



CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 27:	
Question of Namibia (<i>continued</i>):	
(a) Report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples:	
(b) Report of the United Nations Council for Namibia:	
(c) Report of the Secretary-General	1759

President: Mr. Salim Ahmed SALIM
(United Republic of Tanzania)

In the absence of the President, Mr. Mavrommatis (Cyprus), Vice-President, took the Chair.

AGENDA ITEM 27

Question of Namibia (*continued*):

- (a) Report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples;
- (b) Report of the United Nations Council for Namibia;
- (c) Report of the Secretary-General

1. Mr. SINCLAIR (Guyana): In this debate on the question of Namibia, it is appropriate to recall the words of the late Kwame Nkrumah as he launched Ghana's independence more than 20 years ago. He said:

"We again rededicate ourselves in the struggle to emancipate other countries in Africa, for our independence is meaningless unless it is linked up with the total liberation of the African continent".

2. The emancipation of Namibia is and must be a sacred responsibility of the international community, and more particularly of all who truly love freedom and justice. Namibia is a testing ground where the spirit and the force of the Charter meet the determination of one State to be a law unto itself. In this confrontation between the Charter's mandate, on the one hand, and South Africa's obstinacy, on the other, this Organization has a solemn duty to ensure that the principles of the Charter are sustained. This debate should therefore be an opportunity for rededicating ourselves to working towards that objective, an exercise which must necessarily entail a consideration of what future action needs to be taken to advance the process of the liberation of Namibia.

3. The prescription for a settlement of the Namibian question has been made abundantly clear. The United Nations Council for Namibia, as the legal Administering Authority for the Territory until independence, and the General Assembly have consistently set forth the necessary steps to be taken for the liberation of Namibia. In its resolution 435 (1978), the Security Council adopted the report of the Secretary-General

regarding implementation of the proposal for a settlement of the Namibian question,¹ although the manner in which this proposal will be implemented continues to be a subject of discussion. In this connexion, important consultations were held recently in Geneva on the establishment and monitoring of a demilitarized zone on each side of the Namibia-Angola and Namibia-Zambia frontiers, with a view to facilitating the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia. In the course of these consultations, the South West Africa People's Organization [SWAPO], as well as the front-line States, indicated acceptance of the concept of the demilitarized zone, provided South Africa did likewise. It will be recalled that on the very eve of the opening of this debate, South Africa, in characteristic fashion, gave its conditional acceptance of the concept of the demilitarized zone.²

4. The view has been expressed that over the past two years there has been considerable momentum in relation to a settlement of the Namibian question, but Africa and the freedom-loving world will not be deceived into equating such momentum with progress. Frankly, my delegation is uncertain of the true value of contributions to the emancipation of Namibia which merely encourage South Africa's involvement. In the first place, while resolution 435 (1978) calls on South Africa to co-operate "forthwith" in its implementation, it is South Africa that, through its general obstructionist attitude, is effectively determining the pace and the intensity of those efforts. To the friends and allies of the régime in Pretoria, the activity currently taking place may be comforting to the conscience, but Africa and humanity demand more. While my delegation certainly believes that our commitment to implementation of the settlement proposal must be deliberate and total, it must not blind us to actions and attitudes by South Africa which run counter to the spirit of resolution 435 (1978) or which are in direct contravention of other Security Council and General Assembly resolutions on Namibia.

5. I refer, for example, to South Africa's active attempts to alienate SWAPO inside Namibia, an organization which the United Nations has recognized as the sole and authentic representative of the people of Namibia; and to South Africa's attempts to form a coalition of forces inside Namibia in direct opposition to SWAPO.

6. I refer to the so-called Constituent Assembly which came into being as a result of the elections of December last, elections which the Security Council declared null and void. That Assembly has been given legislative powers, and South Africa is undisguisedly seeking to legalize it as a provisional government and to project its leaders as the leaders of Namibia, to be consulted by

¹ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-third Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1978*, document S/12827.

² *Ibid.*, *Thirty-fourth Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1979*, document S/13680, annex.

this Organization on matters relating to the future of the Territory. Why an interim government, may I ask? Does Security Council resolution 385 (1976) or 431 (1978) or 435 (1978) or any other Security Council or General Assembly resolution provide for the formation of an interim government as part of the settlement of the Namibian question?

7. I refer also to South Africa's escalating arrests and detention of SWAPO leaders and its harassment, torture and intimidation of SWAPO sympathizers.

8. I refer to the increased militarism inside Namibia; to South Africa's actual involvement in the creation and training of a Namibian national army—this in addition to the 50,000 South African soldiers already in the Territory—to be under the control of the interim government. Why should there be a Namibian national army at this stage? Would that not considerably complicate implementation of resolution 435 (1978)? Let us assume that South Africa withdrew its troops from the Territory; would the United Nations Transition Assistance Group [UNTAG] then be expected to deal with this newly created entity? How does a Namibian national army fit into the settlement proposal that was adopted by the Security Council? My delegation would like formally to request that the Secretary-General place these questions on the agenda of his next consultation with South Africa on implementation of the settlement proposal and make a report in an appropriate form.

9. I refer again to Botha's idea of a constellation of southern African States around South Africa offering security to the white minorities of the region. Everyone knows that the purpose of such a constellation is to serve as a defence perimeter for *apartheid*, and we also know that it is with Namibia that Botha intends that constellation to begin.

10. Finally, I refer to South Africa's military presence in Rhodesia and to Botha's public concern about what would be the nature of the future government of that Territory.

11. These actions on South Africa's part must not be seen in isolation from each other or from South Africa's conduct in the negotiations on the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). There is a certain method in them; there is an interrelationship between them, which must inform our approach to the negotiations on resolution 435 (1978), as well as to South Africa's attitude to those negotiations. We must not be unwitting accessories to the undermining of the decisions of this Assembly. We must not, through lack of vigilance, help the enemy to achieve its purposes. We must not allow a tactical manoeuvre by South Africa to cause us to demobilize our political forces. Rather, we must bestir ourselves to make a genuine and full-blooded commitment to the emancipation of Namibia within the framework of the authority of the United Nations in respect of the Territory and on the terms laid down by this Assembly and the Security Council, not on South Africa's terms.

12. That kind of commitment is the commitment of SWAPO, which, as the sole and authentic representative of the people of Namibia, remains in the very vanguard of the struggle for emancipation, bearing the full brunt of South Africa's oppression and tyranny. My

delegation reaffirms its continuing support for and solidarity with SWAPO in this armed struggle and calls on the international community to increase its moral and material support of SWAPO.

13. The United Nations Council for Namibia under the efficient and truly dedicated presidency of Ambassador Lusaka of Zambia, has been exerting itself in several practical and imaginative ways, in fulfilment of the mandate entrusted to it by the General Assembly. As a member of that Council, my delegation naturally fully supports the initiatives taken by that body. We believe that the legal Administering Authority for Namibia until independence must be involved at all stages in the process of the talks on implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

14. The front-line States for their part continue to render invaluable moral and material support for the liberation of Namibia, at great sacrifice to themselves. In this regard my delegation would like to pay a special tribute to the late President Agostinho Neto of Angola for his unflinching dedication to the cause of the liberation of Namibia.

15. The forces throughout the world that love peace and freedom are committing themselves in various ways to Namibia's emancipation. In this connexion my delegation would like to make special mention of the decisions by the Governments of Iran and Nigeria regarding trade with South Africa.

16. Of those which have greater strength and influence more is expected. In this regard a special responsibility devolves on South Africa's major Western trading partners, especially the permanent members of the Security Council among them. The people of Namibia expect of the West, and rightly, a level of commitment to their emancipation that is fully consistent with the influence that those countries undoubtedly have in South Africa. After all, South Africa continues defiantly to repudiate all those basic values that underpin the Western conception of human rights. The violation of human rights in other places is indignantly and resolutely condemned; yet there seems to be a preparedness by the West to live with it in respect of the Pretoria régime. But, more than that, Western investment sustains the economy of the régime that is occupying Namibia and trampling underfoot the human rights of the population of that Territory.

17. This Assembly has declared South Africa's non-compliance with Security Council resolutions on Namibia a serious threat to international peace and security which necessitates action under Chapter VII of the Charter, and it recommended that the Council should convene urgently to take effective action, including the imposition of sanctions.

18. Everyone knows that it is the threat or use of Western vetoes that inhibits the decisive action called for by the Assembly.

19. Western collaboration with the Pretoria régime in the field of nuclear technology has given South Africa a nuclear capability which places in even graver jeopardy the peace and security of the African continent and of the world in general. In this connexion, my delegation would like to recall the words of a certain Western permanent member of the Security Council spoken in

the course of the debate in the Council in 1976 on the question of Soweto. That representative said:

“There has also been repeated mention of the sale of . . . nuclear reactors to South Africa. The atom is a subject which easily becomes an emotional one, and which unfortunately lends itself to tendentious confusions. I am surprised that certain speakers whom I would have thought better informed should have allowed themselves to be carried away on a course bordering on demagogy.”³

20. He went on to say that a contract concluded between a certain firm in his country and the South African Electricity Company required that the material provided “cannot be used for anything other than the production of electricity”.⁴

21. We all know the rest of that story.

22. My delegation would like to repeat its often-expressed conviction that if South Africa’s major Western trading partners were to commit themselves to the emancipation of Namibia in the manner in which they are being called upon to do so, Botha could not continue with his designs for the Territory and would be forced to capitulate to the will of the international community. The contention that sanctions do not work can no longer be advanced by the West as an excuse for inaction in the case of South Africa. The West has not lost faith in the effectiveness of sanctions as a weapon to bring about change in the behaviour of States. My delegation is convinced that the West has not lost faith in sanctions or even in the threat of sanctions.

23. Nor can it be advanced that the imposition of sanctions would not gain popular support in Western societies. This contention has no credibility, given the low level of exposure of these societies to the reality of the lives of blacks in South Africa and Namibia. It is indeed a sad commentary on the state of our morality that the dehumanization, degradation, torture and exploitation of more than 20 million blacks in southern Africa is simply not news. It is for this reason that the Council for Namibia has found it necessary to present to this Assembly draft resolution A/35/L.50 on the dissemination of information on Namibia. In the preambular part of that draft resolution, stress is placed upon:

“ . . . the urgent need to arouse world public opinion on a continuous basis with a view to assisting effectively the people of Namibia to achieve self-determination, freedom and independence in a united Namibia and, in particular, to intensify the widespread and continuous dissemination of information on the struggle for liberation being waged by the people of Namibia”.

24. In the spirit of this draft resolution, we should like to see the Western States, using their very effective and highly developed mass media techniques, launch an information offensive with regard to South Africa and Namibia. Let them, if only for the space of one month, turn their spotlights on the pass laws, the bantustans, the arrests, the gaolings, the beatings and the various aspects of all the ugliness that is life-as-usual for the more than 20 million blacks in these territories. There-

after, it might be enlightening indeed to see what action public opinion would be willing to support.

25. Namibia is truly a touchstone of the commitment by States to the principle of the enjoyment by all peoples, without any distinction or qualification whatsoever, of their right to self-determination and independence. There is no room here for half-measures; there is no room for casual commitment.

26. My delegation still hopes that, in giving full support for the achievement of final victory and full emancipation in Namibia, all members of the international community will show themselves to be true and faithful to the Charter and to the Organization’s decision in respect of Namibia.

27. Mr. KOMATINA (Yugoslavia): The international community is again faced with the dilemma regarding the implementation of its decision on the granting of independence to Namibia, which 13 years ago was legally proclaimed a Territory under the Mandate of the United Nations and under the administration of the Council for Namibia as the legal Administering Authority. This dilemma, which is actually not a dilemma at all, requires a correct answer, not only so that we may fulfil our obligation towards the Namibian people and international peace and security but also so that we may preserve our own dignity and self-respect.

28. The racist Government of South Africa has opposed and continues to oppose all the decisions and recommendations of the General Assembly, the Security Council and other bodies within or outside the world Organization and prevents the United Nations from carrying out its mandate. More recently, it has tried to implement so-called internal solutions, the final aim of which is to preserve colonial relationships and to perpetuate racial supremacy and the exploitation of the autochthonous population.

29. South Africa wants to preserve by force its vast material and economic interests in the occupied Territory of Namibia. According to data published by the Council for Namibia, South Africa has penetrated all the pores of the Namibian economy and is constantly encouraging the establishment and development of private enterprises under South African control in all sectors of the economic life of Namibia. South Africans own large tracts of farmland in Namibia. The share of South African capital invested in mining companies amounts to 40 per cent, and in the fishing industry, to almost 100 per cent. Also, South Africa has a considerable share of the capital investment in the building industry, trade and banking, while the ports, air transport, the radio, the postal system and telecommunications have become components of the South African economic system. South Africa also uses Namibia as a source of raw materials, for the exploitation of its diamonds, uranium, copper, zinc, tin and lead. In the world production of diamonds, Namibia’s share is 16 per cent and in the production of lead, zinc and copper, 1 per cent. According to estimates, reserves of uranium and diamonds in Namibia represent 5 per cent of world reserves while reserves of silver represent 2 per cent, and those of zinc and potassium, 1 per cent of world reserves. According to the same reports, approximately 24 large foreign companies participate in the exploitation of the mining resources of Namibia. Of these companies, 12 are South African, 5 have their seat

³ *Ibid.*, Thirty-first Year, 1930th meeting.

⁴ *Ibid.*

in the United States, 3 in Canada, 2 in Great Britain and 1 each in France and the Federal Republic of Germany.

30. In paraphrasing the reports of the Council for Namibia, we believe that we have found the answer to the question as to what it is that enables South Africa to behave aggressively all the time and to defy the decisions of the United Nations and the unanimous condemnation of world public opinion. It is obvious that, in behaving in such a way, South Africa enjoys the support of and is encouraged by transnational corporations whose frantic rush for profits is the only criterion governing their behaviour in the Territory of Namibia, which they consider to be a "no man's land" and a free hunting ground for the acquisition of profits.

31. In order to preserve their economic interests in that Territory and to oppose the ever more intense struggle of the Namibian people for liberation and independence, under the leadership of SWAPO, the racist authorities have concentrated in Namibia vast military power, consisting of all branches of armed forces, including armoured units and air force. They have thus transformed the Territory into a military base for launching ever more frequent and ruthless terrorist attacks not only against the fighters of SWAPO, but also against the neighbouring sovereign and independent States of Angola, Botswana and Zambia. The last-named was just recently the victim of such an attack, which was considered by the Security Council.⁵ South Africa, however, completely ignores all the warnings of the Security Council, which will obviously be faced, in the very near future, with the need to take more drastic measures and to impose sanctions with a view to putting an end to this terrorist activity.

32. In parallel with its aggressive actions against peoples and countries, South Africa—as all occupiers have done in the past—is striving to set up puppet authorities in the Territory under its rule. We recently witnessed an attempt to bring such puppets to the negotiating table when South Africa made its attendance at informal consultations on Namibia in Geneva conditional upon the issuing of invitations to representatives of so-called democratic parties, whose election was branded as illegal by the international community and whose legitimacy is contested even by countries that maintain political, diplomatic and economic relations with South Africa.

33. All this indicates that the situation in Namibia has not changed substantively in the period since the resumed thirty-third session of the General Assembly in May this year. We feel that there is good reason to believe that the present state of affairs is much worse in many aspects, owing to the policy of aggression pursued by the South African racist authorities. This in itself leads to the conclusion that the international community, in its efforts not to miss any opportunity to reach a settlement by peaceful means, should intensify its political and moral support and increase its material assistance to the liberation movement of Namibia in its armed struggle for freedom and independence. More favourable conditions would thereby be created for accelerating the process of peaceful settlement. The vast majority of the international community has already approved and opted for such an orientation. However, despite its illegal occupation of Namibia,

⁵ *Ibid.*, *Thirty-fourth Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1979*, 2171st meeting.

South Africa continues to impose conditions and that could essentially amount, if we are not vigilant, to the imposition of its dictates both on the United Nations and on the people of Namibia, that is, to depriving it of the fruits of its liberation struggle, thus making any effort aimed at a peaceful settlement redundant. The best evidence for this is provided by South Africa's most recent reply, of 5 December, with respect to the acceptance of the concept of a demilitarized zone.

34. The non-aligned countries have, at all their meetings and in all their activities, given the strongest support to the struggle of the people of Namibia for national independence and free development. In this sense, they constantly demand that the South African colonial administration and the troops of occupation be withdrawn from the Territory of Namibia immediately and unconditionally and that political, material, military and financial assistance be lent to SWAPO, so that it may intensify its liberation struggle. The non-aligned countries reject any attempt aimed at imposing so-called internal settlements which delay the attainment of genuine independence or undermine the efforts for achieving a just and lasting solution to the Namibian problem, one which preserves the national unity and territorial integrity of Namibia, including Walvis Bay as a component part of the national territory.

35. The non-aligned countries have, for their part, contributed to the efforts for the peaceful solution of the question, that is, for the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia. Actually, the greatest contribution to the adoption of this plan has been made by the front-line States and SWAPO, which has again proved to be a constructive and responsible factor in international life.

36. Non-aligned Yugoslavia maintains the closest relations with SWAPO, to which it lends all the necessary assistance, including military assistance, in its struggle for national liberation. That is for us a moral and political obligation, for what is involved is a basic principle of non-aligned policy and an expression of the nature of our social and national being. We have also supported the efforts to achieve a peaceful settlement on the basis of the realization of the right to self-determination, provided—as the Yugoslav Federal Secretary for Foreign Affairs pointed out [*13th meeting*]⁶—that such efforts are not misused for the purpose of thwarting the struggle of peoples for freedom and preserving colonialist and racist rule by means of so-called internal solutions.

37. In the meantime, we consider that the Assembly at this session should condemn and prevent the tactics of procrastination and the circumvention of the decisions of United Nations organs. The continuation of South Africa's practice of defying the resolutions of the General Assembly and of the Security Council must be qualified as a threat to international peace and security. This calls for the taking of appropriate action, as a matter of urgency, on the basis of the Charter, including the provisions of Chapter VII.

38. To conclude, the elimination of colonialism and racism from southern Africa is one of the tasks that put the United Nations to a constant test, because we are faced, in this case, with an anachronism in our time when the struggle for emancipation and a higher quality of international life is gaining momentum and in a situa-

tion when the broadest international consensus concerning this question has been practically achieved. The liberation of Namibia is all the more urgent from the moral point of view as well, as we have assumed direct responsibility for this Territory. It seems to us, therefore, that an all-out effort should be made in order to accomplish this task as soon and as completely as possible.

39. Mr. MAKEKA (Lesotho): Once again this General Assembly and the international community are meeting to seek ways and means whereby South Africa can be made to release its illegal and racist grip on Namibia. I need not bore this Assembly with the list of the numerous meetings that have been convened during the past 34 years on the question of Namibia. More recently this Assembly resumed its thirty-third session specifically to debate the issue of South Africa's illegal presence in Namibia. At that time, the international community had high hopes that a breakthrough was in sight along the long and arduous path of a peaceful settlement of the question of Namibia. However, those of us who because of geography have to live side-by-side with the racist white supremacists, knew that South Africa had no intention of withdrawing from Namibia. On the contrary, South Africa was determined to buy time and hoodwink the international community into believing that it was accepting the settlement proposal of the Secretary-General, while in fact it was raising one obstacle after another to foil the implementation of the settlement. In the meantime, South Africa proceeded to take steps clearly calculated to strengthen its presence in the Territory; it increased its military forces in the Territory and used them to perpetrate acts of armed aggression in Angola and in Zambia. Inside the Territory mass arrests and brutalization of the Namibians and the leadership of SWAPO were intensified. Despite assurances that it would not do so, South Africa granted so-called legislative powers to the so-called national assembly, which was a result of bogus elections unilaterally organized by South Africa.

40. A few weeks ago the Secretary-General convened a meeting at Geneva between the five Western countries, the front-line States, SWAPO and South Africa to discuss the proposal of the late President Agostinho Neto on the establishment of a demilitarized zone in northern Namibia. We are all well aware that South Africa, with some reluctance, agreed to participate in the meeting on condition that the so-called democratic parties of Namibia were also invited to the conference on the same footing as all other parties invited.

41. My delegation fails to appreciate the reasoning behind South Africa's conditional acceptance. To begin with, we are where we are today because South Africa has had to recognize and feel the weight of the liberation struggle of the heroic people of Namibia under SWAPO leadership. Before that struggle South Africa never even envisaged that Namibia would become independent; on the contrary, it treated the Territory as an already annexed part of South Africa. It took armed struggle and the persistent and strong representation of the United Nations to make South Africa abandon its annexationist designs and accept the eventual sovereign independence of Namibia. Even then, they attempted to Balkanize and bantustanize the Territory, and thus created the so-called democratic parties. These are the Turnhalle mafia, which are bent on main-

taining South Africa's presence in the Territory in one form or another. These are the groups which all along have embraced the introduction into the Territory of South African racial discrimination and *apartheid*. During the same period, South Africa used its military and economic might not only to discredit SWAPO inside and outside the Territory but even to terrorize and blackmail by military means those countries that support SWAPO.

42. My delegation remains convinced, therefore, that South Africa is still determined to go ahead with a unilateral settlement of the Namibian problem. Somehow South Africa believes that it will present the world community with a *fait accompli* which will be embraced by its Western allies.

43. The response of South Africa to the compromise proposal of President Neto, that great leader of Africa, came as a surprise to many. The response was clearly timed to coincide with the general debate on the issue in order to forestall any meaningful action that might be contemplated. As before, South Africa has come up with another ploy, which in the past has succeeded in rendering our discussions of the issue ineffective. It is clear to my delegation that, unless we are vigilant, this meeting will produce nothing but verbose statements on the desires and lofty goals of the international community on the problem.

44. It is more disheartening and agonizing to be a part of an international community which has for so long allowed itself to be held hostage by South Africa. The General Assembly, the Security Council and the International Court of Justice have repeatedly asserted and reasserted the responsibility of the United Nations for the Territory and the people of Namibia. Unfortunately, this world body has been defied and ridiculed by South Africa, while the people of Namibia continue to be denied their legitimate and inherent right to self-determination and independence.

45. Without pre-empting the response of the Secretary-General to the latest South African gimmick, I should like to state the position of the Lesotho Government on the matter. We think that this is necessary because we were shocked to learn that some countries had welcomed the South African response of 5 December 1979 as a sign that reason would prevail in the matter. In our view, the conditions attached to the so-called acceptance of the concept negate not only the concept itself but also the expressed desire for continued negotiations. While we cannot profess to be masters of the English language or of military terminology, we do not understand how one can speak of a demilitarized zone in which one of the rival parties wants to maintain its military presence. This condition becomes even more absurd when account is taken of the fact that South Africa is in Namibia illegally.

46. Secondly, we keep hearing South Africa say that it is committed to the security of the people of Namibia and to ensuring that the wishes of Namibians are not thwarted by intimidation and acts of terrorism. We really wonder who it was that conferred this responsibility upon South Africa. When did the people of Namibia express a wish to have South Africa looted after its security? As far as we know, South Africa is imposing its version of so-called security on Namibia because it is in Namibia illegally. Also, we know that it is South

Africa that is thwarting the wishes of the Namibians by its acts of intimidation, mass arrests, killing and acts of terrorism.

47. Thirdly, South Africa talks about the disarmament of SWAPO and about the closure of bases, without talking about the withdrawal of South African forces on its own disarmament.

48. The Lesotho Government has repeatedly supported all efforts designed to resolve the thorny problems of southern Africa by peaceful means. We have to state, however, that South Africa has embarked upon a road of confrontation designed to plunge our continent into a racial bloodbath. What is unfortunate is that this suicidal tendency seems to find support in some quarters in this Assembly.

49. South Africa has repeatedly stated that Namibia is strategically important, not only to South Africa but also to the Western world. We know that Namibia is rich and abounds in a variety of minerals, but that cannot be used by some countries as an excuse for not exerting pressure on South Africa to let go of the Territory. In addition, and more important to South Africa, Namibia serves as a good buffer and insulation against the forces of change, believed by South Africa to be coming from the north. As I have stated in this Assembly before, instead of withdrawing from Namibia, South Africa is busy trying to set up what it calls a constellation of southern African States. It is envisaged that the constellation shall include an "independent" Namibia under the Turnhalle mafia, Zimbabwe under Muzorewa and other homeland bantustans. In this way, South Africa hopes to create a fortress against the so-called communist incursions from the north. We repeat that we reject this dream with the contempt it deserves. The international community must not allow this new and dangerous ploy to help further to delay the liberation of our subcontinent. South Africa is determined not to tolerate really independent African States close to its borders.

50. The South African claim to Walvis Bay is absurd, and South Africa knows this very well. The claim has no basis in law, politics or fact. Many speakers before me have advanced ample and cogent reasons for this. Let me emphasize, however, that we are all aware that South Africa wants to use Walvis Bay as a negotiating card in the event of SWAPO forming a government in Namibia. This is one of the South African moves to protect and defend racism and *apartheid* in Namibia and fundamentally in South Africa.

51. In conclusion, may I express my delegation's congratulations to Ambassador Lusaka of Zambia, the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, for his usual lucid and comprehensive introduction of the report of the Council [A/34/24]. We commend the Council for a good job well done. We assure all the members of the Council of our support in their very difficult task and we hope that the day is not far off when the Council will officially hand over power to a truly independent Namibia.

52. Mr. BOYA (Benin) (*interpretation from French*): If we could bridge the really tragic distance which sometimes separates the force of our principles and the strength of our resolutions from the feebleness and the incoherence of actions to implement them, the question

of Namibia would serve to make us extremely pleased with ourselves. Thus, my delegation appeals to the consciences of all, and particularly those of the most powerful among us, to ensure that the Fascist Pretoria régime ceases to defy the international community, stops rowing against the current of history and the irresistible rise of the national liberation movement of peoples.

53. Ambassador Lusaka of Zambia, President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, in submitting the report on the activities of that important body of our Organization sketched a balance sheet, from which it was clear that the essential obstacles to the implementation of our decisions and those mainly responsible for the intolerable impasse in which we find ourselves are the Pretoria régime and those in the West who encourage its criminal obstinacy and abet its manoeuvres.

54. The point of view of our brothers of SWAPO, oppressed and humiliated by an anachronistic colonial and Fascist system, has also been eloquently voiced here, with a feeling of gravity and determination, by our comrade Peter Mueshahange [91st meeting], Secretary for Foreign Affairs of the sole authentic representative movement of the Namibian people.

55. My delegation believes that our concern in the quest for new means of exerting effective pressure on South Africa should impel us, after a courageous scrutiny of our conscience, to point out the people really responsible for this deplorable situation and help us to establish the true historic reasons for the permanent refusal of South Africa to heed the legitimate demands of the international community. If we were sceptical about the diplomatic action of the five Western countries, it was because it appeared—and the failure of the recent negotiations at Geneva proved us right—that those Western Powers were not really and seriously determined to exert on South Africa the specific, decisive weight of economic, military and diplomatic pressure which would wrench from their racist ally the reasons for its blackmail and defiance of our Organization, its resolutions and its decisions.

56. That Western complicity, which must be categorically denounced, can be understood quite easily if clearly and without excuses it is revealed that innumerable links of economic and financial co-operation and ideological and strategic solidarity characterize the world capitalist system in which South Africa holds an eminent place. All the information and documents submitted over a period of years by the United Nations Council for Namibia, SWAPO and many other organizations and progressive circles in Western countries establish this massive concrete reality.

57. I do not want to repeat lengthy extracts, however eloquent. The report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples [A/34/23/Rev.1], which has been circulated to us, and the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia [A/34/24], which is before us for our examination and approval, are two recent and thought-provoking expressions of a point of view which I share. I shall simply add that, as stressed in paragraph 191 in chapter IX of document A/34/23/Rev.1, the uranium deposit and the Rossing mines provide one of the main explanations for Western goodwill and the

refusal of certain strategists of imperialist domination not to impose the tough sanctions that would obviously leave South Africa no choice but to show scrupulous respect for the just decisions that we have been asking it to apply for many long years.

58. An article appeared a few days ago in the *New York Times* which highlighted even better the reality of the nuclear axis which closely binds Pretoria and certain industrial and military circles in Western Europe and Israel. As the best proof of this infamous conspiracy against the independence and freedom of our countries and peoples, the Parisian daily *Libération* printed a series of articles, also in December, which gives fresh information on the French involvement with Namibian uranium.

59. Thus, we have a brief but correct picture of the main factor in and the true historical reason for the manoeuvres which, in the manner of a well-orchestrated diplomatic ballet, South Africa is undertaking to try to blunt our vigilance and sabotage the peaceful settlement of the question of Namibia. A whole people is fighting for its freedom and dignity. Its best sons are organized and mobilized in SWAPO and are continuing to endure persecution, torture and colonial and racist oppression, which is the most humiliating form of oppression. Because the question of Namibia, in the final analysis, confronts our Organization and the international community with the national liberation struggle of an entire people, we must strengthen and expand our support for SWAPO in all the specific ways which our solidarity can make possible. This increased solidarity is a duty that history imposes on us. We must show our fidelity to the resolutions that we vote on and adopt in this Assembly.

60. Furthermore, so that our speeches and texts are not merely worthless annual exercises and so that they do not for ever remain pious wishes, we must raise ourselves to a qualitatively superior stage in the application of the enforcement instruments with which the United Nations system provides us. The General Assembly at its thirty-third session, the Organization of African Unity [OAU], at the sixteenth ordinary session of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government, held at Monrovia last July and the Sixth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Havana last September, clearly indicated the path to be followed and the vigorous decisive means by which to do so. The Security Council must make sure that all the decisions in the operative parts of its resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978) are fully implemented. As our comrade Peter Mueshihange of SWAPO said so pathetically:

“The time has come for the United Nations to face up to the persistent challenge from South Africa. The United Nations must act now to compel that régime to withdraw, unconditionally and forthwith, from Namibia. What we call for are enforcement measures under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter.

“The Fascist Boer junta of Pretoria has been pampered for far too long. It is an illegal régime which maintains the most brutal, violent and repressive military occupation in Namibia. Pretoria does not want and has never accepted a negotiated settlement; it has long opted for a military solution; hence the elaborate and massive military build-up, contrary to

all the efforts to implement the United Nations decolonization plan for Namibia.” [91st meeting, paras. 57 and 58.]

61. If we did not follow that path, we would be allowing South Africa to pursue its military aggression against the brotherly front-line States; we would be allowing the martyrdom of a people to be prolonged, with all the misery, the massacres and the Fascist acts of repression which are its daily lot. Those who make the greatest professions about human rights must join with us to ensure that one of the greatest injustices of our time which has been inflicted upon the people of our continent, is not perpetuated and so that one day in the not-too-distant future we in this Assembly can welcome unanimously and with pride the representatives of sovereign, free Namibia.

62. Mr. SIMBANANIYE (Burundi) (*interpretation from French*): In flagrant and persistent violation of United Nations resolutions on Namibia, the South African racist régime continues illegally to occupy the Territory of Namibia and to subject its peaceful people to one of the cruelest forms of repression of our time. Thus, in total defiance of the resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly, South Africa maintains its illegal administration in Namibia, pursues the all-out militarization of that country, intensifies its oppression of the Namibian people and without scruple relentlessly pillages the natural resources of that Territory, which is, nevertheless, under the direct authority of the United Nations.

63. South Africa's decision to annex Walvis Bay is part of its deliberate policy of refusing to comply with the decisions of our Organization concerning the integrity of the Territory. It was in this same vein that, in spite of Security Council resolutions 385 (1976), 435 (1978) and 439 (1978), the illegal régime of South Africa organized so-called elections in Namibia, which took place from 4 to 8 December 1978 without any outside monitoring. This persistent defiance of the United Nations and the international community should have caused the Security Council to decree the measures provided for in the Charter in cases of non-implementation of its decisions by a State Member.

64. That would have been all the more justified since South Africa had been constantly warned that, in the event of non-compliance with Security Council resolutions 385 (1976), 431 (1978), 435 (1978) and 439 (1978), the Council would feel compelled to meet immediately to decide on appropriate action under the United Nations Charter, including Chapter VII thereof.

65. Since then the question before us has been to ascertain the reasons why the Security Council does not comply with its own resolutions on Namibia. The delegation of Burundi believes it useful to stress this, because we are convinced that the deadlock on the Namibian question arises out of the present inability of the Security Council to comply with its own decisions and therefore to have its resolutions applied by Member States such as South Africa.

66. Certain Member States are against having the Security Council adopt the measures provided for in Article 41 of the Charter even though they do not imply the use of force. We believe that that position is at the root of the paralysis of the work of the Security Council on

Namibia and the deterioration in the situation in that country and throughout the entire region. For more than two years the international community has lived in the hope that the group of States that maintains relations of all kinds with South Africa would exert pressure upon that country to make it respect the decisions of the Security Council and the General Assembly on Namibia.

67. This Assembly will recall the initiative of the five Western countries regarding the proposal for a negotiated settlement of the Namibian question.⁶ Relying on the credibility of those States and their potentially decisive influence upon the position of South Africa, the other members of the Security Council endorsed their proposed settlement in resolution 431 (1978), which was adopted on 27 July 1978.

68. In my delegation's opinion the time has come to pronounce judgement on South Africa's intentions regarding implementation of that resolution. That would enable us to envisage more effective measures to compel South Africa to withdraw from Namibia and thus create conditions for the genuine independence of that country.

69. In the light of the letter of 5 December 1979 addressed to the Secretary-General by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of South Africa which was circulated as document S/13680, my delegation considers that South Africa continues to obstruct implementation of Security Council resolutions 431 (1978) and 435 (1978). The tactics of the illegal Government of South Africa have not changed. They consist in calling in question the essential elements of the proposed settlement while demanding new conditions that would seriously distort the United Nations plan for the decolonization of Namibia.

70. Thus, at the outset of the negotiations on the proposal of the five Western Powers, the stumbling-block was the question of Walvis Bay. In a spirit of political maturity, SWAPO accepted the plan of the five Western countries although that plan was not clear on this important question. Out of concern to see the negotiations move ahead, the Security Council did not define the status of Walvis Bay in its resolution 431 (1978). As we all know, the compromise on this problem is reflected in resolution 432 (1978), which also was rejected by South Africa.

71. On another important point, namely the question of the bases to which the South African armed forces being maintained in Namibia were to be restricted, SWAPO once again showed understanding and cooperated with the Secretary-General.

72. Regarding the size of the military contingent of UNTAG, SWAPO accepted the figure of 7,500 men, while South Africa thought that was too high a figure, forgetting that in Namibia it maintains an army of occupation of 60,000 men.

73. As regards the cease-fire, the international community is aware of South Africa's refusal to sign the cease-fire agreement proposed by SWAPO, simply contenting itself with calling upon SWAPO to put an end to what it calls its "acts of violence". This negative

attitude of South Africa has not prevented SWAPO from co-operating with the United Nations on this important question of a cease-fire.

74. As regards the confinement to barracks of the armed forces of SWAPO, the Secretary-General clarified this point in his report concerning the implementation of Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978).⁷ According to that report, all SWAPO armed forces in Namibia at the time of the cease-fire would be confined in various Namibian localities that would be designated by the Secretary-General's Special Representative after the required consultations.

75. As regards compliance with the cease-fire by the liberation forces stationed outside Namibia, the Secretary-General requested the agreement of the Governments of Angola, Botswana and Zambia with a view to setting up in those three countries offices of UNTAG.⁸ South Africa in its intransigence viewed these provisions as a radical departure from the settlement plan. That régime even attacked not only the Secretary-General but also the Western Powers, accusing them of having gone back on the assurances given South Africa on the interpretation of the provisions of the cease-fire. Thus, South Africa was blocking implementation of the United Nations plan and thereby the dynamics of peace in the region.

76. In order to facilitate the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), the late lamented President of Angola, Mr. Neto, suggested to the Secretary-General the establishment of a demilitarized zone along the northern borders of Namibia. In paragraph 10 of his report of 20 November 1979⁹ the Secretary-General states that SWAPO accepted the principle of the demilitarized zone and agreed to the detailed consideration of technical aspects, provided, of course, that South Africa also accepted the proposal. It is fitting to note likewise that the front-line States supported this initiative and that in principle they agree with the major outlines of the working document submitted by the Secretariat for a cessation of hostilities.

77. The reply of the racist South African Government to the proposals of the Secretary-General is most disappointing. It is contained in the letter of 5 December 1979 addressed to the Secretary-General by the South African Minister for Foreign Affairs.

78. With its customary arrogance and duplicity, South Africa declares that it is prepared to accept the idea of a demilitarized zone provided that

"... agreement is reached in further discussions... on... :

"1. The number of South African bases remaining in the DMZ;

"... ;

"6. Confirmation that the claim for SWAPO bases inside South West Africa/Namibia... will not be revived."¹⁰

⁷ *Ibid.*, *Thirty fourth Year, Supplement for January, February and March 1979*, document S/13120, paras. 11 and 12.

⁸ *Ibid.*, para. 13.

⁹ *Ibid.*, *Supplement for October, November and December 1979*, document S/13634.

¹⁰*Ibid.*, document S/13680, annex.

⁶ *Ibid.*, *Thirty-third Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1978*, document S/12636.

79. It is clear that South Africa in no way wishes a negotiated settlement with SWAPO to succeed.

80. Also, the international community can no longer be lulled with illusions as to South African co-operation with the United Nations with a view to enabling the Namibian people freely to determine their future. In the opinion of the delegation of Burundi, South Africa accepted the settlement proposal of the five Western Powers solely in the hope that SWAPO would reject it. Regrettably for South Africa, SWAPO, in a spirit of lofty responsibility and out of love for its country, accepted the proposal on 12 July 1978.

81. Now that South Africa's bad faith can no longer be camouflaged, the United Nations must fully assume its responsibilities. In the opinion of the delegation of Burundi, it is high time that energetic measures were adopted that are likely to compel South Africa to put an end to its illegal occupation of Namibia and to its policy of aggression against the Namibian people and neighbouring States such as Angola, Zambia and Botswana. The international community should no longer tolerate the policy of Fascist tyranny to which the Namibian people are subjected, that people which, under the guidance of SWAPO, is waging a heroic struggle for freedom, like all other peoples which prize peace and freedom.

82. Once again we wish to condemn that *apartheid* régime outlawed by mankind for its acts of violence and its atrocities committed against Namibian fighters and patriots.

83. We also wish to denounce the economic and military collaboration between South Africa and certain Western and other States.

84. The delegation of Burundi vehemently condemns the complicity of certain States which supply nuclear weapons to South Africa and firmly urges that that collaboration come to an end. With a view to halting the exploitation and pillaging of the economic resources of Namibia, we demand that all States and all companies comply with Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia enacted on 27 September 1974 by the United Nations Council for Namibia.¹¹

85. I also wish to declare that my delegation endorses the recommendations of the United Nations Council for Namibia designed to lead Namibia to genuine independence.

86. In particular I should like to support the proposal for an emergency meeting of the Security Council to be held with a view to adopting effective measures, including the sanctions provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter. These measures, in our opinion, should include comprehensive economic sanctions, including an embargo on trade, an embargo on oil and a total embargo on arms.

87. We hope that all the members of the Security Council will defend the just cause of the Namibian people, which is fighting for its dignity and freedom.

88. Before concluding, I should like to pay a well-deserved tribute to the United Nations Council for Namibia, under the dynamic leadership of Mr. Lusaka, the Permanent Representative of Zambia, for the very appreciable role that it played as the Administering Authority for Namibia until its independence. In this decisive moment for the future of Namibia, it is essential for that body to be accorded the broadest possible support by the international community.

89. Finally, on behalf of my Government I wish to praise the heroic struggle of the Namibian people, which, under the enlightened and responsible leadership of its only authentic representative, SWAPO, has already won important successes at the military and diplomatic levels.

90. To the front-line States, my Government pays a particular tribute for the active solidarity which they have never ceased to display towards that courageous people which my Government once again assures of its unswerving support.

91. Mrs. OSODE (Liberia): This perennial debate on the question of Namibia is immersed in increased political uncertainty and is taking place at a time when the international atmosphere is filled with anxiety. However, the uncertainty which this august body may feel—indeed, which it should feel in the light of circumstances and events—about self-determination and independence for Namibia in the near future should not lead it to feel any uncertainty during this session of the General Assembly about its determination to take, with urgency, positive and concerted action against South Africa.

92. My delegation had the misplaced hope that with the adoption of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), by which the Council approved the report of the Secretary-General, South Africa's mentors would have defused South Africa's intransigence, making possible the implementation of the proposal for a settlement of the Namibian situation. But we cannot avoid the passing thought that since South Africa proceeded to hold unsupervised elections in Namibia from 4 to 8 December 1978 to establish a constituent assembly, despite resolution 435 (1978), this may have been part of a conspiracy, the facts of which may be brought to light years from now. As will be recalled, this action was in defiance of General Assembly resolution S-9/2 of 3 May 1978 and Security Council resolution 439 (1978) of 13 November 1978, by which the Assembly and the Council declared that any such elections and their results would be null and void.

93. Not the least discouraging feature of the elections was the Administrator-General's proclamation of 14 May 1979, by which the racist minority South Africa régime established a legislative authority for Namibia known as the "National Assembly". My delegation understands that that assembly convened on 21 May 1979, two days before the start of the resumed session of the General Assembly on Namibia and established an Advisory Council of 12 members, referred to as a "Cabinet".

94. In the light of those circumstances, can any wise delegation here harbour the illusion that South Africa is indeed prepared to hold consultations seriously unless they are on its own terms? The conclusion is, whether we like it or not, that if force or pressure is not applied,

¹¹ Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-ninth Session, Supplement No. 24 A, para. 84. The Decree has been issued in final form in *Namibia Gazette* No. 1.

South Africa will not yield to any decisions that are not commensurate with its inhumane policies.

95. My Government and delegation whole-heartedly support SWAPO in word, sign and symbol. That organization is recognized by the OAU as the sole and authentic leader of the Namibian people. My delegation dares say, with admitted frankness, that SWAPO has been a significant force in events inside Namibia and outside, on behalf of the Territory and its people, who are struggling to attain freedom, justice, self-determination and independence. Member States adhere to those principles, which are imprinted in the Charter of the United Nations.

96. And yet, because SWAPO and the Namibian people have demonstrated that they, too, like South Africa and indeed all Member States, are entitled to their inalienable rights, members of SWAPO and other Namibians have been arbitrarily arrested, abducted and subjected to excruciating torture by the racists. According to a recent report by the United Nations Council for Namibia, the total number of Namibians arrested in May, June and July 1979 exceeded 15,000, and unprecedented acts of brutality were committed. The number far exceeds the population of some small Territories for which the United Nations seeks self-determination and independence. And to accommodate all those arrested, South Africa has constructed detention centres and concentration camps throughout the Territory, from Windhoek to Walvis Bay.

97. To what could such dastardly acts be attributed? That is not a question of major importance, for what is essential to the discussion is the existence of the fact, rather than the reasons for it. But if an answer were wanted, it could be sought in the startling decline in South Africa's self-confidence about its stronghold over the Namibian people.

98. My delegation concedes that this is an era in which we have to strive for agreement. That is why we supported the Secretary-General's initiative for simultaneous consultations in Geneva on the concept of the demilitarized zone. The talks, we note, were held to ascertain whether there was acceptance by the parties involved of the concept and some of the implications of the plan's terms of responsibility.

99. I am sure the President of the Assembly would agree—since his country, the United Republic of Tanzania, was present at the Geneva consultations held subsequent to two proximity talks held in New York—with the general observation that, while both South Africa and SWAPO were vigilant, it was SWAPO that demonstrated a greater spirit of compromise while at the same time being careful not to take decisions that would shatter its hopes for a free and independent Namibia, under the aegis of those chosen by the people themselves.

100. On the contrary—if my delegation's interpretation of South Africa's cynical letter of 5 December 1979 addressed to the Secretary-General, concerning the demilitarized zone, is correct—it has been South Africa that has once again insisted on its hard-line policy, which could abort whatever gains were made in Geneva and indeed implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia's independence.

101. It is not sufficient to engage in mere condemnation of South Africa. Decisive action designed to achieve genuine implementation must be taken at this session of the General Assembly.

102. My delegation is deeply disturbed that it is not only the Namibian people that South Africa intends to demolish, but also Angola, Zambia, Botswana and other neighbouring States. With blatant consistency, the Pretoria régime has carried out aggressive and wanton destruction of life and property. These States can little afford to suffer such hardships any longer. Although they have time and time again expressed appreciation for the urgent and generous contributions by Member States in their time of need—and we appeal for the continuance of such contributions—they could be impatient at being at the apparent mercy of States for contributions.

103. From a reliable source comes the report that in May 1979 South Africa reinforced its army units in northern Namibia by 8,000 to 10,000 reservists and additional war *matériel*. It has been reported in United States newspapers that, subsequently, South Africa may have detonated a nuclear weapon. We in Africa are greatly concerned about such reports, irrespective of whether they are speculation or fact. Such actions by South Africa further indicate that it does not accept the concept of the demilitarized zone and is indeed preparing for war, not only with Africa but with the United Nations as representing Namibia—since the United Nations Council for Namibia is the legal Administering Authority for the Territory until independence.

104. What makes one gloomy about the situation of Namibia is the impression given that the United Nations is being used in a way which makes it look like an accomplice. That is regrettable. Firm action is therefore necessary on the basis of the declaration by both the Security Council and the General Assembly that the situation of Namibia constitutes a threat to international peace and security.

105. In that connexion, we hope that the Security Council will convene urgently as it is called upon to do by General Assembly resolution 33/206 of 31 May 1979, to take enforcement measures against South Africa provided for under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations. It should be borne in mind that the OAU, whose work complements that of the United Nations, has already adopted resolutions calling for sanctions under Chapter VII, as has the non-aligned movement.

106. In conclusion, my delegation would like to congratulate Mr. Paul Lusaka, President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, for the efficient and laudable manner in which he has carried out his tasks. Ambassador Lusaka assumed his office under difficult circumstances and, since his election he has continued, with the assistance of the members of the Council and the Secretariat staff, to promote the interests of the Namibian people and the activities of the Council. My delegation strongly recommends that the Council's report contained therein [A/34/24], and its decisions be adopted unanimously.

107. We should also like to compliment Mr. Martti Ahtisaari, United Nations Commissioner for Namibia, whose great dedication, patience and integrity has won our admiration.

108. Let us here, one and all, help to strengthen the hand of the Secretary-General in order that his mandate on Namibia may be carried out as determined by the United Nations, for should he fail—against our expectations—we, too, will have failed.

109. Mr. ROBERTS PIQUER (Spain) (*interpretation from Spanish*): It is particularly encouraging to resume our debate on Namibia under the experienced leadership of Ambassador Salim, both because of his country's significant place in the vanguard of the anti-colonial movement and because of his long personal dedication, as 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 cause of the independence and liberation of peoples. On the other hand, it is pathetic that once again, after 13 long years, the General Assembly must deal with the situation in Namibia, and it is not surprising that among the numerous preceding statements, appeals for a just and peaceful solution to the problem have resounded in this hall with a note of urgency and justified impatience.

110. Support for the people of Namibia and for its right to independence with full territorial integrity has been a constant feature of Spain's foreign policy. The Namibian people must exercise its right to self-determination without further delay through the holding of free elections under United Nations supervision, in keeping with the plan endorsed by the Security Council in its resolution 435 (1978). As the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Spain stated before this Assembly on 24 September of this year:

"Spain considers that the active presence of the United Nations and the application of the provisions of this Organization through an international administration are needed to find the solution required to the problem of Namibia. Guided by these considerations, we voted in favour of resolution 33/206, which the General Assembly adopted on 31 May last because we believe that the illegal occupation of the Territory by South Africa must come to an end and because we support the right of the people of Namibia to self-determination, to freedom and to independence within a united Namibia." [5th meeting, para. 142.]

111. During the last two years, the United Nations has witnessed innumerable efforts by its Members to achieve a negotiated settlement of the question of Namibia. The Security Council set forth the basic guidelines for such attempts in its resolutions 385 (1976), 431 (1978), 435 (1978) and 439 (1978). Negotiations between the parties have been difficult and complex, and SWAPO has evinced a spirit of political responsibility by accepting the proposals for the five Western Powers and the plan outlined by the Secretary-General for the independence of Namibia. In recent months, attempts have redoubled to surmount the obstacles that have so far hindered implementation of that plan.

112. The present debate is taking place at a crucial moment in the history of the African continent, and especially in the southern part. The momentum of the liberation forces is an irreversible historical trend and day by day it attains its goals. The conclusion of an agreement in the Lancaster House negotiations on the

future of Southern Rhodesia could open a significant path towards the achievement of peace in that entire area of Africa. In this instance, the Patriotic Front has shown an exemplary spirit of conciliation in the negotiations held with the administering Power and the Salisbury régime with a view to creating an authentically independent Zimbabwe.

113. But it would be of little avail for the liberation movements to be open to dialogue if the Governments that exercise control over those Territories were not to take the necessary steps to achieve a just and lasting solution. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Spain was not speaking lightly when, before our Assembly in October of last year, he regretted "the intransigent attitude of the South African Government, which could lead to a deterioration of the situation, with unforeseeable consequences".¹²

114. I believe we all share the same concern at the attempts by South Africa to achieve an "internal settlement", in violation of the principles of the Charter, as demonstrated by the holding of unilateral elections last December, against the express opinion of the Security Council. Such illicit manoeuvres have been followed by an intensification of South Africa's military presence in Namibia, by arbitrary detentions of a large number of SWAPO leaders and by repeated acts of intimidation and violence, not only within the boundaries of the Territory it is illegally occupying, but also against neighbouring countries. Such acts of aggression have been condemned by the Security Council and deplored by the international community as a whole, which fears that the defiant attitude of a minority could serve to aggravate an already tragic situation.

115. Spain fully supports the efforts of the Secretary-General, the five Western States and the front-line States to carry out what is still the most coherent settlement plan to end South Africa's illegal occupation and thereby bring peace to Namibia. In this sense, the concept of a demilitarized zone between the frontiers of Namibia and Angola, as proposed by the late President Agostinho Neto, is a valuable contribution towards achieving peace in the area. The consultations held last month at Geneva among the various representatives who had already held proximity talks in New York last March—including the five Western Powers, the front-line States, South Africa and SWAPO—represent a positive step along the already lengthy road towards an agreement. We are fully aware of the technical difficulties that exist in implementing the plan for the transition period, and for the action of UNTAG to be fully effective, a final clarification of its tasks and spheres of operation must be made. The acceptance in principle by South Africa of the establishment of a demilitarized zone may be a constructive element, and South Africa must avoid entering a new impasse by setting difficult conditions that the international community, at the present juncture, could hardly regard as other than delaying tactics.

116. At this time, any delay in the effective and immediate implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia represents not only an affront to a people that for many years has been awaiting the attainment of its most basic rights while suffering continued harassment and violence, but also a defiance of the entire interna-

¹² *Ibid.*, Thirty-third Session, Plenary Meetings, 16th meeting, para. 20.

tional community. Spain has always advocated the achievement of a diplomatic solution, all the more so now that a hopeful glimmer of peace is beginning to dawn in the negotiations. However, for that reason, we believe that it would be extremely dangerous to trifle with the well-earned patience of the neighbouring countries and attempts to rein in a people's drive for its independence. At its thirty-third session the General Assembly proclaimed 1979 the International Year of Solidarity with the People of Namibia [*resolution 33/182 C*], and, if we wish that proclamation to be given genuine content, our Organization must without delay adopt relevant measures for the attainment of independence and majority government by that people.

117. In this connexion the United Nations Council for Namibia has been unceasingly mobilizing international opinion in support of the Namibian people and has prepared and carried out assistance programmes for Namibians in close co-operation with SWAPO. I should like to join in the congratulations addressed to the President of the Council for Namibia, Mr. Paul Lusaka of Zambia, for the dynamic manner in which he is guiding the work of the Council, which has during the past year intensified its co-operation with United Nations agencies, such as FAO and UNESCO, and given momentum to the Nationhood Programme planned in close co-operation with UNDP. The Council for Namibia has been able to mobilize international opinion by sending special missions to various parts of the world and by its active participation in several international conferences.

118. We have at our disposal all the instruments that will enable us to build a free and independent Namibia. We also have before us the general outlines of an agreement which have been accepted by the parties concerned. Let us not allow delaying tactics, bad faith or suspicious reservations to continue to frustrate the achievement of the legitimate aspirations of a people for its national unity and independence. We wish here to express the profound conviction of Spain that the Namibian patriots must immediately accede to their right to self-determination and independence in a united Namibia, in accordance with the ideals of justice and freedom contained in our Charter, whose principles are at the basis of the resolutions adopted by the Assembly on the question of Namibia.

119. Mr. BENDAÑA (Nicaragua) (*interpretation from Spanish*): A few months ago the representative of countries friendly to the Nicaraguan people used this forum to express their solidarity with the Sandinist struggle against the criminal dictatorship of the Somoza family. Today the victorious Nicaraguan people wishes, through its Revolutionary Government, to reciprocate that solidarity by associating itself with the right of peoples to self-determination. As a revolutionary movement which has acceded to power, we can do no less than to insist on the universality of the right for which the Nicaraguan people shed their blood—the right to genuine independence and to the formation of an authentic representative government.

120. Today we invoke the rights of the struggling people of Namibia. As Sandinists and as members of the non-aligned movement, the people and the Government of Nicaragua fulfil their political and moral duty to express their complete support for the struggle of the heroic Namibian people and for the positions and claims of their sole and legitimate vanguard, SWAPO.

121. There is no need to elaborate at length on the well-known criminal policy of *apartheid* of the South African colonialists. The purpose of their racist policy is to create a bloc against the liberation of Namibia, Southern Rhodesia and South Africa, under the shameless and merciless leadership of Pretoria. In Namibia, as in Rhodesia, South Africa seeks to impose its system of exploitation on the basis of repression and the promotion of so-called internal settlements. But justice itself and the reports of the Special Committee on decolonization and the Council for Namibia show that the only valid settlement is one based on the cessation of South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia, on its territorial integrity and on the decisive participation of SWAPO.

122. Like beasts at bay the South African forces have transformed Namibia into an armed camp, from which they commit criminal acts of aggression against neighbouring States. We wish to place on record our support and admiration for the front-line States for their commitment to the cause of freeing Namibia, despite the great sacrifices which that solidarity entails.

123. The struggle for liberation in southern Africa has entered its most decisive stage. Nicaragua supports the recommendations of the Special Committee on decolonization and the Sixth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Havana, to the effect that all countries must render the greatest possible assistance and support to the struggle of the Namibian people through SWAPO. Nicaragua supports the report of the Secretary-General [*A/34/404*] and emphatically calls upon the Western Member States to facilitate the taking of effective measures, within the Security Council, against South Africa and the application of Chapter VII of the Charter in particular. As long as certain countries maintain broad military and economic links with the racist régime, South Africa will continue with impunity to resort to force and to illegality in order to perpetuate its occupation, in open defiance of the authority of the United Nations.

124. Finally, Nicaragua, together with other countries members of the non-aligned movement, reaffirms its total support for the inalienable right of the Namibian people to freedom, independence and territorial integrity and also reaffirms its support for the struggle of SWAPO, the sole legitimate representative of the Namibian people, to liquidate by every possible means South African domination over Namibia.

125. Mr. ESQUEA GUERRERO (Dominican Republic) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Once again we are considering in the General Assembly one of the gravest problems of concern to the peoples of the world which is casting doubt on the effectiveness of this world Organization.

126. We really cannot understand how, 13 years after this very Assembly declared South Africa's Mandate ended and ordered South Africa to hand the Territory of Namibia over to the United Nations Council for Namibia, that country, in sheer obstinacy, continues to dominate the noble people of Namibia and improperly exploit its wealth.

127. But South Africa is not satisfied with its illegal occupation and unrestrained plunder of the wealth of that people and sinking to the depths of ignominy, has

transplanted to those territories its policy of *apartheid*, depriving the people inhabiting them, the sole legitimate owner, of the most elementary rights.

128. Time and time again the General Assembly and the Security Council itself have confirmed the responsibility of this Organization for the total and speedy accession of Namibia to independence and self-determination. And we have on more than one occasion condemned South Africa's goal of seizing the Territory of Namibia.

129. The position which this General Assembly has maintained has convinced South Africa of the imminent liberation of the Namibian people and, in the face of this reality, it now seeks to appropriate part of the Namibian territory by annexing Walvis Bay and to fragment that Territory, granting a so-called independence by rigged elections to some of the bantustans into which it has divided the noble country of Namibia.

130. Fortunately, this attempt by South Africa to appropriate Walvis Bay and the fraudulent elections held in the bantustans have been rejected by this Organization. But we still have to find a definite solution to the problem of Namibia.

131. On many occasions this Assembly has requested the Security Council to adopt measures which would compel South Africa to comply with the resolutions adopted by the Assembly and by the Council itself, and yet to date we have not seen any conclusive decision in this regard.

132. Our delegation, which has always supported the people of Namibia in its struggle, will support the draft resolutions which are to be put to the vote in this Assembly, and we wish to emphasize our view that the Security Council should at once proceed to adopt appropriate measures, including the application, if need be, of Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter, to solve the problem once and for all.

133. Lastly, allow me to congratulate the Secretary-General as well as 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 for the reports which they have submitted to us on the subject.

134. Mr. MESTIRI (Tunisia) (*interpretation from French*): The destiny of Namibia is marked by a sad combination of colonization and racial discrimination. They are both familiar to us; they have profoundly affected the history of African societies, but never has a nation, either in Africa or elsewhere in the world, suffered such frustration from the colonial order, since it has been doubly denied its natural right to sovereignty and to human dignity for each of its children.

135. Basically, that borrowed sovereignty which South Africa took over from the first colonial Power so as to claim legality for its power over Namibia, is the last vestige of the murky history of colonization. The world has already condemned that claim, of which Namibia is the only remaining victim.

136. Furthermore, the social order based on racial discrimination has been condemned, but it is being

directly imposed on South African territory. It is especially denounced in that Territory in which the Namibian has already been stripped of his political rights and is still afflicted by the oppression that is being inflicted upon him only because he is African.

137. That is why the definitive liberation of Namibia is for us a symbol of the joint resolve of all nations of the world to restore the rights of a people which has fared so badly in this respect.

138. The development of the Namibian question has ceased to be linked to the affirmation of the rights of the Namibian people or even the recognition of those rights, because the General Assembly and the Security Council have taken a definite stand on the matter which allows no hesitation or uncertainty. The United Nations Council for Namibia has contributed greatly to the establishment of the scope of those rights and to broadening the recognition and the implementation of them in the United Nations system. Here, at least, progress on the question of Namibia has been considerable.

139. But the means mobilized to permit the exercise of these rights by the Namibian people are insufficient, since we see that there has been dangerous stagnation in the negotiations, without any breakthrough or any draft plan which would allow us at least some hope of a change in the Territory itself. The lessons to be learned from this confrontation with the South African party are complex and pregnant with consequences. This phase of decolonization, in the specific conditions of southern Africa, poses essential problems linked to a type of responsibility with which the United Nations is not totally or in all honesty associated.

140. In the specific case of Namibia our Organization has without a doubt assumed direct responsibility to administer the Territory until it accedes to independence. But the deadlock in the negotiations regarding the exercise of the United Nations Mandate has been accompanied by a worsening of the military situation and an intensification of the repression within Namibia itself.

141. Two points are noteworthy here. First, the mere repression of Namibian civilians by the South African administration entails a responsibility for the United Nations when the means of that repression are recognized as inhuman or take on the systematic character of genocide. It is clear indeed that that defenceless population has not been placed under the authority of a national Power and that the present administration has only delegated power. The abandonment of the population to harsh persecution presents a problem of direct responsibility to our Organization because with respect to the Namibian people the commitment of the United Nations is imperative and direct.

142. Here we note that characteristic acts of violation of rights and tortures have been noted and described in irrefutable detail in the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia without any authority being invoked to guarantee respect for the rights of the victims or even to call for an immediate inquiry. If, as is probable, these campaigns start up again and if there is more systematic extension of the concentration camps, of which there were 10, according to the report, in July

1979, what authority in the world will be able to ensure the protection and the survival of the Namibian people?

143. The return to these methods is in itself a legitimate reason for this Organization to intervene as a matter of urgency, without prejudging the outcome of the political negotiations now in progress with regard to the conditions for the general elections to be supervised by the United Nations.

144. This particular facet of the Namibian question should ensure the sincere support of all the Powers that witnessed the horrors perpetrated during the Second World War. Naturally, the effectiveness of the United Nations depends on the political will shown and the pressure exerted mainly by the Western Powers. The African States will not be insensitive to that effort—not in its rhetorical manifestations but in its effectiveness—which in our view is the only proof of its sincerity.

145. That first purely humanitarian and preservative concern requires, of course, a political decision, to the extent that the United Nations can only secure increased effectiveness by invoking the authority of the Security Council. That concern is necessary, however, so that the essential initiative may be taken by the international community, quite apart from any tactical considerations as to decolonization, especially if there is a possibility that decolonization may be postponed indefinitely.

146. Our second concern is with regard to the major political negotiations on the final liberation of the Namibian people. These lengthy, involved and sterile negotiations have been hampered politically by the principal Powers, which claim to entrust a clear, decisive mandate to the United Nations, but without deigning to give it the capacity to discharge that mandate. Here, three aspects are worthy of attention.

147. First of all, there is the permanent equivocal situation of the succession of responsibilities between the South African administration and the United Nations concerning the Territory. The claim of South Africa is that it will lead the Territory to independence without interruption and, in particular, without any intermediate authority replacing its authority to transmit power to independent Namibia in due course. The formal decision taken by the United Nations is first to negotiate the end of the interim mandate of the United Nations.

148. The main point in the divergencies which separate the proposals and counter-proposals which have been made for two years now has to do with vagueness whereby the South African negotiating body attempts to mislead world public opinion, claiming to subscribe to the aim of independence but reserving to itself the right to elaborate directly the terms of that independence by assuming the essential responsibility for the maintenance of order, the limited selection of the electors, and the essential participation of its own agents in the principal phases of the electoral process. In a word, South Africa upholds the idea of its continued sovereignty over Namibian territory, reserving power to itself during both the preparatory stage and the elections themselves and reserving to itself the right to negotiate its own withdrawal with the power to which it transmits sovereignty over the Territory. The controversy over the demilitarized zone is merely a conse-

quence of that artificial problem. Indeed, this equivocation increases and aggravates the stalemate in the negotiations, impeding progress because the intermediate steps have not been identified and the question of the elections is being isolated from security matters, which should not be confused in the hypothesis of the succession of powers. The United Nations Council for Namibia should first remove all South Africa's administrative responsibility for Namibia.

Mr. Salim (United Republic of Tanzania) took the Chair.

149. At this stage in the evaluation of the plethora of proposals, we consider that a clearer definition of the various negotiating stages should enable us to clarify the scope of the divergent views and would certainly make some progress possible on matters of substance.

150. A second aspect of this process lies in the relative negotiating capacity of each of the parties. Faced with the power of South Africa, which has the option of using its prerogative of total sovereignty by promoting any military initiative in the Territory and in the region, freezing any decision of the international Organization, the United Nations has merely to indicate the latitude of action given it by the Member States under the terms of the Charter. It is clear that a theoretical evaluation of the equation could only permit greater progress if the South African party agreed, or if, with the support of the General Assembly, it was the will of the permanent members of the Security Council.

151. The Western Powers have decided to assume qualified responsibility during these negotiations.

152. In defining and formulating the rights of the Namibian people, our Assembly displayed a considerable degree of agreement, which soon led to the preparation of the strategy for a peaceful settlement. The support for that strategy by the Powers concerned gave us hope for decisive progress in decolonization within the framework of the United Nations.

153. The support of the Western Powers has been qualified by reservations and has caused deadlock by abstention when we have had to negotiate, faced by South Africa, on means of protection and conditions for the exercise of the rights of the Namibian people. That abstention would have been justified if another alternative had been proposed to ensure the attainment of those rights within acceptable time-limits. Unless they condemn the evasions and denials of the South African party in these negotiations, which reveal its delaying tactics, the Powers concerned must be held responsible for this policy of obstruction.

154. Finally, faced with the demands and the aggression committed by South Africa and its refusal to abide by the proposal for a peaceful settlement, the United Nations can only impose economic sanctions and the other measures provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter. It is then that the Western Powers use their veto. Therefore they must assume the responsibility for the position.

155. Thus the role assumed by the Powers concerned is decisive for the outcome of the peaceful settlement of the Namibian question. That policy of fractional distillation is certainly based on traditional considerations of

a colonial nature, with which the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia deals at length, and on the military considerations to which the official Norwegian authorities refer when they mention the debate on Namibia in the Council of Nordic countries during the meetings of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization [NATO], as indicated in paragraph 137 of the report of the Council for Namibia. These considerations are all familiar to us: the decolonization process has dealt with these obsolete strategies and shown that international peace and security are even more threatened by the persistence of colonization than by respect for the freedom and independence of people. The obstruction by these Powers casts doubt on the value of what they say against the practice of racism and in favour of the principle of freedom. It is this aspect that we shall deal with in the next point.

156. The emergence of a racist and military Power in pre-war Europe gave rise only to a defence reflex and precipitate action to accede to the first demands of a régime which apparently only wanted peace. But in the final analysis, Europe was very quickly convinced that it is impossible to compromise with a racist régime. The only Power which tried to do that suffered the destructive ravages promised to all the others. The United Nations was born of that tragic experience.

157. Today we denounce the attempts to compromise with racism, at the root of the Western strategy. If the world of today has been able to check colonization, it has still not eradicated from our continent that ultimate production of colonization which has been exacerbated in that system which is the enemy of the African man, by which the white minority has legalized its domination under the indulgent eyes of the Western world.

158. The manifestation of solidarity can hardly be attributed to inexperience. Perhaps it contains the very spirit of the first colonial drive, when the colonizers were reluctant to extend for the benefit of the indigenous people the principles they reserve for the exclusive use of the society considered to be superior. That propensity to tolerate for the African what the white man fought against and would not accept for himself offends our concept of international morality. It warns us of a demarcation of civilization pregnant with consequences.

159. Africans were enrolled in the armies of the allied nations in the war against the Nazi system. Thus the African has the right to believe today that the victorious Powers recognize that as the price of freedom, because at the root of this tragic evasion is the very meaning of the freedom that is now being challenged.

160. When the African countries dealt the decisive blow to colonization, their faith in the future of a world with greater respect for freedom and human dignity was absolute. Having rejected the colonial order, we were convinced that we were bringing to our continent a better order, one of the foundations of which was universal acceptance of the principle of the equality and dignity of man. If the Powers that first colonized Africa and then established and protected their by-products in that continent could accept that principle and draw the right conclusions, we would be able really to arrive at the end of the twentieth century at an era of mutual respect and true co-operation. That would be one of the foundations of the final liberation of Namibia and one of the bases of a new international order in accordance

with the spirit of the Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

161. Mr. FILLIE-FABOE (Sierra Leone): Recently, while the whole world has been watching with keen interest the outcome of the Zimbabwe negotiations, with hopes for a peaceful solution, and while the minority régime in Salisbury has been exposed and shown to be illegal, the régime in Pretoria has contrived not to realize that the writing is on the wall and that the *apartheid* system is doomed to failure. With every passing day the forces of liberation are closing in on the usurpers of power in southern Africa.

162. With the attainment of independence by Angola and Mozambique, South Africa's first constellation of States disappeared. Now, with the imminent independence of Zimbabwe, South Africa is once more talking about building a second constellation of States to revolve around it. Such desperate manoeuvres just will not do, nor will the threat of a nuclear device. There is historical evidence for this. History has proved that not even an arsenal of nuclear weapons can prevent a people from gaining freedom and independence, and South Africa ignores this fact at its peril.

163. For the past 12 years the Pretoria régime has defied and continued illegally to occupy the Territory of Namibia against the wishes of the Namibian people and their sole and authentic representative, SWAPO; against the wishes of the international community, as expressed in numerous resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council; against even the judgement of the International Court of Justice. Instead, South Africa has continued its policy of repression of the people of the Territory in the form of detention, torture and, in many cases, even death.

164. Another form which the illegal occupation has assumed is that of the dismemberment of the Territory. The régime in Pretoria, in violation of the General Assembly resolutions, has proceeded to separate Walvis Bay from the rest of Namibia and place it under direct South African administration. In the midst of all this and again contrary to the will of the General Assembly, South Africa has continued to exploit the wealth and natural resources of the Territory.

165. Last year, against our better judgement, we allowed our hopes to be raised by the effort of the five Western Powers to bring independence to Namibia. Our reservations were based on our understanding of the Pretoria régime and its notorious inability to undertake any meaningful negotiations or act in good faith on issues from which *apartheid* does not stand to be strengthened.

166. With the adoption of resolution 435 (1978), and given the concurrence of the five Western members of the Security Council, hopes had been raised that at last the problem of Namibia would be settled peacefully. It is clear to all fair-minded observers that the adoption of that resolution could have come about only as a result of the significant concessions made and the good faith eloquently displayed by SWAPO, the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people. But it has now turned out that such hopes were misplaced because of the racist régime's prevarication and determination not to grant genuine independence to Namibia.

167. In the circumstances, and with the rejection by South Africa of the Security Council resolutions, this Organization is left with no alternative but to take action under Chapter VII of the Charter in order to compel South Africa to comply with the decision of this Organization that, its occupation of the Territory being illegal, it must withdraw from Namibia.

168. In order to justify its decision to wreck the implementation of the plan for peaceful independence for Namibia, South Africa has asserted that the provisions excluding the monitoring of SWAPO bases outside Namibia constitute a violation of the terms of the settlement proposals. It also contends that it would be a violation of the settlement proposals to establish designated locations for the armed forces of SWAPO inside Namibia. We submit that these are untenable assertions and that they cannot genuinely constitute the main reasons for South Africa's decision to renege on its undertaking and duty to carry out faithfully the settlement proposals which were agreed upon.

169. SWAPO had, throughout the negotiations, made its position clear: that it would allow its forces to be monitored and confined in bases within Namibia. There is, therefore, no question of throwing thousands of SWAPO liberation fighters into Namibia upon the declaration of a cease-fire, as South Africa is alleging. On the other hand, South Africa has of late been pouring thousands of soldiers and tanks into Namibia, especially into the northern regions. Therefore, the effort by South Africa to abort the settlement proposals for the reasons given, flimsy as they are, cannot be accepted.

170. In the circumstances, this body is left with no alternative but to take punitive action now against the occupying régime of Pretoria. The Foreign Minister of that Fascist régime is reported to have stated that it is no longer interested in achieving an internationally acceptable settlement in both Namibia and Zimbabwe and that South Africa envisages the establishment of a South African "power bloc of moderate States", in which South Africa would no doubt be the lynchpin. Moreover, the claim by South Africa that it should be allowed to locate a military base in the proposed demilitarized zone is further proof that it is not interested in a peaceful solution of the Namibian problem or in removing its occupation forces from that Territory.

171. It is, therefore, very appropriate and timely that action be taken that will frustrate South Africa's barbaric intention to remain in Namibia after the installation of its puppet régime.

172. Mr. MAVROMMATIS (Cyprus): The General Assembly is once again considering the question of Namibia, a Territory for which the United Nations has had direct responsibility since the adoption of General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI), by which the Mandate of South Africa over Namibia was terminated. Since then, the United Nations has been faced by the stubborn refusal of the South African régime to end its illegal occupation and administration of Namibia and to comply with a series of United Nations resolutions.

173. The establishment in 1967 of the United Nations Council for Namibia [resolution 2248 (S-V)] contributed tremendously to alerting public opinion and increasing international support for the cause of the Namibian people in their just struggle for genuine inde-

pendence under the leadership of SWAPO, their sole and authentic representative. I wish, in this regard, to express to Ambassador Lusaka of Zambia, President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, of which my delegation prides itself on being a member, and to you, Mr. President, in your capacity as 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, my delegation's deep appreciation of the significant contribution made by those bodies in the interests of the people of Namibia and of decolonization in general. My delegation would like also to commend highly the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia, Mr. Ahtisaari, for his tireless efforts in preparing the Nationhood Programme for Namibia and promoting its progressive implementation.

174. It may be recalled further that, despite its contemptuous disregard of a series of Security Council and General Assembly resolutions, the Pretoria régime has found it possible to avert decisive and effective action against it under the Charter by using various delaying tactics and other devious methods. As the record clearly shows, South Africa has adopted the same attitude to the proposals of the five Western members of the Security Council for an internationally acceptable settlement of the question of Namibia, which, as is well known, were endorsed by the Security Council in its resolutions 431 (1978) and 435 (1978).

175. Indeed, despite the announced acceptance by the South African régime of those proposals we have witnessed the implementation of the arbitrary decision of the racist régime to hold its own so-called elections in Namibia without any United Nations supervision or control. The fact that South Africa proceeded with those elections despite the warning and condemnation of the Security Council constitutes yet another basic reason for immediate and effective response by the Security Council as provided for under Chapter VII of the Charter.

176. If additional evidence of Pretoria's bad faith were needed, that came with the reply sent on the eve of this debate purporting to accept the idea of a demilitarized zone. That so-called acceptance is subject to many conditions, which in effect negate the very idea of the demilitarized zone as proposed by the Secretary-General. In this respect, I wish to take this opportunity to register our deep appreciation of this initiative by Mr. Waldheim, in which we are confident he will persist.

177. We strongly condemn South Africa's attempt to retain control over and to annex Walvis Bay, in clear violation of international law, the United Nations Charter and, in particular, 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 essential element in the 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 Namibia's national security and unity.

178. We also strongly condemn the creation of tribal armies, the forced bantustanization of the Territory and the repeated attacks on front-line States, the most recent of which was against Angola.

179. What constitutes an added cause for alarm is the news of South African activity towards the acquisition of nuclear weapons. In such circumstances, my delegation is of the view that the conclusions and recommendations of the United Nations Seminar on Nuclear Collaboration with South Africa, held in London on 24 and 25 February 1979,¹³ which call, *inter alia*, for the adoption of mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter to put an end to all nuclear collaboration with South Africa, should be acted upon without any further delay.

180. As a member of the Council for Namibia, Cyprus has participated in the work of the Council and we wish to join the President of the Council and other members in urging acceptance and speedy implementation of the recommendations contained in the Council's report.

181. We take particular note of the fruitful participation of the Council, on behalf of the people of Namibia, in the work of the specialized agencies, and the granting of full membership to it by an increased number of those agencies. Similarly, we wish to acknowledge the importance of the work of the Institute for Namibia, based in Lusaka, which, in anticipation of a free and independent Namibia, busily trains administrative and other personnel.

182. The cause of the people of Namibia is quite similar to that of the people of Cyprus, for they both encompass the struggle for genuine independence and the survival of their threatened identity and status. The analogies between the plight of the Namibian people and that of our own are also striking. Thus, in our modest way we shall continue, despite the hardships and adverse conditions prevailing in our country, to contribute consistently to the relevant United Nations programmes for Namibia.

183. In its desire to see the achievement of tangible progress in the efforts to promote a just settlement of this question, my delegation is among the sponsors of draft resolutions A/34/L.45 to A/34/L.50/Rev.1. It is our hope that these draft resolutions will be supported by the largest possible majority. However, it would be remiss of me not to stress that resolutions alone, even if adopted unanimously, cannot bring about the desired end. It is their implementation that is of paramount importance, for that alone can lead to the achievement of the objectives of the Charter. I hope that the result of this year's debate will mark a definite movement in that direction.

184. The illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa must be ended by the latter's effecting its complete and unconditional withdrawal, so as to enable the Namibian people, under the leadership of SWAPO, to exercise fully its right to self-determination and independence. Let us all join in collective action to that end.

185. Mr. de FIGUEIREDO (Angola): The thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly is drawing to a close; myriads of resolutions have been adopted and countless decisions taken. But, for the people of Namibia, history appears to be moving backwards, despite the best efforts of the front-line States in general

and those of the People's Republic of Angola in particular.

186. I shall not attempt to recount the history of Namibia's illegal military occupation by the racist minority régime in South Africa or to go into the painfully slow pace of the negotiations of the past few years. The international community is aware of the positive and constructive role of my Government, which has time and again broken the deadlock resulting from South Africa's sabotage and subversion whenever a negotiated settlement seemed to be in sight.

187. The world is also well aware of the courageous stand adopted by SWAPO, the national liberation movement of the Namibian people. SWAPO has been engaged in armed struggle for the liberation of Namibia, but since the start of the negotiations by the five Western countries, SWAPO has displayed consistent and constant willingness to seek a solution to the question of Namibian independence. Apart from the endless list of crimes being committed by the racist South African Government against the people of Namibia, the Pretoria Government has hounded and terrorized SWAPO in particular in an attempt to annihilate physically the national liberation movement of Namibia. Despite those brutalities, SWAPO has maintained its readiness to seek a negotiated settlement, and the five Western countries are the foremost witnesses to this. SWAPO has returned again and again to the negotiating table, even after the murderous attacks and bombardments in Kassinga.

188. South Africa has continued to deploy military, political, diplomatic and even semantic weapons to prevent the implementation of the Secretary-General's plan for the independence of Namibia. It is testimony to our fortitude and forbearance, as well as to South Africa's favoured position in the Western economic and political system, that SWAPO and the front-line States have been the ones which have borne the brunt of military action in the area and the ones to accept the reformulations, the revisions, the redefinitions, the repositioning and the renumbering: in effect, in the interests of peace in Africa, stability in southern Africa, the independence of Namibia and the lessening of international tension and the dangers posed to international peace and security. For all those reasons, we have wholeheartedly co-operated with efforts by the five Western countries and the United Nations to work out a formula that will lead to genuine independence for Namibia.

189. SWAPO has returned to the negotiating table after each and every one of South Africa's attacks, gaolings, brutalities and terror campaigns. And the world knows what the People's Republic of Angola has faced since our independence four years ago: armed South African invasions, paratroop assaults, bombing, strafing, shelling, armoured assaults, helicopter assaults, wanton destruction of livestock and factories, mines, communications and transport equipment; not to mention the loss of human lives, not only military but civilian also—children in schoolrooms, women in the fields, men in factories killed by Western-supplied aircraft, weapons and ammunition wielded by racist South African troops. All this is daily experienced by thousands of Angolans as our borders are violated both on the ground and in the air.

¹³ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-fourth Year, Supplement for January, February and March 1979*, document S/13157, chap. VII.

190. Yet we take our wounded to the hospital, we replace the livestock, we rebuild the schoolrooms, we bury our dead. And we, too, return to the negotiating table so that the cause of peace and stability may be strengthened in southern Africa.

191. Revolution is not merely armed insurrection, as much of the world mistakenly thinks. It is a constant dynamic, an ongoing process in which the masses take part, in which they shape their own priorities and their own future. And revolution, finally, cannot be contained in tight little boxes; an international outlook is as much a part of revolutionary obligation as is the quest for national liberation, social justice and mass participation.

192. The people of Angola, led by the Central Committee of their vanguard party, the MPLA¹⁴ Workers' Party, have always supported progressive causes all over the world, and especially on the African continent. Our support for SWAPO and the people of Namibia and for the Patriotic Front and the people of Zimbabwe has never wavered, even when the battlefield has been in Angola, even when the victims have been Angolans.

193. It was in the same spirit of revolution and liberation that the Angolan Government presented a new set of proposals late last summer, which once more broke the deadlock in which South Africa had once again placed the entire United Nations plan. Talks were held in Geneva not too long ago, but South Africa has once again succeeded in buying time, as is clear from its latest communication, contained in document S/13680. In that document South Africa has outlined six points, many of which give Pretoria the opportunity, whenever it chooses, to twist the formulation, to make impossible demands or to break off forward movement. I base this, of course, on South Africa's past actions, which have run true to form.

194. On behalf of my Government I once again reiterate our demand that the five Western countries, which have been the middlemen and brokers on the Namibian issue, continue to discharge their responsibilities and ensure that Pretoria does not continue to play its game of buying time, of linking Namibian independence to the outcome of the Salisbury plan and of continuing to have a puppet group in power in Namibia.

195. I will honestly confess our apprehension and our fears, to which we have already referred in the course of this session's deliberations on other but related items. We know of South Africa's "constellation" strategy, of which key components are a pliant, passive, Pretoria-controlled Namibia and Zimbabwe. As part of that strategy, in 1978, Pretoria went ahead and held sham elections the sole purpose of which was to create a puppet body that would become a party to a Namibian settlement.

196. The international community is once more waiting for the five Western countries to deliver the goods by persuading South Africa to negotiate on details of the plan honestly and without subterfuge and by putting pressure on South Africa not to sabotage the peace process. We also expect the five Western countries to continue in their role of sponsor until successful implementation of the Secretary-General's plan.

¹⁴ Movimento Popular de Libertação de Angola.

197. When intentions are honest, when there is a willingness to negotiate, then working out details does not present insurmountable problems. History has given us no proof either of Pretoria's honesty or of its willingness to see Namibia move towards genuine independence. As for us, the positive concessions we have made, the flexibility we have shown and the restraint we have practised are all amply documented. The cause of Namibian independence is one that involves every Angolan, and in fact it is one that should involve every African, for the freedom of Namibia is part of the freedom of the African continent.

198. *A luta continua.*

199. Mr. DOUKOURE (Guinea) (*interpretation from French*): One of the guiding principles of the foreign policy of the State Party of Guinea is sufficiently known. It consists in the expression of unconditional and active solidarity with all democratic forces throughout the world that are struggling against imperialism and against its string of injustices, a relentless struggle, the outcome of which is well known to us in advance, it consists also in solidarity above all with the peoples of Africa, in the resolute and constant support for their legitimate struggle to eliminate the last vestiges of colonial régimes from the continent and to reaffirm true freedom and independence.

200. That is why the question of Namibia which is on the agenda at this session marks a decisive stage in the decolonization process that has gone forward so rapidly since the end of the Second World War.

201. The OAU has many member States which, apart from Ethiopia and Liberia, were colonies in 1945. Among those 49 African States are all the ex-colonies that were placed under Mandate in 1919 by the Treaty of Versailles. Cameroon became independent in 1960, after the allied occupation of 1914-1916; before that, it was under a Franco-British Mandate. Togo, in 1922, was divided into two Territories under a Mandate entrusted to England and France; it became an independent Republic in 1960. Tanganyika, which was a German possession in 1890, was in 1920 placed under a British Mandate, and in 1946 under a United Nations Mandate; it has been independent since 1961. In the Middle East, Syria became independent in 1945, after the French Mandate officially expired on 1 January 1944. In Lebanon, independence was proclaimed on the same date; it had been placed under a French Mandate in 1920.

202. Of all those Mandated possessions, only Namibia is still under foreign domination. South Africa and its allies, far from respecting the clauses of the Covenant of the League of Nations, introduced into Namibia the odious system of *apartheid*, which is a consequence of colonialism. However, even before the historic referendum of 28 September 1958 and the acceleration since then of the process of liberation and African independence, the United Nations, in its concern to honour the noble commitments of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, did not remain totally inactive.

203. The end of the Second World War clearly marked the advent of a new era in Africa, Asia and Latin America. After the victory over the Hitlerite forces, the world turned to the colonial peoples, and

political organizations and trade unions hastily mobilized their energies to open the way to the liberation of countries that had been too long subjugated. Since 1946 the corridors of the United Nations have been bustling with petitioners who have come from all parts of the world to address themselves to the universal conscience and to make the voices of their peoples heard and their profound aspirations to freedom, dignity and full sovereignty known.

204. That is the main reason that prompted the International Court of Justice, on 11 July 1950, to rule in respect of Namibia that

“the General Assembly of the United Nations is legally qualified to exercise the supervisory functions previously exercised by the League of Nations with regard to the administration of the Territory, and that the Union of South Africa is under an obligation to submit to supervision and control of the General Assembly and to render annual reports to it”.¹⁵

205. At the same meeting, the 14 members of the International Court of Justice declared that article 6 of the Mandate had survived the dissolution of the League and that the former functions exercised by the League would now fall to the United Nations. Article 7 of the Mandate remained valid since South Africa as the mandatory Power was still subject to the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice with respect to any problem regarding interpretation of the Mandate.

206. In June 1960, the Governments of Ethiopia and Liberia decided to bring before the International Court of Justice a complaint against South Africa in which they denounced the flagrant violations of the Mandate, in particular those relating to article 2, which require the mandatory State to guarantee the moral and material well-being of the peoples administered and to ensure the social progress of the inhabitants of the Territory concerned.

207. Notwithstanding that warning, South Africa behaved like an annexationist State and hastened to strengthen its military bases and its measures of oppression and repression of the Namibian people. The swift development and deterioration of the situation forced the International Court of Justice to meet on 18 July 1966.¹⁶ Following that meeting, the debate in the twenty-first session of the General Assembly turned the spotlight on the question of Namibia. Indeed, on the basis of the report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, the Assembly decided at that session, to terminate South Africa's Mandate over Namibia and to entrust it to the United Nations. That decision mentioned, *inter alia*, the refusal of South Africa to submit an annual report in accordance with the clauses of the Mandate, South Africa's use of barbaric and inhuman methods in the conduct of its administration in Namibia, and the appearance of a serious threat to peace and security.

208. The General Assembly declared in paragraph 3 of its resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966, that the

¹⁵ *International status of South-West Africa, Advisory Opinion: I.C.J. Reports 1950*, p. 128.

¹⁶ *South-West Africa, Second Phase, Judgement, I.C.J. Reports 1966*, p. 6.

mandatory Power had failed to fulfil its obligations relative to the Mandate entrusted to it in respect of the administration of Namibia, and decided, in paragraph 4, that the Mandate conferred upon His Britannic Majesty to be exercised on his behalf by the Government of the Union of South Africa was thus terminated. South Africa therefore no longer had any right to administer Namibia.

209. In paragraphs 5 and 6 of that resolution, the General Assembly entrusted to an *Ad Hoc* Committee composed of 14 members the task of advocating ways and means of leading Namibia to self-determination and independence.

210. In response to these pertinent decisions of both the General Assembly and the International Court of Justice, we note the statement made on 5 October 1966 by the Pretoria régime affirming that “South Africa's right to administer the Territory is not derived from the Mandate, but from military conquest”.¹⁷

211. Such presumption by the upholders of *apartheid* needs no comment, and SWAPO's call to arms was the most appropriate reply to the arrogance of the Pretoria criminals. Faithful to the noble ideals of freedom and independence which animated the PAIGC,¹⁸ FRELIMO¹⁹ and MPLA, respectively in Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique and Angola, SWAPO resorted to underground resistance, strong in the right of peoples to self-determination and convinced that it would achieve victory in the unjust war that was imposed on it by the Vorster hordes and their motley allies, because, as President Ahmed Sékou Touré often proclaims, no stratagem, no conventional weaponry however sophisticated can succeed against the anger and the irresistible determination of the African peoples which are so thirsty for freedom; the upholders of *apartheid* and their allies, their neutron bombs and their ballistic missiles will be destroyed as in Viet Nam, Angola and elsewhere, and it will go hard for those who have never learned the lessons of history.

212. Security Council resolution 269 (1969) established a deadline for the South African administration to remove itself from Namibia. That deadline has long passed, and South Africa cares nothing for decisions of the United Nations.

213. As described by an experienced observer of the situation in southern Africa, the greater the danger that southern Africa presents in the long run for world stability, the greater becomes the very real possibility that one day the national liberation movements in Africa, fighting for freedom, will find themselves on the brink of victory faced with a thinly disguised military intervention on the part of the so-called free world. That thought is most relevant given the whole array of plans that are being deployed to downgrade or to steal SWAPO's imminent victory. Indeed, that prophecy has long since become a bitter reality given the ever-growing support of all kinds that South Africa receives from its friends in the so-called free West.

214. The economic support given in the form of massive investments by States and multinational corpora-

¹⁷ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-first Session, Plenary Meetings*, 1431st meeting, para. 264.

¹⁸ Partido Africano da Independência da Guiné e Cabo Verde.

¹⁹ Frente de Libertação de Moçambique.

tions allows that shameful Pretoria régime to make enormous profits. Notwithstanding the General Assembly resolutions and the arms embargo decreed by the Security Council in its resolution 418 (1977), South Africa possesses the most sophisticated weaponry and is also seeking the nuclear weapon, which it probably even possesses already thanks to the felony of its allies. We have been present when certain decisions were unfortunately blocked by a triple veto in the Security Council. That abuse of the veto in the case of the question of South Africa is very revealing of the diplomatic support given to the *apartheid* régime.

215. We are also witnessing a broadly based subversive campaign against the African countries that border on South Africa. That cleverly orchestrated campaign to make us believe in a communist peril in the region is part of a well-calculated strategy by the imperialist circles. They advise South Africa to extend its policy of *apartheid* to Namibia and to proceed to the effective bantustanization of Namibia in order to dislocate the Territory and to annex Walvis Bay. These same circles are trying by transparent means to create reactionary buffer States in Zimbabwe and in Namibia so as to preserve a South Africa which is threatened with a breakup. That explains the existence of the internal settlement plans like those advocated by Ian Smith in Rhodesia, and the Turnhalle negotiations, which were another striking example of the Machiavellian policy which some wish to use to block the coming to power of the black majority.

216. People are quick to speak of Soviet-Cuban intervention in Africa, in general, and in southern Africa, in particular, forgetting that the same slogans have been used elsewhere, in South-East Asia, the Middle East and so forth.

217. These scenarios, which have been ably orchestrated by the enemies of peace, are mounted with the sole aim of making fabulous profits, thanks to the genocide of which their authors have always been guilty of in Africa, in Asia and in Latin America.

218. The plans that were recently highlighted are designed to compromise the outcome of elections that can lead Namibia to independence. The attempt to isolate Walvis Bay is another machination that gulls nobody.

219. All States now recognize the unshakable resolve and ever-growing strength of SWAPO's underground resistance which is militarily strong, while its international influence is not in any doubt.

220. Since the adoption of resolution 3295 (XXIX), in which the General Assembly requested all specialized agencies and other organizations within the United Nations system to take such necessary steps as would permit the representation and participation of Namibia in the work of such agencies and organizations and to render all possible assistance to the people of Namibia and to their national liberation movement, SWAPO, we must welcome the participation of that movement in the United Nations, in the non-aligned movement and in the OAU in defence of the paramount interests of its people.

221. At all these levels, the valiant fighters have given fierce expression to the profound aspirations of their people, aspirations which were summed up in 1978 as

follows. With regard to the cease-fire, the presence of South African troops in Namibia cannot be justified. Those who have for decades tried to massacre a people cannot in the space of a few days become the defenders of that people. The Fascist army of Pretoria can never maintain order and security in that country; hardened in the commission of massacres, torture and other cruel crimes against the peaceful inhabitants, it has long been disqualified in the view of international opinion. Since they advocated that SWAPO be disarmed and that thousands of racist soldiers be maintained at strategic points in the country, it would be naive to believe that the intention of these brutes is not to intimidate the population before and during the elections that were arranged, in 1978. Any cease-fire in Namibia could come only after the complete withdrawal of Pretoria's troops and their replacement by United Nations forces, if needed. With regard to the problem of consultations, SWAPO was prepared to consider any kind of consultations provided they took place under the auspices of the United Nations, which, in our view, remains the sole repository of our common will to achieve the rights of peoples proclaimed in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). With regard to the elections, a pre-condition is the release of all detainees and the return of the exiles. Clearly, it is no use engaging in negotiations at Windhoek and muzzling the authentic representatives of the people. The efforts to exclude SWAPO from the negotiations on Namibia will be in vain.

222. At the time, we thought the Special Representative and United Nations personnel entrusted with the administration and preparation of the elections would already be on the spot. SWAPO would never have opposed the idea of a South African authority responsible for speaking on behalf of his Government on any question having to do with the transfer of instruments.

223. The Special Representative could have had an exclusive right of veto and, with his staff, could have dealt, *ad interim*, with all questions until independence, which at that time had been envisaged for 6 August 1978.

224. The immediate task of that Special Representative would have been the abolition of all racially discriminatory and repressive measures and the preparation of elections in the following conditions: first, that all persons exiled should be returned; secondly, that all political prisoners should be released; and, thirdly, that the electoral campaign should not start until South African troops had been completely and unconditionally withdrawn from the Territory of Namibia. The elections could then have taken place in three days, with the election for the Constituent Assembly not being separated from that for the National Assembly. As I have said, the declaration of independence had been envisaged for 6 August 1978.

225. Those reasonable requirements by SWAPO still have the support of the people of Guinea and of its State Party and Government. Indeed, these provisions are a guarantee for a glorious future for Namibia.

226. The oppressors view Namibia's independence as an event that would leave them no alternative but flight. It is that sick panic that inculcates in the South African racists an exaggerated propensity for dismembering the Territory. The racist South African régime is constantly strengthening its military apparatus in Namibia.

227. It is already public knowledge that South Africa's soldiery is training troops of FNLA and UNITA²⁰ to commit constant aggression against Angola. Camouflaged in the ranks of the Rhodesian army, bandits leave from Namibia to massacre Zambians and Mozambicans.

228. The real danger threatening that region emanates from within the borders of the country. The imperialist Powers know perfectly well that it is the African people of southern Africa that will destroy white racist supremacy, as it is its duty to do.

229. We all remember that the South African Government was a zealous advocate of the Mandates System initiated in 1919. At Versailles it was the champion of the thesis that there should be an international administration of all the colonial possessions seized from Germany. Now, the Covenant of the League of Nations made it an obligation for the administering Power to respect the integrity of the Mandate Territory—in other words, there was a prohibition of any annexation by the Mandatory State and of any cession of territory by that State to third States. The South African Government flagrantly betrayed that principle, which was supposed to be immutable.

230. Under article 3 of the Mandate,²¹ all traffic in weapons and munitions was to be subject to strict control, in conformity with the Convention relating to the control of arms traffic, signed on 10 September 1919. Today, we note with regret that Walvis Bay, an integral part of Namibia, has been annexed. Military bases are being constructed and, what is more, installations at those bases are placed at the disposition of NATO. Article 4 of the mandate²² provided that no naval or military bases should be established in the Territory and it formally prohibited the construction of any fortifications.

231. But it is not the history of Walvis Bay that is significant here; what is of concern to us is that that vital part of the country should remain the sovereign and exclusive property of the Namibian people.

232. Indeed, under General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) and relevant Security Council resolutions, the United Nations is today the only authority legally responsible for the welfare and administration of the Territory of Namibia, until the people is able to assume its own responsibilities, within the framework of the United Nations Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council.

233. For us, the concept of self-determination implies above all the unconditional right of peoples to decide their own future, including the right to create their own sovereign State and to choose a political system and a social structure in line with their freely expressed will. Many peoples that had been subjugated and exploited by the colonial system have managed, by means of a stubborn, and sometimes bloody, struggle to gain their independence and to establish States that are now Members of the United Nations. How can we speak seriously of a free expression of the will of the Namib-

ian people when Namibia, according to the United Nations itself, has been annexed by means of force by a brutal and racist, and indeed Fascist, régime that has been repeatedly condemned by the Organization?

234. The United Nations has already used all possible means to make the South African Government see reason. Large numbers of resolutions have been adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council condemning South Africa for its policy of aggression and *apartheid*. In our view, all these measures have remained dead letters—particularly since Pretoria has never been willing to make the slightest gesture that would encourage us to believe that it wishes to see reason.

235. Thus, the only solution is struggle. As Comrade Sékou Touré, the President of the Republic of Guinea, has said, freedom is not given, it is won; dignity is not given, it is won; progress is not given, it is won.

236. Confronted by a situation such as the one facing the people of Namibia, the nations represented here can no longer avoid taking certain required actions.

237. All the sanction measures that could be taken against South Africa under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter have not been taken in the struggle against *apartheid*. We have at our disposal important resources to put an end to Pretoria's cavalier and insolent attitude. The first of these radical measures is economic sanctions. That is essential, indeed vital. The arms embargo constituted one stage, and we are still awaiting its results. There is an ever-growing weight of opinion in favour of adopting economic sanctions against the South African régime. The Security Council must now take due account of the non-implementation of all the provisional measures laid down in the Charter. The Council in that case has the right to adopt measures not involving the use of armed force to give effect to its decisions. But, as a matter of fact, such steps, too, have been taken and now there is a desire to prevent us from having recourse to the more severe steps—namely, complete or partial interruption of economic relations and of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio and other means of communication, as well as the severance of diplomatic relations. All that is provided for under Article 41 of the United Nations Charter.

238. We know that South Africa has been given a reprieve by its Western allies. But one cannot at one and the same time be responsible for international security and protect the racist minorities in southern Africa. It would be a betrayal of the conscience of mankind to transgress what is at the basis of peaceful coexistence and the guaranteeing of security. That is why my delegation appeals to all nations to ensure that justice is done and that peoples in southern Africa that have long been subjugated, exploited and tortured are able finally to accede to freedom and independence.

239. Hence, the States Members of the United Nations are obliged to recognize the illegality of South Africa's presence in Namibia and to denounce the illegitimacy of any measure taken by South Africa on behalf of the colonized people. All nations have the imperious duty to abstain from all acts, and in particular from all relations, that could give the Pretoria régime *de facto* recognition in regard to its actions in Namibia.

²⁰ União Nacional para a Independência Total de Angola.

²¹ League of Nations, *Official Journal*, 2nd Year, No. 1 (January-February 1921), p. 89.

²² *Ibid.*

240. SWAPO and the front-line countries have always demonstrated political good will in regard to all the proposals on the Namibia question.

241. Since the ninth special session of the General Assembly, on the question of Namibia, other Western initiatives have been met consistently by co-operation on the part of SWAPO. But on the South African side—and the Government of South Africa specializes in theatrics—we are witnessing the same comedy that has been going on for only too long now. We need only recall the discussions in March 1979 and, more recently, the meeting at Geneva to realize that there has been no progress. The non-implementation of Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978), on the question of Namibia, says a great deal about South Africa's attitude towards a negotiated solution of the Namibian problem.

242. The armed attacks against the neighbouring States, the establishment of a puppet régime in Namibia, resulting from a unilateral declaration of independence in the style of Ian Smith's: all this shows that nothing remains to be said and that, finally, energetic steps must be taken to put an end to South Africa's obstinacy.

243. At this stage I should like to express to the freedom fighters, to our brothers in SWAPO and to the Namibian people as a whole Guinea's unswerving attachment to the spirit of solidarity in the struggle for the freedom, progress and rehabilitation of the African homeland.

244. We should like to pay a tribute here to the United Nations Council for Namibia, which, under the presidency of Mr. Lusaka, has been working and is still working to this very day for the protection of the inalienable rights of the Namibian people. We welcome any co-operation given the Council by United Nations organs and, for our part, we assure the Council of the co-operation of the people of Guinea and their State Party and Government.

245. Mr. LUSAKA (Zambia), President of the United Nations Council for Namibia: As we come to the conclusion of the debate on the question of Namibia at the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly, it is appropriate for me in my capacity as President of the United Nations Council for Namibia to review the main thrust of the arguments presented by Member States and to draw the appropriate conclusions regarding our task for the months ahead.

246. It has been most gratifying to hear Member States, particularly those of Africa, Asia, Latin America, Eastern Europe and the Middle East, reaffirm their support for the just struggle of the Namibian people under the leadership of SWAPO, their sole and authentic liberation movement. Their support for the role of the Council for Namibia in its efforts for international political mobilization may be viewed as a strengthening of a commitment which has certainly shifted the balance of international action in favour of the Namibian people in their struggle for self-determination, freedom and national independence in a united Namibia.

247. Many representatives have condemned the racist régime of South Africa for developing a nuclear

capability for military and aggressive purposes, and they have also recognized that this development poses a serious threat to international peace and security. They have further denounced the nuclear co-operation of certain Powers, especially in the West, which has allowed South Africa to attain a nuclear capability.

248. Many representatives have supported the call for the application of Chapter VII of the Charter, including mandatory sanctions, in order to force South Africa to comply with United Nations resolutions on Namibia. There has been generalized condemnation of the militarization of Namibia by South Africa and the use of that international Territory as a base for aggression, particularly against Angola and Zambia.

249. While many Member States welcomed the concept of a demilitarized zone, as accepted by both SWAPO and the front-line States, they deplored South Africa's acceptance of the proposals with conditions, a move which raised the suspicion that South Africa is using delaying tactics in order to outmanoeuvre the proposals for a negotiated settlement and to impose on Namibia an internal settlement contrary to the legitimate aspirations of the Namibian people and in violation of Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978).

250. Many representatives reaffirmed that Namibia is a direct responsibility of the United Nations and that Walvis Bay is an integral part of Namibia. They stressed the responsibility of the international community to take all possible measures to obtain a withdrawal of the illegal South African administration from the Territory.

251. The representatives of many countries reiterated their unconditional support for the liberation struggle under the leadership of SWAPO, rejected any internal settlement which excludes SWAPO and declared that only elections with the full participation of SWAPO and supervision by the United Nations would be accepted as a legitimate transition to Namibian independence.

252. Much concern has been expressed by a large number of representatives from all regions with respect to the manoeuvres of South Africa to impose the participation of non-representative groups from Namibia in the efforts to achieve a negotiated settlement of the question of Namibia. Some delegations proposed that a deadline should be established to have South Africa comply with the United Nations resolutions. This proposal is consistent with the concern expressed by other delegations that South Africa's latest reply on the concept of a demilitarized zone has not been made in good faith and represents a delaying tactic to prevent the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia.

253. Many delegations recognized the statesmanship of SWAPO in showing flexibility in the negotiations and emphasized the need for a negotiated settlement, so that all Namibians could participate in the free election supervised by the United Nations. Many delegations, including representatives from the Western countries, rejected any internal settlement or any settlement that was not achieved under the United Nations plan for Namibia.

254. It is therefore clear from the views expressed at the current session of the General Assembly that the

struggle of the Namibian people under the leadership of their sole and authentic liberation movement, SWAPO, enjoys the firm and sustained support of an overwhelming majority of the members of the international community.

255. The reaffirmation of the policies pursued by the United Nations Council for Namibia will inspire the Council to redouble its efforts at international political mobilization to obtain the withdrawal of the illegal South African administration from the Territory. The Council will remain vigilant in the protection of the interests of the Namibian people and in intensifying its programmes of assistance to the Namibian people. It will unceasingly denounce all manoeuvres by South Africa to undermine international efforts for a negotiated settlement and to promote its puppets under the pretence of guiding Namibia to independence outside the framework defined by Security Council resolution 385 (1976). The Council for Namibia will furthermore remain vigilant with respect to the attempts by South Africa to destroy the territorial integrity and unity of Namibia by carrying out administrative measures to separate Walvis Bay and its surrounding areas from Namibia. In all its endeavours, the Council will remain in close consultation with SWAPO to enhance its efforts to fulfil the legitimate aspirations of the Namibian people for self-determination and national independence in a united Namibia.

256. Finally, allow me sincerely to thank all delegations which participated in the debate on Namibia. The number of participants is a clear manifestation of the great support for the struggle of the Namibian people and SWAPO for genuine independence.

257. I should also like to place on record my own appreciation for the very kind words said about me by many delegations. I am not sure I deserve all that praise. I think that on behalf of the General Assembly, and of course with your permission, Mr. President, I shall convey the kind sentiments to the United Nations Council for Namibia and the Commissioner for Namibia, without whose dedicated work we would not be where we are today with regard to the question of Namibia.

258. The PRESIDENT: We have now heard the last speaker in the debate on agenda item 27, the question of Namibia. It is my understanding that consultations are going on with respect to one further draft resolution to be submitted to the Assembly, in addition to those already submitted. On the understanding that this draft resolution is likely to be circulated tomorrow, we may expect to proceed to the vote on the draft resolutions on Namibia on Wednesday.

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.