africa.

152. Following the initiative of the five Western members of the Security Council we were informed that South Africa was willing to accept their proposal as a basis for negotiations, except for Walvis Bay—the only deep sea port in the area—which it claims as part of the Territory of South Africa.

153. We are witnessing again the blatant arrogance of power of South Africa. After 60 years of plundering and robbing the Territory of Namibia at will, one does not hear one single word about paying compensation for the ill-gotten wealth that they have been plundering, but, instead, we hear a counter claim of an inherent right to Walvis Bay. My delegation was astonished to hear the Canadian Secretary of State for External Affairs state, on behalf of the five Western countries [*3rd meeting*], that he sees no way of settling the Walvis Bay question at the moment in the negotiations and that the question must be subject to discussions between the Government of South Africa and the elected Government of Namibia. My Government fully shares the position taken by the President of SWAPO construing this position to be an unfortunate compromise with an obvious South African neo-colonialist design to gain strategic leverage whereby it could easily commit aggression against an independent Namibia. It is tantamount to an attempt to remove the consideration of Walvis Bay from the United Nations agenda, thereby making it easier for South Africa to twist the arm of Namibia. It is our opinion that South Africa should unconditionally remove its troops forthwith from the Bay area and hand over the place to United Nations troops.

154. In the halls of the United Nations lately one has the impression that there is a tendency to equate the oppressor



with the oppressed. My delegation has some reservations about the initiative of the Western countries, but we are willing to give it the benefit of the doubt.

155. Only a few days ago, a representative of a Western country approached me saying that after Vorster's statement he thought that the ball was now in SWAPO's court. I simply asked him, "Are you aware that South Africa has never taught the Namibians how to play tennis?" And then I added, "I would have understood you better if you had said, 'The knife is now at SWAPO's throat'".

156. It is the opinion of my Government that document A/S-9/7 is an excellent one and that it can be used as a working paper in our deliberations in the Assembly. It is our contention that resolution 385 (1976), which was adopted by the Security Council in 1976, can also be used as a guideline in our determination.

157. We feel that the liberation of Namibia cannot be achieved if the following conditions are not met: complete withdrawal of all South African troops from the Territory; release of all political prisoners; dismantling of all bantustans, security forces and tribal armies and placing of the police force under the control of United Nations forces; return of all Namibians in exile to their country; removal of the whole South African administrative machinery and the placing of Namibia under the authority of the United Nations during this period. The territorial integrity of Namibia, especially Walvis Bay, is not subject to negotiation.

158. Mr. President, I am quite sure that under your leadership this Assembly will find the correct means of helping Namibia in this crucial stage of the life of that country. We are also aware that South Africa might refuse to comply with the recommendations emanating from this General Assembly, and that the Assembly should now start contemplating recommending to the Security Council the application of Chapter VII of the Charter.

159. My party, the Partido Africano da Independência da Guiné e Cabo Verde (PAIGC), has a long history of collaboration and association with SWAPO and its leaders. Throughout these past years that we have been dealing with SWAPO we have made good friends among its ranks, and one of them is my good friend, Sam Nujoma. We know that they have fought gallantly in the battle for the liberation of their oppressed people. We know that, whatever decision we may take in this Assembly, the ultimate decision rests with SWAPO and its leaders. We are quite sure that SWAPO will live up to its responsibilities, as it has done in the past—and I do not have to tell it that.

160. *A luta continua.*

161. Mr. KIKHIA (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*interpretation from Arabic*): More than 10 years have passed since, on 27 October 1966, the General Assembly adopted resolution 2145 (XXI), which provided for terminating South Africa's Mandate over Namibia and placing the administration of Namibia under the direct responsibility of the United Nations. Since then, South Africa's presence in Namibia has been illegal and contrary to international law. It is also a violation of the United Nations Charter and a

challenge to the more than 30 resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council on the question.

162. South Africa continues to flout United Nations resolutions. It wishes to turn Namibia into an arsenal and a springboard for acts of aggression against neighbouring African countries. That cannot but be a matter of grave concern to us, because South Africa's presence in Namibia and its refusal to withdraw from that Territory, whose natural resources it is systematically plundering, are a challenge to the United Nations. It flouts General Assembly resolution 1803 (XVII), which stresses the right of permanent sovereignty of the peoples over their natural resources and their freedom to use those resources in the best way they see fit to serve their progress and growth.

163. It also flouts the decree adopted by the United Nations Council for Namibia concerning control over the resources of that Territory<sup>2</sup>, paragraph 1 of which prohibits any person, entity or company from selling, exploiting or exporting the natural, mineral or animal resources of Namibia, without the permission of the Council, which was founded, under General Assembly resolution 2248 (S-V) of 19 May 1967, to be the legal authority to administer Namibia until its independence.

164. The United Nations has adopted several resolutions stressing the right of the Namibian people to independence and freedom. The most recent is General Assembly resolution 32/9, of 4 November 1977, which strongly condemned South Africa for its persistent refusal to comply with Security Council resolution 385 (1976). It also condemned the South African administration for its massive repression of the people of Namibia and their liberation movement with the intention of establishing an atmosphere of intimidation and terror for the purpose of imposing a political arrangement aimed at subverting the territorial integrity and unity of Namibia. That resolution also exposed the imperialist interests in Namibia and the co-operation of the imperialist Powers and their assistance in developing the capability of South Africa to manufacture nuclear weapons.

165. In view of the worsening situation in Namibia and the policy of brutal violence carried out against the Namibian people by the South African racist administration, the General Assembly recommended in the resolution mentioned above that this special session should be convened, to remedy the deterioration of the situation, since that could lead to a conflagration threatening peace and security in the entire world.

166. The racist South African entity by its continued illegal presence in Namibia has not confined itself to flouting United Nations resolutions; it has gone so far as to promulgate a law—dated 22 September 1977—proclaiming the illegal annexation of Walvis Bay, an integral part of Namibian territory. That act of aggression against the people of Namibia, which is designed to serve the purposes of South African expansion, to the detriment of Namibia's territorial integrity, has been condemned by the United Nations Council for Namibia and by the General Assembly,

<sup>2</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-ninth session, Supplement No. 24A*, para. 84.

and has been declared null and void. This measure taken by the illegal administration, whose purpose is to undermine the territorial integrity and unity of Namibia, has been condemned by the Organization of African Unity, in a resolution adopted during the thirtieth session of its Council of Ministers, held at Tripoli, in the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, from 20 to 28 February last. That resolution declared that the Council of Ministers of the OAU vigorously condemned South Africa's illegal annexation of Walvis Bay. It reiterated that Walvis Bay is an integral part of Namibia, and demanded that South Africa respect the territorial integrity of Namibia.

167. With the victory of the African people in Mozambique and Angola and the accession of the peoples of those two countries to independence and freedom, the racist South African régime and its allies finally understood the danger posed by the intensification of the armed struggle in Zimbabwe and Namibia. They also understood that the continuation of that struggle would inevitably lead to the accession of the peoples of those Territories to freedom and independence, posing a danger to the South African racist entity and to the colonialist interests. That is why those Powers—to avoid that situation—have tried to create a so-called peaceful settlement of the Namibian problem, with the aim of achieving the following objectives: first, to prevent the United Nations from establishing majority rule, under the leadership of SWAPO, the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people, and, secondly, to establish a puppet régime in Namibia so as to give the illusion of independence to this Territory, while enabling South Africa to maintain its power there and subsequently to maintain the interests of the imperialist Powers in the region.

168. This was referred to directly by the former Secretary of State of the United States, Mr. Henry Kissinger, after his trip to southern Africa at the beginning of 1976. He said the following to the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Congress:

“We are concerned about a continent politically embittered and economically estranged from the West, and we see ahead a process of radicalization which will place severe strains on our allies in Europe and Japan.”<sup>3</sup>

169. In May 1976, Mr. Kissinger said the following to the United States Senate:

“We have a stake . . . in not having the whole continent become radical and move in a direction that is incompatible with Western interests. That is the issue.”<sup>3</sup>

170. In September 1976, during a press conference in Washington, Mr. Kissinger stated:

“We are facing a situation in which a so-called armed struggle is already taking place in Rhodesia and is beginning in Namibia. The history of these struggles is that they lead to escalating violence . . . and have the danger of the probability of the radicalization of the whole continent of Africa.”<sup>3</sup>

171. Mr. Kissinger said also that the United States and the Western Powers were concerned about the situation in southern Africa and that most of the Western countries were now aware that it was impossible to continue their support to the illegal occupation of Namibia. That statement was made at Lusaka on 27 April 1976.

172. All these trips and statements by Mr. Kissinger received a great deal of publicity in the Western press. Mr. Kissinger was portrayed as the apostle of peace who was heaven-sent to solve, with his magic wand, the African problem. All this happened after it had been demonstrated that the racist régime, despite its powerful weapons, was unable to liquidate the African people and to put an end to their struggle to attain their usurped rights, their independence and freedom.

173. However, after all these attempts, we see the Western Powers are no longer able to maintain the illegal occupation of Namibia. Nevertheless, those Powers are endeavouring to defend the South African racist entity, preventing the Security Council from taking the necessary measures against the racist régime by using the veto against the draft resolution presented in the Council by the non-aligned countries. Those were the efforts made by the Western Powers on behalf of South Africa in the context of the efforts to achieve the so-called peaceful settlement made in 1976.

174. As to the role played by the racist entity of Vorster, that was revealed in the convening of the Constitutional Conference at Windhoek in early 1975, with the participation of white representatives and some tribal chiefs considered as moderate. The talks in that Constitutional Conference were conducted according to a plan which gave South Africa total control over the final results of the talks, which were based on the following principles: (a) that South Africa should decide the date for independence; (b) that it was impossible to accept a settlement which did not receive the support of the white minority; (c) that the policy of bantustanization would be continued.

175. On 12 August 1976 the results of that Constitutional Conference were proclaimed. It was stated that the conferring parties had reached an agreement on the establishment of a government based on racial principles, on the constitution, on the establishment of a permanent government and on the designation of 31 December 1978 as the date for Namibia's independence.

176. The United Nations Council for Namibia condemned that Conference and SWAPO, the genuine representative of the Namibian people, which had been excluded from the talks, announced that the agreement did not produce any results which could lead to self-determination and real independence for Namibia.

177. The racist régime in South Africa chose the month of August 1976 to announce the results of the so-called Constitutional Conference, the same date given by the Security Council to the régime for implementing resolution 385 (1976), unanimously adopted by the Council on 30 January 1976, which decided that the end of August would be the date for further meetings to consider to what extent the South African régime had complied with that resolution

<sup>3</sup> Quoted in English by the speaker.

and that, in the case the régime had failed to implement the resolution, the Council would consider taking measures against it in accordance with Article VII of the Charter.

178. After proclaiming the results of the Constitutional Conference of Windhoek, the South African administration remained where it was, and the foreign corporations continued to control the Namibian economy and South Africa continued its exploitation of Namibia's people and its natural resources. And we can see that the Western Powers, permanent members of the Security Council, continue to have recourse to the veto to oppose the draft resolution introduced by the non-aligned countries. These two events constitute act two of the farce, a so-called search for a peaceful settlement.

179. Of course, this farce is composed of several acts, the number of which is ignored by its producers. So, in the beginning of 1977 the second act began. It was set in a new framework of concern about the fact that peace was being threatened in South Africa and about the violation of human rights that had been going on throughout the existence of the racist régime in southern Africa. But unfortunately, attention was not drawn to the violation of those rights until early in 1977. That was the date chosen by the sponsors of the peaceful settlement farce to begin act two, so as to prevent the Security Council from taking effective measures against the South African racist entity, under the pretext that this was not the right time for such a move, so long as contacts were being made between representatives of the Western Powers and that entity in an effort to realize the following two important objectives: (a) to persuade the South African entity to exercise pressure on the illegal régime of southern Rhodesia to participate in negotiations aimed at reaching a peaceful settlement with regard to the problem of Zimbabwe; (b) to bring about a peaceful settlement of the Namibian problem in keeping with Security Council resolution 385 (1976).

180. The sponsors of that act claimed that in order for the Council to show opposition to the South African racist policy, the Council should issue a statement to be delivered by the President. That statement, however, was never issued because the Western Powers insisted that, since it had to be worded in a specific manner, it would actually do more harm than good to the problem.

181. The African countries members of the Security Council, among which our country is included, have not insisted on the need to vote on the draft resolutions presented to the Council so as to permit the Western countries to pursue their contacts with the South African régime. Thus, the Council had to suspend consideration of the South African problem at the end of March 1977 to take it up again six months later. The Western Powers have shown hostility to the African people and have offered their continued support to the Pretoria régime, which not only has taken an obstinate stand regarding the relevant resolutions of the Security Council but also has intensified its acts of repression and intimidation against the African people of Namibia and South Africa. Thus, the Western Powers have adopted, once again, a favourable attitude towards injustice and repression in opposing the adoption of African draft resolutions presented to the Council which provided for boycotting the South African régime as long as

that régime persisted in defying the resolutions and the Charter of the United Nations.

182. One can thus see the conclusion of the second act of the comedy of what the Western Powers call the search for a peaceful settlement of the problem of southern Africa. The results are the same as those obtained from the first act.

183. The chief adversaries of the African people are the racist minority régimes in Namibia, South Africa and Zimbabwe. Then come the colonialist countries, which have devoted themselves to defending those régimes in international bodies and, whenever they felt it necessary, have impeded the adoption of effective measures in the Security Council aimed at putting an end to the régimes' obstinate flouting of the resolutions and the Charter of the United Nations. In third place come the countries which are attempting to increase the defensive strength of those racist régimes by giving them weapons and assistance in the manufacture of destructive weapons to be used against the African peoples. In fourth place come the countries which are co-operating economically with those régimes, thereby violating decisions of the United Nations and flouting the United Nations Charter and world public opinion.

184. The racist régimes which we are addressing, particularly that in South Africa, cannot continue alone to defy the will of the international community and to ignore the recommendations of the General Assembly and the Security Council. They could not do so for long if they did not find countries to help them to defy international public opinion and the United Nations resolutions and Charter. What is involved here is not only the fact that the racist régimes in Pretoria and Namibia persist in their illegal defiance of Security Council and General Assembly resolutions but the fact that this régime is supported by countries which were among the original signatories of the Charter of the United Nations and guarantors of respect for it. These countries are willing today to violate that Charter for the protection of that racist régime, and to encourage it to keep on violating the United Nations resolutions, as well as ignoring the freedom and fundamental rights of man, rights for which the reactionaries, imperialists and world capitalistic forces shed crocodile tears on every occasion, claiming to be the defenders when they actually are the real executioners.

185. In view of the continued support of the Western countries for the racist entities in southern Africa, the African people, as a whole, have lost confidence in each and every step or initiative advocated by these countries which claim to be seeking a peaceful settlement of the problems in southern Africa. Experience has shown us that these countries do not speak seriously but rather have attempted to impose plans which are directed towards the capitulation of the African people, sometimes by force and sometimes by persuasion. How else can we explain the preparation by the Western countries of their plan for a solution of the Namibian problem and the distribution of that plan as an official document of the Security Council at the very moment when the South African racist entity is continuing to mass troops in Namibia, where more than 50,000 soldiers are already to be found, particularly in the north of the Territory, soldiers who engage in constant terrorist

activities against the civilian population in order to maintain a climate of fear and terror at all times? How can we explain too the fact that South Africa is attempting to train ethnic armies to be used against the Namibian people to create dissension among them, applying the well-known colonialist principle of divide and rule?

186. These are questions which cannot be treated lightly. The Council of Ministers of the OAU, at its thirtieth regular session held at Tripoli from 20 to 28 February 1978, denounced that policy, just as it denounced the annexation of Walvis Bay, an integral part of Namibia, an annexation which is further proof of the fact that the racist entity is obstinately continuing to defy the Charter and the resolutions of the United Nations.

187. In examining the draft proposal for a settlement of the Namibian situation, in document S/12636, we note that it adds nothing new to the statements made by the spokesman of the Western Powers in 1977 to the interested parties, which included my country at that time since it was a member of the Security Council. The only new—and even curious—thing is the date on which the document was officially submitted, that is to say, once the date of the special session of the General Assembly on Namibia had been set and less than a month before it opened. The choice of that precise date to submit the document arouses legitimate suspicions on our part.

188. In the introduction of this proposal for a settlement of the Namibian situation which relates to the transfer of power in Namibia to an independent Government in accordance with Security Council resolution 385 (1976), we note first that paragraph 4 states that the authors of the text believe “that this proposal provides an effective basis for implementing resolution 385 (1976) while taking adequate account of the interests of all parties involved”. But who are “all the parties” whose interests, according to the sponsors, must be taken into consideration?

189. Paragraph 2 of the introduction refers to “an appropriate United Nations role in accordance with resolution 385 (1976)”. There again, what is meant by “an appropriate role” when referring to participation of the United Nations? In our view and that of all African States, the appropriate role of the United Nations is to take effective measures with respect to the administration of the Territory after the immediate withdrawal of the South African forces and administration, that is the role referred to in the decisions and resolutions of the United Nations, in particular Security Council resolution 385 (1976). Next, the question is to know how free and honest elections can take place under United Nations control while the South African administration and forces remain in Namibia under the orders and commands of the Administrator-General, that is to say, while the police forces charged with maintaining order in the Territory will be essentially forces under South African control.

190. Paragraph 10 states that “The United Nations special representative will take steps to guarantee against the possibility of intimidation or interference with the electoral process from whatever quarter.” But, in truth, what measures could he take, in the minds of the authors of the proposal, while the South African administration continued

to administer the Territory? Would those measures consist in bringing complaints or taking decisions, which would be added to all the previous resolutions which South Africa has chosen to ignore until now?

191. No, as I have already said, this proposal brings nothing new. Because of its ambiguity, and also the date on which it was submitted, we question its seriousness. We believe that it is but a new act in this comedy. The goal pursued by the Western Powers, in agreement with the racist régime of South Africa, is to attempt to create a new colonial situation in the Territory through a kind of fictitious independence.

192. The authors, before presenting this so-called proposal for a peaceful solution in Namibia, should first have determined in which camp they were: in the camp of law and justice sought by the African people of Namibia, all African peoples and all peace-loving peoples, or in the camp of injustice and oppression. Those countries must tell us very clearly whether they intend to continue their manoeuvres against the African people in southern Africa, to continue—in order to deceive world public opinion, and in particular that in their own countries—pretending that they are seeking a peaceful solution of the African problems in South Africa when in reality they continue to defend the racist régimes in the Security Council and in other international bodies and support them economically, financially and politically, so as to prevent the taking of effective measures against those régimes. That attitude has been denounced by the African people, who suffer greater loss of innocent human lives each day, while the racist régime and its friends continue to try to gain time in order to reap still more material profits through their multinational corporations and to exploit a little longer the natural and human resources of Namibia. Their policy is to gain time and to seek to impose a fictitious independence by placing power in the hands of puppet régimes of their creation. The time has come for those countries to tell us frankly and clearly what their position is with regard to the historic and decisive struggle being waged by the people of Africa against the racist régime. They must also take full responsibility for the results of that policy of obstinately supporting the racist régimes in southern Africa.

193. The favourite argument of the Western countries in seeking to justify their policy is that of their economic interests and public opinion in their countries. But the whole world knows very well that world public opinion, including public opinion in the Western countries, is much further advanced with respect to questions of racism than are the Governments of the countries in question. The real problems before us are not with the peoples of those countries but with the régimes in power and the Governments, that is to say, with capitalism. Those régimes and Governments seek to impose an illusory solution of the Namibian problem in an effort to lull public opinion, in Europe as in the United States. We for our part know very well that with regard to the problems of racism the peoples of Europe and the United States are far more advanced than are their Governments, and that the pressure that they exercise runs counter to the position of those Governments.

194. The African people seek above all peace, they seek above all a peaceful solution to the problems of southern

Africa. And if they resort to arms, it is because they really have no other means of attaining freedom and independence. The African people believe that the real solution of the problem of Namibia lies in the respect by the South African racist entity of the resolutions of the United Nations, and in particular of Security Council resolutions 366 (1974) and 385 (1976).

195. This was clearly stated in the Declaration on Namibia of the Council of Ministers of the OAU at its ninth special session, held from 7 to 10 April 1975 at Dar es Salaam. In that Declaration, it is clearly stipulated that, should South Africa fail to observe the United Nations resolutions which request South Africa to end its illegal occupation of Namibia, the OAU should offer all possible assistance and support to SWAPO in its armed struggle to ensure the liberation and independence of the Namibian people.

196. The Council of Ministers of the OAU, at its thirtieth regular session, held at Tripoli, Libya, from 20 to 28 February 1978, reaffirmed its full support for the armed struggle being carried on by SWAPO in order to put an end to the South African occupation of Namibia. It also reaffirmed that any negotiations concerning the independence of Namibia must be accepted by SWAPO, the legitimate representative of the Namibian people, and by the United Nations, the legal Administering Authority of the Territory.

197. To sum up, the aim of the OAU in supporting the people of Namibia, led by SWAPO, is to arrive at a just and lasting solution of the Namibian problem and to put an end to the persistent acts of oppression and aggression against the Namibian people and to the assassination of freedom fighters and the fragmentation of the Territory by the creation of bantustans.

198. Within the framework of the preparations for this special session of the General Assembly, the United Nations Council for Namibia met at Lusaka, Zambia, on 23 March 1978 and adopted a Declaration [*see A/S-9/4, para. 31*]. In that Declaration can be found the opinion of the Council on the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa, which constitutes a threat to international peace and security. Paragraph 35 of that Declaration also contains the following objectives:

(a) The reaffirmation of the direct responsibility of the United Nations for Namibia;

(b) The determination of the conditions and steps which will ensure the immediate and genuine independence of Namibia;

(c) The reaffirmation of the territorial integrity of Namibia;

(d) The implementation of the Maputo Programme of Action for the Liberation of Zimbabwe and Namibia;

(e) The condemnation and unqualified rejection of any so-called internal settlement in Namibia;

(f) The strengthening of SWAPO as the vanguard of the struggle of the Namibian people for genuine national liberation and independence;

(g) A call upon those countries which have not yet done so to recognize SWAPO as the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people.

199. In paragraphs 36 and 37 of that Declaration, the Council recommends that the General Assembly should urge the Security Council to apply the measures necessary to terminate South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia and that, in the event of the Security Council's inability to adopt concrete measures, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, to compel South Africa to end its illegal occupation by withdrawing from the Territory, the General Assembly, cognizant of the fact that this is a unique instance in which the United Nations has assumed direct responsibility for Namibia, should urgently consider what action is necessary in this regard.

200. Experience has taught us that partial solutions and half-measures cannot lead to an equitable settlement and that peace can only be based on justice, and justice can be realized only through the attainment by the peoples of their right to independence and self-determination. It is high time for recognition of the rights of oppressed peoples, including those of the Namibian people, which is suffering injustice, oppression and inhuman treatment in violation of the resolutions of the United Nations, of world public opinion and of the moral principles which prohibit all discrimination on grounds of race and colour.

201. The question of Namibia, being a unique instance in which the United Nations has assumed direct responsibility, in accordance with paragraph 37 of the Lusaka Declaration, the General Assembly should take the necessary measures that would guarantee the implementation of the resolutions previously adopted.

202. Our country will continue to support the just struggle being carried out by the Namibian people under the leadership of SWAPO. We shall do everything we can in the moral and material spheres and we are prepared to play the part assigned to us by the United Nations to ensure the application of the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council so as to enable the Namibian people to enjoy freedom and independence.

203. Finally, I reaffirm that the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya unreservedly supports SWAPO's position as stated here last Friday by our militant brother, Sam Nujoma, its President [*10th meeting*], who declared that the Namibian people were ready to continue negotiations but were in no way prepared to commit the crime of suicide as regards the national problem of Namibia.

204. The PRESIDENT: We have heard the last speaker in the debate on agenda item 7.

*The meeting rose at 6.40 p.m.*

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

NINTH SPECIAL SESSION

Official Records



**15th  
PLENARY MEETING**

Wednesday, 3 May 1978,  
at 11.20 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

- Agenda item 3:  
Credentials of representatives to the ninth special session of the  
General Assembly (*concluded*):  
(b) Report of the Credentials Committee
- Agenda item 7:  
Question of Namibia (*concluded*)
- Agenda item 2:  
Minute of silent prayer or meditation
- Closure of the ninth special session

*President: Mr. Lazar MOJSOV (Yugoslavia).*

AGENDA ITEM 3

**Credentials of representatives to the ninth special session of  
the General Assembly (*concluded*):**  
(b) Report of the Credentials Committee (A/S-9/10)

1. The PRESIDENT: Since no representative has asked to speak on this item, I invite members to turn their attention to the draft resolution recommended by the Credentials Committee in paragraph 14 of its report (A/S-9/10).
2. The Credentials Committee adopted that draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt the draft resolution?

*The draft resolution was adopted (resolution S-9/1).*

AGENDA ITEM 7

**Question of Namibia (*concluded*)**

**Report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee of the  
ninth special session (A/S-9/11)**

3. Mr. VLASCEANU (Romania), Rapporteur of the *Ad Hoc* Committee of the ninth special session: As the Rapporteur of the *Ad Hoc* Committee of the ninth special session, I have the honour to present to the General Assembly the report of that Committee contained in document A/S-9/11 dated 2 May 1978.
4. The report is submitted in accordance with a decision taken by the Assembly at the 1st plenary meeting of its current special session, by which the Committee was entrusted with the task of considering the proposals submitted under item 7 and of reporting thereon to the Assembly.

5. At its 1st meeting, following the elections of the Committee officers, the *Ad Hoc* Committee decided that it should consider the working paper submitted by the United Nations Council for Namibia [see A/S-9/7] containing the draft declaration on Namibia and programme of action in support of self-determination and national independence for Namibia directly in Committee, rather than creating a subsidiary body to review the draft text.

6. The *Ad Hoc* Committee held five meetings between 27 April and 2 May and, following extensive consultations, adopted the draft declaration and programme of action as proposed by the United Nations Council for Namibia, by a roll-call vote of 88 votes to none, with 18 abstentions. The text of the draft resolution embodying the declaration and programme of action appears in paragraph 10 of the report for consideration by the Assembly.

7. On behalf of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, I commend this report to the serious attention of the General Assembly in the confident hope that it will receive the full support of the Member States, thus reaffirming the will and determination of the United Nations to act firmly to discharge its direct responsibility towards Namibia until independence, and to implement the solemn obligation assumed by this Organization to assist the Namibian people in attaining their independence in a free and united Namibia.

*Pursuant to rule 66 of the rules of procedure, it was decided not to discuss the report of the Ad Hoc Committee of the ninth special session.*

8. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their vote before the vote.

9. Mr. CORRÊA DA COSTA (Brazil): In my capacity as Chairman of the Latin-American Group it is incumbent upon me to convey to the General Assembly the Group's position on the question of Namibia.

10. The countries of our region have attended the present special session of the General Assembly with the firm and resolute intention of making a positive contribution to the cause of the self-determination and independence of Namibia. Latin America has always sided with the Namibian patriots represented by the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), and has constantly and unfailingly supported the successive measures that have been taken to advance the forthcoming independence of the country.

11. Inspired by its loyalty to the cause of anti-colonialism and to the ideals of the United Nations, the Latin-American Group has maintained the widest possible range of contacts, and has, at all times, emphasized the pre-eminence of the

international community as represented in the United Nations, particularly in the General Assembly, in all that may bring about and accelerate a peaceful and democratic solution of the Namibian question.

12. This spirit has encouraged some Latin-American countries to attempt to translate our support for the cause of Namibia's liberation into concrete definitions, which could constitute a constructive contribution to the solution of this fundamental question.

13. All the contacts made by the Group indicated, however, that the best possible contribution Latin America had to offer to the cause at this current session consisted in supporting the draft declaration and programme of action for Namibia with their votes.

14. I should like to stress, moreover, the determined will of the regional Group I am honoured to represent to continue to serve the lofty cause of anti-colonialism and to contribute to the attainment of self-determination and independence by Namibia, with territorial integrity, which certainly includes Walvis Bay.

15. Latin America wishes to put on record that it is firmly convinced of the primary responsibility of the United Nations in the process of the liberation of Namibia to ensure the free expression of the will of its people as it emerges to independent life as a sovereign State.

16. Mr. HARRY (Australia): My delegation regrets that it will be unable to support the draft declaration and programme of action on Namibia. Delegations, particularly those also members of the Council for Namibia, will be aware of Australia's views on South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia and our wish to see a prompt movement to independence in the Territory. Australia is committed to a process that accords with Security Council resolution 385 (1976). Above all, we wish to see the peaceful evolution of a truly independent Namibia, a Namibia not wasted by war, or, as I said in my statement in the plenary meeting on 24 April, "... embittered and crippled by the hates and destruction engendered by the conflict". [2nd meeting, para. 201.] Australia, therefore, will not support armed struggle to bring about independence. It hardly needs to be added that we will not commend intensification of the armed struggle.

17. I would add that, as we have made clear on many previous occasions—particularly in the working group of the Council that prepared the draft and, indeed, at Lusaka when the Council for Namibia adopted a Declaration not dissimilar from the document before us—other points in the draft declaration create difficulties for us, but I do not propose to go into the substance of these again.

18. We would not wish to see this session of the Assembly disturb what we regard as the best chance for a peaceful resolution of the Namibia problem, namely the current settlement proposals of the five Western members of the Security Council. Thus my delegation regrets that it has not been possible for the session to come to a consensus.

19. Mr. KALILANGWE (Malawi): The delegation of Malawi will vote for the draft declaration and programme

of action on Namibia although we have some reservations on the phrasing of certain paragraphs in the draft. We have taken this decision because we believe Namibia requires the guidance of the United Nations in order to achieve its genuine independence. We also feel that the recent developments in Namibia should have been reflected in that draft.

20. Mr. DE BARROS (Portugal): Allow me to make some brief comments on the texts concerning the question of Namibia on which we are about to vote.

21. In keeping with my Government's policy regarding Namibia and the decolonization issues in general which are before the United Nations, the delegation of Portugal will vote in favour of the draft declaration and programme of action for Namibia. In so doing, I should like, however, to refer to some aspects of this question which merit the following comments on the part of my delegation.

22. Portugal, as was clearly stated by our delegation during the general debate [8th meeting], firmly believes that all efforts at reaching a peaceful settlement of the Namibian problem must be pursued to their fullest extent. Therefore we must express our preference for a peaceful negotiated solution and our support for the initiative taken by the five Western members of the Security Council as a practical means of implementing its resolution 385 (1976).

23. I should like also to stress the necessity, in the opinion of the Portuguese delegation, of holding free and democratic elections, in accordance with that resolution, under the supervision and control of the United Nations so as to ensure the democratic transfer of power to the elected representatives of the Namibian people.

24. Regarding some particular provisions of the draft programme of action, my delegation shares the view that they do not duly reflect the different nature and scope of the competence of the General Assembly and the Security Council.

25. Mr. ALVARADO CORREA (Nicaragua) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Nicaragua has followed attentively the debate during the present special session, as well as the discussions which have taken place between the parties in conflict.

26. The delegation of Nicaragua will vote in favour of the draft resolution. It is the opinion of our delegation that this is a matter of international importance and a concern which is shared by the peoples which desire the maintenance of peace among nations and which, guided by the principles on which the United Nations is founded, seek appropriate and just solutions for the problems which threaten world security. Therefore my delegation wishes to do all it can to help in the attainment of peace based on reason and law through the positive results of the dialogue at present taking place between the parties to the conflict.

27. However, my delegation recalls the reservations that we have expressed on earlier occasions in United Nations bodies whenever the question of Namibia was being discussed. Our recognition of the just aspirations of the peoples of the world for independence and self-determination is linked to a positive and strong desire to

carry on talks in a conciliatory spirit, by resorting to all possible means of promoting peace and endeavouring to take a stand that will not hamper a solution of the problem or create any new negative factors.

28. The position of the delegation and Government of Nicaragua has always been in favour of the self-determination of peoples, and we repeat our desire that no people should live under a colonial régime and that all peoples should enjoy their right to independence.

29. Mr. KUNENE (Swaziland): My delegation wholeheartedly supports the inalienable rights of the Namibian people and recognizes the legitimacy of their struggle for self-determination which, according to Security Council resolution 385 (1976), could be realized through fair and free elections held under the full control and supervision of the United Nations. In my delegation's view, the draft declaration and programme of action constitute the element that will ensure that this world body effectively discharges its direct and special responsibility over Namibia, a responsibility that has been greatly eroded over the years by South Africa's refusal to withdraw its illegal presence from that Territory.

30. We shall vote in favour of the draft declaration and programme of action because, among other essential points, it unequivocally states that the existence of South African military bases at Walvis Bay, an integral part of Namibia, constitutes a violation of Namibia's territorial integrity. My delegation fully supports the General Assembly declaration that Walvis Bay is indeed an integral part of Namibia with which it is inextricably linked by geographical, historical, cultural, economic and ethnic ties.

31. As a State in southern Africa, we are very strongly against any manoeuvres to amputate from Namibia its life-giving territorial organ, and therefore unequivocally reaffirm that Walvis Bay is not a question of territorial claim but an inviolable and non-negotiable part of Namibia. We are aware—perhaps more than anyone else—of the sad effects of such an amputation, because it would place an independent country in a very vulnerable and weak position in the exercise of its sovereignty. Owing to similar regrettable historical events which also placed my country in a similarly delicate and sensitive geopolitical position, we cannot but reserve our position on paragraph 35 of the draft, given the economic sensitivity imposed by our location.

32. My delegation is looking forward to the day when our brothers from Namibia will join us in this Assembly and express their gratitude to the world community for its untiring efforts to help them liberate their country. Some of those efforts are reflected in the document on which we are about to vote. It will indeed be a happy day for SWAPO, for the people of Namibia and for all of us, when they join this world body of nations.

33. Mr. KAPLLANI (Albania): During the general debate on the question of Namibia the Albanian delegation expressed its Government's viewpoint and position on the issue [6th meeting]. The Albanian delegation will vote in favour of the draft declaration and programme of action submitted to this Assembly by the *Ad Hoc* Committee.

However, it would like to point out that it has reservations on certain formulations contained in some paragraphs of that document.

34. The Albanian delegation reaffirms once again its resolute support for the just cause of the Namibian people and for its armed struggle against the racist régime of South Africa. The Albanian delegation condemns all attempts and manoeuvres by the racists of South Africa and the imperialist Powers which, under the guise of arriving at a settlement through negotiations, aim at undermining and putting down the armed struggle of the Namibian people and hindering it from achieving genuine national independence.

35. Mr. JAIPAL (India): My delegation, in voting in favour of the draft resolution, feels obliged to place on record its position to the effect that, while the draft resolution is a faithful reproduction of the views and sentiments expressed by the overwhelming majority, it does not take into account the most recent developments that took place during this very special session, including the two important statements made by the President of SWAPO. To ignore those ongoing developments or to be indifferent to them is neither realistic nor pragmatic. If we were to react to them wisely there might result a peaceful negotiated solution leading to self-determination and independence for the people of Namibia. On the other hand, if we close our eyes to the recent developments, South Africa may well go its own way in the direction of an internal settlement, which we all strongly deplore.

36. We would have preferred, in addition to the present declaration and programme of action, another decision by the General Assembly which would transmit to the Security Council the entire proceedings of this session and request the Security Council to bear in mind the discussions in this session and take appropriate steps and measures urgently to implement paragraphs 7 and 8 of its resolution 385 (1976).

37. Mr. KARUHIJE (Rwanda) (*interpretation from French*): The problem of Namibia has reached the stage where the international community must unequivocally take a stand on the forthcoming accession of Namibia to independence. Therefore, my delegation would like to reaffirm the position we have set forth here in the general debate [14th meeting]. We unreservedly support the draft declaration submitted by the *Ad Hoc* Committee. My delegation has not been in a position to follow all the work of the *Ad Hoc* Committee but we would ask that due note is taken of the fact that my delegation will vote in favour of the draft declaration and programme of action.

38. Mr. RAMPHUL (Mauritius): My delegation will naturally vote in favour of the draft declaration and programme of action on the question of Namibia, as recommended by the *Ad Hoc* Committee.

39. I wish further to add that my delegation appreciates the efforts of the five Western Powers of the Security Council for their unilateral efforts during the last 13 months or so. I hope they will continue their constructive exercise. I must say also that, so far as I know, no self-respecting African will ever agree that Walvis Bay is anything else but an integral part of Namibia, and that the



independence and sovereignty of Namibia will be meaningless without Walvis Bay; nor do I know of any African State which will underwrite a so-called South African internal settlement in Namibia.

40. Mr. President, I take this opportunity to express to you my regrets for not having been in this Assembly hall more often. I happen to be leading a one-man delegation. I am sure you will understand and forgive me.

41. Mr. FARRUGIA (Malta): My delegation agrees with the general thrust of the declaration and programme of action contained in the report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, on which a lot of work and effort has been expended, recently and in the past. We will support it today as a strong reaffirmation of the will of the international community at this special session, but this does not necessarily imply that we agree with every single word contained therein. Our position remains as explained in the general debate [13th meeting]. In particular, I stress our hope for a peaceful, just and early solution satisfactory to the people of Namibia.

42. Mrs. CASTRO DE BARISH (Costa Rica) (*interpretation from Spanish*): As my delegation did not participate in the general debate on the subject, Sir, I wish to take this opportunity to express our satisfaction at seeing you preside over the General Assembly at this ninth special session on the question of Namibia.

43. The delegation of Costa Rica would like to join with others who have spoken in this Assembly in favour of strengthening United Nations efforts towards complete decolonization and the elimination of one of the scourges of mankind, racial discrimination in all its forms, the worst expression of which has been the *apartheid* policy pursued by the Government of South Africa, not only in its own country but also in Namibia, which it continues to occupy unlawfully.

44. The independence of Namibia is at the present time an inescapable responsibility of the United Nations, which was assumed by the world Organization upon the termination of South Africa's Mandate over the Territory of South West Africa, conferred upon it by the League of Nations. That Mandate came to an end upon the adoption of General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966. Hence the United Nations should promote the speedy and complete independence of Namibia as an overriding goal, as has often been stated in numerous resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council.

45. These efforts have been intensified with the active participation of the United Nations Council for Namibia, presided over today by Ambassador Konie of Zambia, whom we congratulate on her election as Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, and on her tireless dedication.

46. We wish to pay a tribute to the heroic people of Namibia in their fight for independence and freedom—an arduous struggle waged at great sacrifice.

47. Our appreciation goes also to the majority liberation movement, SWAPO, which has assumed the leadership of the Namibian people in their struggle for self-determination.

48. We have greatly appreciated the efforts made by the five Western members of the Security Council—Canada, France, and the United States, the Federal Republic of Germany, the United Kingdom—to find a possible basis for negotiation in keeping with Security Council resolution 385 (1976) which might permit the attainment of a solution to the problem of Namibia. My delegation believes that such proposals submitted to the Security Council for consideration may provide a way of bringing the interested parties together, if it is possible to smooth out the rough spots and clarify ideas, to achieve the final goal we all desire which is the genuine and total independence of Namibia.

49. My delegation is encouraged by the conciliatory position shown by Mr. Nujoma, President of SWAPO, with respect to those efforts, invoicing his willingness to continue talking to see whether an acceptable agreement can be achieved.

50. We also listened to the representative of Canada [3rd meeting] speak about the South African Prime Minister's acceptance, albeit qualified, of the proposals of the aforementioned five.

51. Similarly, the representative of the United States indicated to us yesterday [14th meeting] his intention to pursue and intensify the talks in order to close the still substantial gap, as he said, and try to bring about a peaceful settlement, thereby averting a prolongation of violence and of the suffering of the valiant Namibian people.

52. Costa Rica wishes to reaffirm here the faith of its people and Government in the genuine and legitimate democratic process, guaranteed by free elections. In Costa Rica that is a condition *sine qua non* of our institutional life. That is why we should like other peoples to be able to enjoy that sovereign attribute, and in Namibia we hope that that will become a happy reality, allowing the Namibian people to emerge victorious, after exercising their self-determination, as expressed through their sovereign will in elections which, in accordance with Security Council resolution 385 (1976), must be fully guaranteed by the United Nations. Indeed, the whole process of transition must take place under its undisputed authority and alert vigilance so that the popular will can be legitimately and authentically expressed.

53. My delegation wishes to state that the independence of Namibia must be achieved without placing any limitations or restraints upon its territorial integrity. Consequently, Walvis Bay is not a negotiable issue, since we believe it to be part of what will be the new free and independent State of Namibia, in the democratic processes of which all liberated political prisoners and political exiles—who will return to their native land pursuant to paragraph 7 of Security Council resolution 385 (1976)—must be allowed to participate.

54. Costa Rica sincerely hopes that political will and common sense will prevail in the negotiations so that the complete and genuine independence of Namibia will be achieved in a climate of conciliation, as proof that the international community is increasingly aware of the fact that the world Organization is the sole collective expression of mankind's hopes for peace.

55. My delegation supports everything that the Chairman of the Latin-American Group, the Ambassador of Brazil said a few moments ago. We support the document that we have before us. It represents the efforts of the Council for Namibia in the preparation of the draft declaration, and programme of action recently adopted by the *Ad Hoc* Committee. This notwithstanding, we should like to enter Costa Rica's reservations to certain paragraphs relating to the possible use of force by the United Nations and to the armed struggle. We are realistic. We know that it is necessary to resort to those means in critical or chronic situations, such as the one prevailing in Namibia, but we do not believe that the Organization created to promote peace and international security should recommend that extreme recourse. We are just a few weeks away from the tenth special session of the Assembly devoted to disarmament, and that makes us even more keenly aware of the vital need to avoid that kind of recommendation.

56. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now proceed to a vote. The recommendation of the *Ad Hoc* Committee appears in paragraph 10 of its report (A/S-9/11). A roll-call vote has been requested.

57. In view of the misunderstanding which arose during the vote in the *Ad Hoc* Committee yesterday morning, I request the Under-Secretary-General for Political and General Assembly Affairs to clarify the manner in which the roll-call vote will now be conducted.

58. Mr. BUFFUM (Under-Secretary-General for Political and General Assembly Affairs): In following the conduct of the vote this morning, it may help Members to understand in advance that, in keeping with existing precedent, the names of certain delegations will not be called. All those involved were mentioned in the Secretary-General's letter to the President of the General Assembly, dated 20 April 1978, contained in document A/S-8/6, as being in arrears in the payment of their contributions to the United Nations regular budget within the terms of Article 19 of the Charter. In addition, the Secretariat was advised by the Government of Democratic Kampuchea on 31 March 1978 that it did not intend to attend any of the special sessions of the General Assembly scheduled for this spring. Moreover, all the other delegations concerned have been absenting themselves voluntarily during the votes.

59. The PRESIDENT: I thank the Under-Secretary-General for this clarification. The voting will now begin.

*A vote was taken by roll-call.*

*Surinam, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory

Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Surinam Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

*Abstaining:* Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

*The draft resolution was adopted by 119 votes to none, with 21 abstentions (resolution S-9/2).<sup>1</sup>*

60. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the Soviet Union on a point of order.

61. Mr. FOKINE (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): The delegation of the Soviet Union noted that during the roll-call vote that has just taken place, the names of a number of delegations were not called and, accordingly, those delegations were unable to take part in the voting. The Soviet delegation has drawn the conclusion that an attempt has been made to represent matters as if those States have been automatically deprived, under Article 19 of the United Nations Charter, of the right to vote in the General Assembly. If such an attempt has indeed been made, the Soviet delegation deems it necessary to repeat the Soviet Union's position of principle with regard to the application of Article 19 of the Charter.

62. As is known, Article 19 of the United Nations Charter provides that:

“A Member of the United Nations which is in arrears in the payment of its financial contributions to the Organization shall have no vote in the General Assembly if the amount of its arrears equals or exceeds the amount of the contributions due from it for the preceding two full years. . . .”

That is an important provision which has a direct effect on the interests both of States Members of the United Nations and of the Organization as a whole. The right to vote in the General Assembly is one of the basic rights of Members of the United Nations. It is a reflection of the sovereign equality of all the States Members of the United Nations.

<sup>1</sup> The delegation of Lebanon subsequently advised the Secretariat that, had it been present during the voting, it would have voted in favour of the draft resolution.

63. This provision in Article 19 should, of course, be applied in strict accordance with the provisions of the Charter that lay down the procedure for the taking of decisions and the suspension of the rights and privileges of membership. Such provisions are contained in paragraph 2 of Article 18, which states that:

“2. Decisions of the General Assembly on important questions shall be made by a two-thirds majority of the members present and voting. These questions shall include: . . . the suspension of the rights and privileges of membership, . . .”

64. It therefore follows clearly from Article 18 that the decision on whether or not a given Member State retains its right to participate in voting in the General Assembly can be taken only by the General Assembly itself, and for decisions on the suspension of the right to vote there must be a two-thirds majority of the members present and voting.

65. The Soviet delegation confirms its position of principle, based upon the United Nations Charter, with regard to the procedure for the application of Article 19 of the Charter.

66. The PRESIDENT: The representative of the Soviet Union, speaking on a point of order, has made certain reservations and explained his delegation's position concerning the vote which has just taken place. That position will be duly recorded in the verbatim record of this meeting.

67. The President of the South West Africa People's Organization has asked to be allowed to make a statement at this stage. I now call on him.

68. Mr. NUJOMA (South West Africa People's Organization): The General Assembly, meeting in a special session on Namibia from 24 April to today, has listened to about 120 speakers. The combination of the number of speakers heard and the high level of political participation, exemplified by the attendance of heads of government, foreign ministers and other high-ranking officials, attests to the historic importance of this ninth special session on the question of Namibia.

69. The debate covered a whole range of issues related to the colonial problem in Namibia and all its international ramifications. I sincerely hope that SWAPO's participation in the debate has contributed to the provision of relevant information regarding the deteriorating, indeed explosive, situation now prevailing in Namibia as a result of the continued cruel repression and colonial oppression by the military occupation régime of racist South Africa. This has also been an occasion for us to reaffirm the legitimate aspirations and the true interests of the oppressed people of Namibia, and to rededicate ourselves to the urgent tasks ahead so that, with the support and solidarity of the international community, the total liberation of Namibia may be vigorously accelerated.

70. We leave this Assembly assured of increased assistance from the overwhelming majority of the Members of this Organization to our just struggle and fortified by the

knowledge that so long as the deplorable situation continues in our country, the United Nations system in general and the United Nations Council for Namibia in particular will persist in rendering the necessary support to SWAPO. It is because of this ever-worsening situation that the General Assembly should remain seized of this matter and take appropriate measures to avert the impending catastrophe.

71. I should like once again to express SWAPO's readiness to engage in further talks with the five Western Governments in order to resolve the outstanding crucial issues. It is our sincere hope that the next round of talks will be fruitful.

72. Mr. President, I wish to thank you personally for having brought these deliberations to a successful conclusion. Similarly, our thanks go to the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, Ambassador Konie of Zambia, and her colleagues in the Council for the efficient manner with which they concluded their work. I should also like to thank all the participants who stood firm throughout this debate and voted affirmatively on the declaration and the programme of action. It is our sincere hope that those who were not able to join the majority in the vote will be able to do so in the future.

73. In conclusion, I should like to reassure representatives that the Namibian people, under the leadership of SWAPO, will not succumb to neo-colonial manoeuvres and intrigues aimed at installing a puppet régime in Namibia but will persevere and intensify the armed liberation struggle, in the absence of any acceptable alternative, until the whole of Namibia, including Walvis Bay, is totally liberated.

#### *Closing statement by the President*

74. The PRESIDENT: The ninth special session of the General Assembly on the question of Namibia is just concluding its work. In the course of the last 10 days we had the opportunity to devote our full attention to this important and crucial issue, and it has been both a challenge and a test for the role with which the United Nations has been entrusted. This is a role which the United Nations must clearly maintain until the people of Namibia finally achieve freedom and independence in a sovereign and united State, and all Member States have a special responsibility in this delicate moment in the history of the Namibian question. Ten days have been spent here in debate in plenary meetings, in the work in the *Ad Hoc* Committee and in numerous meetings of individual groups and consultations—all parallel with the proceedings of the General Assembly.

75. In the Assembly debate we heard statements made by representatives of 116 States and this morning too we have heard statements by representatives of several States. We also listened to statements by the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia and by the Chairman 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. These are the two United Nations bodies that bear the primary responsibility for the problems of decolonization in general and of Namibia in particular. The General Assembly also had the opportunity to hear, on three occasions, the views

and positions of the most authentic representative of the Namibian people—the President of SWAPO.

76. This is not the first time that the General Assembly has been so actively seized of the question of Namibia. Namibia has been with us, in the United Nations, from the very beginning of the work of the General Assembly. Since 1966 and 1967, in particular, the United Nations has assumed full competence and direct responsibility for that country. The importance of this question has long been acknowledged by the General Assembly, as well as by other important organs of the United Nations, which have adopted many decisions and resolutions relating to Namibia. Hardly any other issue on the agenda of the General Assembly is so crystal clear and so firmly defined as the question of Namibia—in terms of legal, political, moral and all other aspects. Therefore, it is no mere accident that once again all Member States—with rare exceptions—are in full agreement with the set objectives of the United Nations—the termination of the illegal presence of South Africa in Namibia, the ending of colonial slavery and racial oppression, the attainment of freedom and independence for Namibia. On this point there is full consensus here, though certain shades of difference or different approaches do exist with respect to the means and methods to be employed in reaching this ultimate goal. No one can deny the role which the United Nations should play or the responsibility assumed by our world Organization for ending once and for all the unbearable situation in Namibia today.

77. As we conclude this special session, we must ask ourselves: how long are we going to pose the same questions in the General Assembly about the role and the responsibility of the United Nations in attaining the independence of Namibia? How long can we wait for Namibia to gain its independence and, like the many others that have experienced the process of decolonization and the liberation struggle, finally assume its rightful place among the Members of the United Nations?

78. The past 10 days have been enlightening ones and have given all of us a new opportunity to turn in earnest to these questions. After the exhaustive debate and the adoption of the declaration and the programme of action, there is a firm impression that it is no longer possible to postpone answers to these questions and that the international community is no longer able to tolerate a delay in finding a lasting and just solution. Namibia must attain full independence and sovereignty without any preconditions or manipulations.

79. The ninth special session has dramatized fully the existing untenable situation and greatly expanded our knowledge about the present conditions prevailing in Namibia. We can no longer afford to lose time or to miss the opportunities that have been presented for Namibia finally to achieve its independence during the current year—1978. This special session has restated and reaf-

firmed the known and indisputable principles of the United Nations upon the basis of which Namibia can achieve independence. Furthermore, it has not only expedited the search for a just settlement but has, through consultations and negotiations which are still in progress, accelerated the process of final clarifications for the crucial decisions which should be taken in this moment of truth.

80. The special session, in all its context of debate, decisions and consultations, has once again made it clear to everyone that only if the United Nations plays a larger and more active role in this situation will it be possible for Namibia to achieve finally its independence in the immediate future. There is now a real prospect for this to happen. It is my firm hope that in the near future Namibia will be with us not as a problem demanding resolution, but as a Member of the United Nations, a free, independent and sovereign State.

81. The ninth special session of the General Assembly has confirmed that the urgent problems besetting southern Africa can no longer be bypassed. The entire region of southern Africa is now experiencing a historic and irreversible movement forward which cannot be stopped. Namibia and Zimbabwe, free and independent, must join the United Nations soon as full-fledged members. Should various manipulations be resorted to and obstacles created in order to prevent this, or should the attainment of their independence be delayed, then we shall face very dangerous threats to the peace, security and unhampered social and economic development that will not be restricted to southern Africa or Africa alone. We shall be confronted with unpredictable dangers to international relations in general.

82. I should like in closing to voice my deep conviction that the year 1978 will be the year of the freedom and independence of Namibia and Zimbabwe. I thank all Members for their dedicated work and demonstrated perseverance during this ninth special session of the General Assembly. Their efforts will, I am sure, contribute towards making this prediction a reality.

## AGENDA ITEM 2

### Minute of silent prayer or meditation

83. The PRESIDENT: I now invite representatives to stand and observe one minute of silent prayer or meditation.

*The members, standing, observed a minute's silence.*

### Closure of the ninth special session

84. The PRESIDENT: I declare closed the ninth special session of the General Assembly.

*The meeting rose at 12.35 p.m.*

**Part Two**

***AD HOC* COMMITTEE OF THE NINTH SPECIAL SESSION**

**Sessional Fascicle**

## CONTENTS OF MEETINGS

*Note.* In the table of contents which follows, the headings appearing in the summary records have been corrected where necessary.

### **1st meeting**

*Tuesday, 25 April 1978, at 10.35 a.m.*

OPENING STATEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

ELECTION OF THE VICE-CHAIRMEN

ELECTION OF THE RAPPORTEUR

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

### **2nd meeting**

*Thursday, 27 April 1978, at 3.45 p.m.*

AGENDA ITEM 7:

Question of Namibia

### **3rd meeting**

*Monday, 1 May 1978, at 11.15 a.m.*

ORGANIZATION OF WORK (*continued*)

### **4th meeting**

*Monday, 1 May 1978, at 4.15 p.m.*

ORGANIZATION OF WORK (*concluded*)

### **5th meeting**

*Tuesday, 2 May 1978, at 10.30 a.m.*

AGENDA ITEM 7:

Question of Namibia (*concluded*)

REPORT OF THE *AD HOC* COMMITTEE TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

COMPLETION OF THE COMMITTEE'S WORK

## CORRIGENDUM

In accordance with General Assembly resolution 3415 (XXX) of 8 December 1975, the records of the meetings of the Main Committees of the Assembly and of the General Committee—which were issued first in provisional mimeographed form and, after being edited, reissued in printed form—have, since the thirty-first session, been issued only once, in final form, the text being subject to correction.

The corrigendum that follows contains delegation and Secretariat corrections to the English text of the records of the meetings held by the *Ad Hoc* Committee during the ninth special session (A/S-9/AC.1/SR.1-5).

With the issuance of this corrigendum, the records of the above-mentioned meetings are to be considered final.

---

*Note.* As a rule, corrections to the following have not been included in the corrigendum:

- (a) The headings and tables of contents of individual meetings;
- (b) The symbols of documents pertaining to the agenda item under consideration;
- (c) The spelling of proper names.

For these, see the contents of meetings above, the relevant annex fascicles, and the *List of Delegations* respectively.

---

### *2nd meeting*

#### *Paragraph 7, lines 8-10*

*Replace* the lines by the following text:

support needed by the Namibian people as they moved towards independence. At this extremely sensitive juncture, the five Governments would not, however, be able to express a substantive position on elements embodied in the draft declaration and programme of action. That position, it should be understood, was without

#### *Paragraph 22*

*Delete* the last sentence

#### *Between paragraphs 22 and 23*

*Delete* Section I and Paragraphs 1-28

#### *Between paragraphs 23 and 24*

*Add a side-heading* Preamble and section I

#### *Paragraph 24*

*Replace* the existing text by the following:

24. The *CHAIRMAN* said that if there were no specific comments on the preamble and section I the Committee could proceed to consider section II.

#### *Between paragraphs 24 and 25*

*Delete* Paragraphs 29-45

#### *Paragraph 25, line 5*

*Before accurate delete* quite

**Part Three**

**ANNEXES**

**Agenda items 3, 6 and 7\***

---

\* No fascicles were issued for the following items: 1, 2, 4 and 5.





---

**Agenda item 3:\* Credentials of representatives to the ninth special session of the General Assembly:**

- (a) Appointment of the members of the Credentials Committee;
  - (b) Report of the Credentials Committee
- 

**CONTENTS**

<i>Document No.</i>	<i>Title</i>
A/S-9/10	Report of the Credentials Committee

---

**Action taken by the General Assembly**

---

\* For the discussion of this item, see *Official Records of the General Assembly, Ninth Special Session, Plenary Meetings*, 1st and 15th meetings.

**DOCUMENT A/S-9/10**

**Report of the Credentials Committee**

*[Original: English]  
[1 May 1978]*

1. At its 1st plenary meeting, on 24 April 1978, the General Assembly, in accordance with rule 28 of its rules of procedure, appointed for its ninth special session a Credentials Committee consisting of the following Member States which had previously been appointed for the thirty-second regular session: Canada, China, Ecuador, Fiji, Madagascar, Nepal, Nigeria, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and United States of America.

2. The Credentials Committee held one meeting on 1 May 1978.

3. Mr. Narendra Singh (Fiji) was unanimously elected Chairman.

4. The Committee had before it a memorandum by the Secretary-General, dated 26 April 1978, indicating that as at that date communications had been received from 69 Member States participating in the session. Credentials issued by the Head of State or Government or by the Minister for Foreign Affairs, as provided for by rule 27 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, had been submitted by 34 Member States (Argentina, Bangladesh, Bulgaria, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Equatorial Guinea, Honduras, Hungary, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Mexico, Oman, Panama, Philippines, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Spain, Surinam, Sweden, Thailand, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America, Uruguay and Viet Nam). The appointment of the representatives of the Central African Empire, El Salvador, Guatemala, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Maldives and the Sudan had been communicated

to the Secretary-General by cables from the Ministers for Foreign Affairs. The appointments of 29 representatives of Member States (Austria, Bahrain, Botswana, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Cyprus, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Kenya, Malawi, Malta, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Poland, Rwanda, Turkey, Yemen, Yugoslavia and Zambia) had been communicated to the Secretary-General by letter or note verbale from the permanent representative or permanent mission concerned. Of the Member States for which no formal credentials, as provided for by rule 27 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, had been submitted, 74 Member States (Albania, Algeria, Angola, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Congo, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mongolia, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Samoa, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Yugoslavia and Zaire) had empowered their permanent representatives to represent their Governments, without limitation as to session, in all organs of the United Nations.

5. The Legal Counsel informed the Committee that, since the preparation of the memorandum of the Secretary-General, credentials in the form provided for by rule 27 of the rules of procedure had been received from Guinea, Portugal, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone and the United Republic of Tanzania. Cables on the representation at the ninth special session had been received from the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Indonesia, Mauritius and the Niger. Letters or notes verbales had been received from the permanent representatives or permanent missions of Angola, Benin, the Congo, India, Israel, Kuwait, Liberia, Madagascar, Peru, Sri Lanka, Togo, Tunisia and the United Republic of Cameroon.

6. Thus, as at the date of the meeting, there were 23 Member States from which no communications had been received concerning their participation in the ninth special session of the General Assembly and whose permanent representatives had no credentials to represent their Governments in the Assembly, irrespective of which session.

7. The Legal Counsel also informed the Committee that it would be in accordance with past practice for the Committee to accept the credentials of all those Member States mentioned in paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 of the Secretary-General's memorandum, as orally supplemented, on the understanding that, in the case of those Member States mentioned in paragraphs 3 and 4 and the ones mentioned orally, whose permanent representatives were not in possession of credentials expressly authorizing them, without limitation as to session, to represent their Government in the General Assembly, formal credentials would be communicated to the Secretary-General as soon as possible. The Legal Counsel further stated that, in view of the limited number of credentials and communications that had been received to date, owing to exceptional circumstances such as, mainly, lack of time, the Committee might also, in accordance with past practice, wish to accept the credentials of all other Member States mentioned in paragraph 5 of the Secretary-General's memorandum in so far as they participated in the ninth special session. In addition, the Committee might also decide, in accordance with the same practice, that the representatives of the remaining Member States, which were not mentioned in the Secretary-General's memorandum and which were participating in the ninth special session, should be seated provisionally with the same rights as other representatives, on the understanding that formal credentials would be communicated shortly to the Secretary-General.

8. The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics stated that his delegation did not recognize the credentials of the delegation of the fascist régime of Chile and requested that this view be reflected in the report of the Committee to the General Assembly.

9. The representative of the United States of America stated that issues of the nature of the one raised by the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics were not properly before the Credentials Committee and that the credentials of the delegation in question were obviously in order. In the view of his delegation, there was

no basis in law or in fact for questioning the validity of those credentials and it would be a violation of the Committee's mandate and of the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations to do so.

10. The Chairman then proposed that, in the light of the remarks made by the Legal Counsel, the Committee should decide to accept the credentials of representatives of all Member States referred to in paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 of the memorandum by the Secretary-General, as orally supplemented, on the understanding that formal credentials of representatives of those Member States referred to in paragraphs 3 and 4, the permanent representatives of which did not have standing full powers, would be communicated shortly to the Secretary-General. He also proposed that the Committee should decide to accept the credentials of all other Member States mentioned in paragraph 5 of the Secretary-General's memorandum in so far as they participated in the ninth special session. With regard to the credentials of the representatives of the remaining Member States which participated in the ninth special session, the Chairman proposed that, in the light of the statements made in the Committee, the Committee should decide that those representatives should be seated provisionally with the same rights as other representatives, on the understanding that formal credentials would be communicated shortly to the Secretary-General.

11. In the light of those decisions, the Chairman then proposed the following draft resolution for adoption by the Committee:

*"The Credentials Committee,*

*"Having examined the credentials of the representatives to the ninth special session of the General Assembly,*

*"Accepts the credentials of all representatives to the ninth special session of the General Assembly."*

The draft resolution was adopted without a vote.

12. The Chairman then proposed that the Committee should recommend to the General Assembly the adoption of a draft resolution (see para. 14 below). The proposal was approved by the Committee without a vote.

13. In the light of the foregoing, the present report is submitted to the General Assembly.

#### *Recommendation of the Credentials Committee*

14. The Credentials Committee recommends to the General Assembly the adoption of the following draft resolution:

*Credentials of representatives to the ninth special session of the General Assembly*

*The General Assembly*

*Approves the report of the Credentials Committee.*

---

**ACTION TAKEN BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

At its 1st plenary meeting, on 24 April 1978, the General Assembly appointed the Credentials Committee as indicated in paragraph 1 of the report of the Committee (A/S-9/10) (see decision S-9/11).<sup>1</sup>

At its 15th plenary meeting, on 3 May 1978, the General Assembly adopted the draft resolution submitted by the Credentials Committee in its report (A/S-9/10, para. 14). For the final text, see resolution S-9/1.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Ninth Special Session, Supplement No. 2*.



---

**Agenda item 6:\* Adoption of the agenda**

---

**DOCUMENT A/S-9/1**

**Provisional agenda of the ninth special session  
of the General Assembly**

*[Original: English/French]  
[28 March 1978]*

1. Opening of the session by the Chairman of the delegation of Yugoslavia.
2. Minute of silent prayer or meditation.
3. Credentials of representatives to the ninth special session of the General Assembly:
  - (a) Appointment of the members of the Credentials Committee;
  - (b) Report of the Credentials Committee.
4. Election of the President of the General Assembly.
5. Organization of the session.
6. Adoption of the agenda.
7. Question of Namibia (resolution 32/9 H of 4 November 1977).

---

**ACTION TAKEN BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

At its 1st plenary meeting, on 24 April 1978, the General Assembly adopted the agenda of the ninth special session contained in documents A/S-9/1 (see decision S-9/21).<sup>1</sup>

At the same meeting, the General Assembly adopted a decision on the establishment of the *Ad Hoc* Committee of the ninth special session and on the allocation of agenda items (see decision S-9/22).<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Ninth Special Session, Supplement No. 2*.

---

**CHECK LIST OF DOCUMENTS**

*Note.* This check list includes the documents relating to agenda item 6 which are not reproduced in the present fascicle.

<i>Document No.</i>	<i>Title or description</i>	<i>Observations and references</i>
A/S-9/3	Letter dated 4 April 1978 from the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia to the Secretary-General	Mimeographed
A/S-9/5	Annotated provisional agenda of the ninth special session of the General Assembly	Ditto
A/S-9/8/Rev.1	Agenda of the ninth special session of the General Assembly	See <i>Official Records of the General Assembly, Ninth Special Session Plenary Meetings</i> , p.viii.

---

\* For the discussion of this item, see *Official Records of the General Assembly, Ninth Special Session, Plenary Meetings*, 1st meeting.



---

**Agenda item 7:\* Question of Namibia**

---

**CONTENTS**

<i>Document No.</i>	<i>Title</i>
A/S-9/11	Report of the <i>Ad Hoc</i> Committee of the ninth special session
<b>Action taken by the General Assembly</b>	
<b>Check list of documents</b>	

---

\* For the discussion of this item, see *Official Records of the General Assembly, Ninth Special Session, Plenary Meetings*, 1st to 15th meetings; *ibid.*, *Ninth Special Session, Ad Hoc Committee of the Ninth Special Session*, 2nd to 5th meetings; and *ibid.*, *Ad Hoc Committee of the Ninth Special Session, Sessional Fascicle*, corrigendum.

**DOCUMENT A/S-9/11**

**Report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee of the ninth special session**

[Original: English]  
[2 May 1978]

1. At the 1st plenary meeting of its ninth special session, on 24 April 1978, the General Assembly decided:

(a) To establish an *Ad Hoc* Committee of the ninth special session, which would be a committee of the whole with a chairman, three vice-chairmen and a rapporteur, on the understanding that the chairman would be elected by the General Assembly;

(b) To allocate the item entitled "Question of Namibia" to the *Ad Hoc* Committee, which would be entrusted with the task of considering the proposals submitted under the item and of reporting thereon to the General Assembly, with the understanding that the general debate on the subject would take place in plenary meetings;

(c) To allow the *Ad Hoc* Committee to establish, as necessary, an open-ended working group.

At the same meeting, the General Assembly unanimously elected Miss Gwendoline C. Konie (Zambia), President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, as Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee.

2. At its 2nd plenary meeting, on the same day, the General Assembly decided to increase to four the number of vice-chairmen of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, on the understanding that the new vice-chairman might serve as the chairman of a working group which the Committee might decide to establish.

3. At its 1st meeting, on 25 April, the *Ad Hoc* Committee unanimously elected Mr. Fathih Khaouane

Bouayad-Agha (Algeria), Mr. Francisco Cuevas Cancino (Mexico), Mr. Rikhi Jaipal (India) and Mr. Eamonn Kennedy (Ireland) as Vice-Chairmen and Mr. Petre Vlasceanu (Romania) as Rapporteur.

4. In connexion with its consideration of the item, the *Ad Hoc* Committee had before it the working paper submitted by the United Nations Council for Namibia, the legal Administering Authority for Namibia until independence, containing the draft Declaration on Namibia and Programme of Action in Support of Self-Determination and National Independence for Namibia (A/S-9/7, annex).

5. At the same meeting, the *Ad Hoc* Committee decided to consider the draft directly, without establishing a working group.

6. The *Ad Hoc* Committee considered the draft at its 2nd to 5th meetings, between 27 April and 2 May.

7. At its 2nd meeting, the *Ad Hoc* Committee: (a) adopted without objection the preambular paragraphs; (b) completed consideration of sections I and II; and (c) decided to take action on the draft as a whole at a subsequent meeting.

8. At its 5th meeting, the *Ad Hoc* Committee adopted the draft as a whole, by a roll-call vote of 88 to none, with 18 abstentions (see para. 10 below). The voting was as follows:

*In favour:* Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria,

Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, India, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Surinam, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

*Against:* None.

*Abstaining:* Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

9. At the same meeting, the *Ad Hoc* Committee authorized its Rapporteur to submit the report of the Committee directly to the General Assembly.

*Recommendation of the Ad Hoc Committee of the Ninth Special Session*

10. The *Ad Hoc* Committee recommends to the General Assembly the adoption of the following draft resolution:

*Declaration on Namibia and Programme of Action in Support of Self-Determination and National Independence for Namibia*

*The General Assembly,*

*Gravely concerned* at the threat to international peace and security posed by the continued illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa,

*Conscious* of its responsibilities under its resolutions 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966 and 2248 (S-V) of 19 May 1967 and subsequent resolutions of the General Assembly relating to the question of Namibia,

*Recalling* the Declaration of Dakar on Namibia and Human Rights,<sup>1</sup> adopted by the International Conference on Namibia and Human Rights, held at Dakar from 5 to 8 January 1976,

*Recalling further* the Maputo Declaration in Support of the Peoples of Zimbabwe and Namibia and the Programme of Action for the Liberation of Zimbabwe and Namibia,<sup>2</sup> adopted by the International Conference in Support of the

Peoples of Zimbabwe and Namibia, held at Maputo from 16 to 21 May 1977,

*Bearing in mind* the 1978 Lusaka Declaration of the United Nations Council for Namibia,<sup>3</sup> adopted on 23 March 1978,

*Reaffirming* that the Territory and people of Namibia are the direct responsibility of the United Nations and that the Namibian people under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization, their sole and authentic representative, must be enabled to attain self-determination, freedom and genuine independence within a united Namibia, including Walvis Bay,

*Cognizant* that the deteriorating situation in Namibia, resulting from the attempts of South Africa to perpetuate its illegal occupation of the Territory and its increased acts of aggression and repression against the people of Namibia, necessitated the convening of the current special session of the General Assembly in order urgently to initiate action which would speedily bring about the genuine independence of the Territory of Namibia,

*Adopts* the following Declaration on Namibia and Programme of Action in Support of Self-Determination and National Independence for Namibia:

I. DECLARATION ON NAMIBIA

1. The General Assembly reiterates that Namibia is the direct responsibility of the United Nations until genuine self-determination and national independence are achieved in the Territory and, for this purpose, reaffirms the mandate given to the United Nations Council for Namibia as the legal Administering Authority for Namibia until independence.

2. The General Assembly reaffirms the inalienable rights of the Namibian people to self-determination, freedom and national independence in a united Namibia, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and as declared in Assembly resolutions 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960 and 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966, as well as in its subsequent resolutions and those of the Security Council relating to Namibia, and the legitimacy of their struggle by all means at their disposal against the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa.

3. The General Assembly stresses its commitment to end the illegal South African occupation of Namibia by ensuring its complete and unconditional withdrawal to enable the Namibian people, under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization, to exercise freely their right to self-determination and independence.

4. The General Assembly strongly condemns the colonialist and racist régime of South Africa for its continued illegal occupation of Namibia in defiance of repeated demands by the Assembly and the Security Council for its withdrawal from the Territory, and further condemns South Africa for its attempts to perpetuate its illegal occupation of Namibia and for its escalated brutal repression of the Namibian people.

<sup>1</sup> *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-first Session, Supplement No. 24*, vol. II, annex II, para. 51.

<sup>2</sup> A/32/109/Rev.1-S/12344/Rev.1, annex V. For the printed text, see *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-second Year, Supplement for July, August and September, 1977*.

<sup>3</sup> A/S-9/2-S/12631, annex.

5. The General Assembly expresses its grave concern that, in complete defiance of continued demands by the international community, members of the South West Africa People's Organization and its supporters continue to be constantly harassed, intimidated and humiliated. There has been an escalation of the arbitrary mass arrest, torture, detention and imprisonment of members of the South West Africa People's Organization. Prolonged illegal and fraudulent trials of its members are being conducted to undermine it and drain its financial resources.

6. The General Assembly condemns the creation of tribal armies in Namibia by South Africa as a measure of ensuring its control of the Territory after independence. It is imperative that all tribal armies be dissolved in order to prevent additional sources of conflict within the Territory.

7. The General Assembly condemns the military build-up of South Africa in Namibia in preparation for a major confrontation with the liberation forces led by the South West Africa People's Organization. In order to increase its military activities in Namibia, South Africa is intensifying the recruitment of mercenaries and organizing tribal armies in the Territory. South Africa has increased the shipment into Namibia of large numbers of tanks and large quantities of ammunition and is constructing additional army barracks.

8. The General Assembly strongly condemns South Africa for exploiting the uranium resources of Namibia and for pursuing policies of nuclear adventurism with incalculable consequences for the people of Namibia and Africa as a whole.

9. The General Assembly strongly deprecates any collaboration with South Africa in the development of nuclear weapons that could enable it to intimidate neighbouring African States and thus perpetuate its colonialist and racist régime in Namibia.

10. The aggressive policies of the South African occupation régime in Namibia are further reflected in its repeated acts of aggression against the neighbouring States, in particular Angola and Zambia, its military incursions into those countries and violations of their territorial integrity, causing considerable loss of human life and damage to property. These activities have the immediate objective of consolidating the position of the occupation régime and of carrying out its hegemonistic ambitions in the region.

11. The General Assembly reiterates that Walvis Bay is an integral part of Namibia and condemns South Africa in the strongest possible terms for its decision to annex Walvis Bay, thus violating the principle of the territorial integrity of Namibia, which is embodied in relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, including Council resolution 385 (1976) of 30 January 1976. It further reiterates that this decision is illegal, null and void and that it is an act of aggression against the Namibian people. The existence of South African military bases in Walvis Bay is a threat to the national security of Namibia. The illegal annexation of

Walvis Bay, the main port and vital economic artery of Namibia, is a deliberate attempt to undermine the territorial integrity, economic independence and national security of Namibia.

12. The General Assembly reiterates that South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia constitutes a continued act of aggression against the Namibian people and against the United Nations. The militarization of Namibia by South Africa, its development of nuclear weapons, its brutal use of force against the Namibian people, its attempts to undermine the South West Africa People's Organization, the vanguard of the Namibian liberation struggle, its attempts to destroy the national unity and territorial integrity of Namibia and its acts of aggression against neighbouring independent African States clearly constitute a serious threat to peace and security in the region and to international peace and security.

13. The General Assembly strongly condemns South Africa for its continued exploitation and plundering of the natural resources of Namibia in complete disregard of the legitimate interests of the Namibian people. The exploitation and plundering of those resources by South African and other foreign economic interests, in violation of the relevant resolutions of the Assembly and the Security Council and of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia, enacted by the United Nations Council for Namibia on 27 September 1974,<sup>4</sup> are illegal and contribute to the maintenance of the illegal occupation régime.

14. The General Assembly expresses its full support for the armed liberation struggle of the Namibian people under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization, its sole and authentic representative. It expresses its conviction that the intensified armed liberation struggle by the Namibian people continues to be a decisive factor in the efforts to achieve self-determination, freedom and national independence in a united Namibia.

15. The General Assembly commends the valiant people of Namibia, under the leadership of the South West Africa people's Organization, for having intensified the armed struggle for the liberation of their country from the illegal occupation of South Africa.

16. The General Assembly supports the political and diplomatic efforts of the South West Africa People's Organization to secure genuine independence for Namibia, in accordance with all relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, and commends that organization for its willingness to enter into negotiations for the achievement of genuine independence for Namibia, in conformity with Council resolution 385 (1976) in its entirety.

17. The General Assembly notes that the South West Africa People's Organization has made far-reaching and substantive concessions to facilitate a negotiated settle-

<sup>4</sup> *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-ninth Session, Supplement No. 24A, para. 84.*

ment. On the other hand, South Africa, by its continued intransigence and inflexibility, has refused to demonstrate any good faith or willingness to enter seriously into meaningful negotiations for its withdrawal from Namibia.

18. The General Assembly rejects the idea that South Africa, as the illegal occupier of Namibia, has any legitimate interest in Namibia about which the South West Africa People's Organization should be pressed to make concessions in any negotiated and internationally acceptable settlement. South Africa has no right whatsoever to remain in Namibia or to procrastinate and prevaricate in any negotiating process on the question of genuine independence for Namibia.

19. The General Assembly declares that, unless effective political, economic and diplomatic pressures are demonstrably brought to bear on South Africa, no negotiation will succeed. Moreover, any genuine attempt to resolve the problem of Namibia by negotiation must not undermine the position of the South West Africa People's Organization or diminish the role of the United Nations or the United Nations Council for Namibia as the legal Administering Authority for the Territory until its independence. It is imperative that any negotiated settlement be arrived at with the agreement of the South West Africa People's Organization and within the framework of the resolutions of the United Nations.

20. The General Assembly strongly condemns the intensified preparation by South Africa to impose in Namibia a so-called "internal settlement", designed to give a semblance of power to a puppet régime and a cover of legality to the racist occupation, to foster civil war and to propagate the fiction that the struggle of the Namibian people for the liberation of the Territory would be aggression perpetrated from the outside.

21. The General Assembly, in this regard, expresses grave concern that South Africa is continuing to promote its puppets and quislings of the Turnhalle tribal gathering as an alternative to the South West Africa People's Organization, which is fighting for the genuine national and social liberation of Namibia as a united political entity.

22. The General Assembly approves the activities of the United Nations Council for Namibia and the policies and programmes defined by the Council in co-operation with the South West Africa People's Organization for the implementation of the mandate which has been entrusted to the Council to promote the cause of self-determination and independence of the Namibian people.

23. The General Assembly declares that it will continue to carry out its responsibilities in regard to the Territory until genuine independence has been attained. These responsibilities will be discharged through the United Nations Council for Namibia, in its capacity as legal Administering Authority for Namibia, until the Council informs the Assembly that genuine independence has been attained. In this regard, the Council must be associated with any solution in which the United Nations is involved.

24. The General Assembly declares that membership of the United Nations Council for Namibia in the specialized agencies and other organizations and bodies within the United Nations system, in conformity with the recommendations of the Assembly, is an indispensable element in the fulfilment of the responsibilities of the international community towards the people of Namibia, represented by the South West Africa People's Organization, their sole and authentic liberation movement. The Council's membership in the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations is a significant step in achieving this objective. Further and more vigorous initiatives must be taken, however, in order to meet fully the responsibility of the United Nations towards Namibia.

25. The General Assembly reaffirms its determination to continue its efforts towards increased assistance to Namibians in the context of the Nationhood Programme for Namibia, the Institute for Namibia at Lusaka, the United Nations Fund for Namibia and all other projects and programmes designed to prepare the Namibian people in the skills needed to build a prosperous and independent Namibia.

26. The General Assembly expresses its satisfaction with the effective work being accomplished by the Institute for Namibia in training Namibian cadres to administer an independent Namibia and in conducting research into basic problems relating to the human and natural resources of Namibia. These activities should be further intensified and widened.

27. The General Assembly endorses the initiatives of the United Nations Council for Namibia, in accordance with its 1978 Lusaka Declaration, to implement the Nationhood Programme for Namibia, and notes with appreciation the co-operation of the specialized agencies and other organizations and bodies within the United Nations system in the planning and implementation of the Programme.

28. The General Assembly decides that, in the event of the Security Council's inability to adopt concrete measures to compel South Africa to end its illegal occupation by withdrawing from Namibia, it will urgently consider necessary action in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, cognizant of the fact that this is a unique instance in which the United Nations has assumed direct responsibility for promoting self-determination, freedom and national independence for Namibia.

## II. PROGRAMME OF ACTION IN SUPPORT OF SELF-DETERMINATION AND NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE FOR NAMIBIA

29. The General Assembly reiterates its commitment to discharge the solemn obligation it has assumed to assist the Namibian people to achieve self-determination and independence.

30. The General Assembly, recognizing the role and scope of the activities of the United Nations Council for Namibia in furtherance of the attainment of self-determination by the people of Namibia, appeals to Member States to extend full support to those activities.



31. The General Assembly calls upon those countries which have not yet done so to recognize the South West Africa People's Organization as the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people.

32. The General Assembly appeals to all Member States to render increased and sustained support and assistance to the South West Africa People's Organization to enable it to intensify its struggle for the liberation of Namibia.

33. The General Assembly calls upon Member States and the international community as a whole to reject unequivocally all manoeuvres designed to deprive the Namibian people of their legitimate right to achieve genuine national independence in a united Namibia and to undermine and destroy the achievements of the liberation struggle of the South West Africa People's Organization.

34. The General Assembly calls upon the Governments of Member States and governmental and non-governmental organizations to give all possible assistance to the Nationhood Programme for Namibia and the Institute for Namibia and to increase contributions to the United Nations Fund for Namibia.

35. The General Assembly is fully convinced that, at this decisive stage in the struggle of the Namibian people, the international community must take definitive action to ensure the complete and unconditional withdrawal of South Africa from Namibian territory and thus eliminate the dangerous threat to international peace and security created by South Africa. To this end, it strongly urges the Security Council to take the most vigorous measures, including sanctions provided for under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, particularly comprehensive economic sanctions, an oil embargo and an arms embargo.

36. The General Assembly calls upon the international community, especially all Member States, to refrain from extending any recognition to, or co-operation with, any régime which the illegal South African administration may impose upon the Namibian people in disregard of the provisions of Security Council resolution 385 (1976).

37. The General Assembly urges all States to do their utmost to compel South Africa to renounce its spurious claims to Walvis Bay, to respect the territorial integrity of Namibia and to withdraw immediately from the entire Namibian territory.

38. The General Assembly urges all States to cease and desist from any form of direct or indirect military consultation, co-operation or collaboration with South Africa.

39. The General Assembly urges all States to refrain from any collaboration with South Africa in the nuclear field, including the production and development of nuclear weapons.

40. The General Assembly requests the Security Council to take appropriate, effective and urgent steps to prevent South Africa from acquiring or developing nuclear weapons and from exploding nuclear devices, and to ensure the dismantling of the nuclear-test installations in the Kalahari Desert, all of which endanger international peace and security.

41. The General Assembly calls upon all States to take effective measures to prevent the recruitment of mercenaries for service in Namibia or South Africa.

42. The General Assembly urges once again all States to take steps to ensure the termination of all arms-licensing agreements with South Africa and to prohibit the transfer to it of all information relating to arms and armaments.

43. The General Assembly urges once again all Member States to take all appropriate measures to ensure the full application of, and compliance with, the provisions of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia.

44. The General Assembly calls upon States to compel transnational corporations under their jurisdiction to comply with all pertinent resolutions of the United Nations by immediately abstaining from making any investment in Namibia, by withdrawing current investments from the Territory and by terminating their co-operation with the illegal South African administration in Namibia.

45. The General Assembly calls upon the International Atomic Energy Agency and appeals to the members of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade to apply, within their respective spheres of competence, the resolutions of the Assembly and the Security Council on Namibia and to ensure that South Africa does not represent Namibia in those organizations and thereby benefit from its participation in them.

---

#### ACTION TAKEN BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

At its 15th plenary meeting, on 3 May 1978, the General Assembly adopted the draft resolution submitted by the *Ad Hoc* Committee of the ninth special session in its report (A/S-9/11, para. 10). For the final text, see resolution S-9/2.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>5</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Ninth Special Session, Supplement No. 2*.

---

## CHECK LIST OF DOCUMENTS

Note. This check list includes the documents relating to agenda item 7 which are not reproduced in the present fascicle.

<i>Document No.</i>	<i>Title or description</i>	<i>Observations and references</i>
A/S-9/2-S/12631	Letter dated 4 April 1978 from the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia to the Secretary-General transmitting the text of the Lusaka Declaration	Mimeographed. For the text of the Declaration, see A/S-9/4, para. 31
A/S-9/4	Report of the United Nations Council for Namibia	<i>Official Records of the General Assembly, Ninth Special Session, Supplement No. 1</i>
A/S-9/6	Letter dated 13 April 1978 from the Acting Chairman 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 to the Secretary-General	Mimeographed
A/S-9/7	Letter dated 21 April 1978 from the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia to the Secretary-General	Ditto
A/S-9/12-S/12678	Letter dated 2 May 1978 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of South Africa to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General	See <i>Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-third Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1978</i>
A/S-9/AC.1/1	Note by the Chairman of the <i>Ad Hoc</i> Committee of the ninth special session	Mimeographed