



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 .....	1703

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

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. KARSTENSEN (Norway): This debate on the question of Namibia is taking place at what may be a turning-point in the history of southern Africa.

2. The Norwegian Government welcomes with deep satisfaction the breakthrough in the negotiations on Zimbabwe in London. The basis has now been laid for transition to genuine majority rule.

3. We sincerely hope that the peaceful settlement of this long-standing and tragic conflict will open up a new era of stability, peace and progress in southern Africa as a whole. We strongly hope that we shall soon witness a similar development towards a negotiated settlement in Namibia.

4. The Norwegian Government welcomed the Secretary-General's initiative in convening a meeting of all parties concerned for high-level consultations at Geneva in the middle of last month.

5. A settlement of the Namibian question was brought closer by the constructive proposal of the late President Neto of Angola for the establishment of a demilitarized zone along the Angolan-Namibian border. It is highly significant that all parties concerned have now accepted the concept of a demilitarized zone. Acceptance by South Africa, however, seems to be subject to certain conditions. It is unclear to us what those conditions actually entail, but we expect that South Africa's acceptance in principle of the demilitarized zone proposal has paved the way for early implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia. We urge that speedy efforts be made to solve the outstanding questions of a practical nature, so that the United Nations Transition Assistance Group [UNTAG] may arrive in Namibia at an early date.

6. In this situation it is of utmost importance that the parties involved show restraint and refrain from any actions or measures that might further complicate the negotiations. It is imperative that the negotiating process now under way be concluded successfully. We urge the parties concerned to do their utmost to reach an internationally acceptable solution in Namibia, in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

7. As the occupying force in Namibia, the South African Government bears a special responsibility in this connexion.

8. Mr. DAMDINDORZH (Mongolia): Since the question of Namibia was just last considered at the resumed thirty-third session of the General Assembly<sup>1</sup> six months ago, the situation in Namibia has been deteriorating because of the intransigence, sinister manoeuvres and delaying tactics of the racist minority régime of Pretoria. In complete disregard of numerous resolutions and decisions of our Organization, the South African racists continue to occupy Namibian territory and to increase their brutal repression against the Namibian people and its true representative, the South West Africa People's Organization [SWAPO]. According to the reports of the United Nations Council for Namibia [A/34/24] and the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples [A/34/23/Rev.1, chap.IX], as well as the statement made by the representative of SWAPO [91st meeting], the South African police have arrested and detained large numbers of Namibian patriots and leaders and members of SWAPO since April this year. There is no sign of the military occupation of Namibia by South Africa coming to an end. On the contrary, South African troops in the Territory have increased in numbers and they are equipped with sophisticated weapons including tanks, armoured cars, fighter bombers and other aircraft. According to the information of SWAPO, the number of South African troops in Namibia has increased to 75,000.

9. South Africa continues its practice of destroying the national unity and territorial integrity of Namibia and of annexing parts of its territory. In spite of the United Nations decision which declared that the annexation of Walvis Bay by South Africa was null and void and that Walvis Bay was an integral part of Namibia [resolution S-9/2, para.11], the racists of Pretoria continue to claim sovereignty over Walvis Bay and are taking steps to reinforce their military position in Walvis Bay.

10. The Mongolian delegation is gravely concerned about South Africa's military build-up and its illegal use of Namibian territory for repeated acts of aggression against the independent African countries. According

<sup>1</sup> Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-third Session, Plenary Meetings, 97th to 108th meetings.

to the report issued by the Government of the People's Republic of Angola,<sup>2</sup> from 27 March 1976 to 11 June 1979 South African regular troops killed at least 570 and wounded 594 Angolan citizens, most of whom were innocent peaceful workers and peasants. They also killed 198 and wounded 600 inhabitants of Zimbabwe and killed 612 and wounded 611 Namibians. The damage and losses inflicted on Angola for that period amounted to \$6.7 billion.

11. These armed attacks and provocations against the neighbouring African States are designed to destroy the national liberation movement of Namibia and the sole legitimate representative of the Namibian people, SWAPO, and to intimidate the front-line States because of their legitimate support of the just struggle of the people of Namibia. As is known, the Security Council this year alone has dealt on several occasions with South Africa's acts of aggression against Angola.<sup>3</sup> Recently the Council adopted resolution 454 (1979) in which it categorically condemned South Africa's aggression against Angola. The resolution again demanded that South Africa scrupulously respect the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of the People's Republic of Angola.

12. The Mongolian delegation is particularly disturbed by the information that South Africa has carried out a nuclear test explosion. It goes without saying that the acquisition of nuclear weapons by the racists is fraught with the most serious consequences for the peace and security of both the African continent and the world as a whole. In these circumstances my delegation deems it imperative that our Organization take concrete measures in order to put an end to the nuclear collaboration of certain Western States with South Africa and to ensure the strict implementation of Security Council resolution 418 (1977) which imposed an arms embargo against South Africa.

13. Over the last two years there has been much talk about the Western plan for a so-called negotiated settlement of the Namibian problem, but we have so far not seen any positive results. In fact we have witnessed the reluctance and the lack of political will of Western countries to settle the Namibian problem in accordance with United Nations decisions. Meanwhile, the South African racists have employed the Western plan to gain time and to impose a puppet régime on the Namibian people through the so-called internal settlement. The situation now prevailing in Namibia is a direct result of the policy of Western countries, which are resorting to various manoeuvres to protect the racist régime of South Africa. Therefore the main responsibility for the continued occupation of Namibia by South Africa rests with those countries which continue to give political, economic and military support to South Africa, in open defiance of the decisions of the United Nations and other international bodies.

14. The position of the Government of the Mongolian People's Republic on the question of Namibia has been made clear on many occasions. The Government and people of the Mongolian People's Republic believe that a just solution to the problem of Namibia can be found

<sup>2</sup> *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-fourth Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1979*, document S/13473.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, *Thirty-fourth Year*, 2130th, 2132nd, 2133rd, 2135th to 2139th, 2169th and 2170th meetings.

through the complete cessation of the illegal occupation of Namibia, the unconditional granting of national independence to the Namibian people and the transfer of full power to that people in the person of its sole, legitimate representative, SWAPO. In order to create the necessary conditions for achieving that objective, it is essential to ensure the immediate withdrawal of the South African occupation troops, police force and racist administration from that country, and the discontinuance of all support for and assistance to the *apartheid* régime of Pretoria.

15. We strongly advocate the application of sanctions against the South African régime. The Security Council should be convened urgently to adopt enforcement measures against South Africa under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter to ensure South Africa's compliance with United Nations resolutions and decisions on Namibia, as it was requested to do at the resumed thirty-third session last spring. Likewise, my delegation attaches great importance to the international conference to be held next year under the joint auspices of the Organization of African Unity [OAU] and the United Nations [see A/34/552, annex I, CM/Res. 734 (XXXIII)] to mobilize world public opinion and ensure effective implementation of economic and other sanctions against South Africa.

16. In conclusion, I should like to express to the United Nations Council for Namibia my delegation's appreciation of the work done since the last session of the General Assembly.

17. Mr. FOUM (United Republic of Tanzania): The question of Namibia is one of those important issues that have been most fully discussed by this Organization. It is an issue which the Assembly has analysed and pronounced itself upon in all its aspects. It is an issue that the Security Council also has discussed and pronounced itself on without ambiguity. Indeed, the question of Namibia, the continued illegal occupation of that Territory by the racist régime of South Africa, is an issue which, by any standard, does not require any further debate, for the history of this issue is one of decision by this Organization and intransigence by racist South Africa; more rightly, it is an issue that demands decisive action now.

18. Ever since the Mandate over Namibia was revoked by this Organization by General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966, South Africa has shown only disregard for the demands of the international community. Ever since initiatives for a peaceful settlement were launched under the terms of the relevant Security Council resolutions, South Africa has shown only disregard for the wishes of the people of Namibia, under the leadership of SWAPO, to exercise their legitimate right to freedom and independence.

19. Instead of heeding the will of the international community and submitting to the wishes of the people of Namibia under the leadership of SWAPO, racist South Africa has shown two unambiguous tendencies. On the one hand, South Africa has taken advantage of the negotiating opportunities provided by the international community to demonstrate its intransigence. On the other hand, as an illegal occupier, South Africa has taken every advantage to entrench its colonial occupation of Namibia. Symptomatic of this approach have been the brutal persecution of Namibian nationalists,

arbitrary arrests and imprisonment of SWAPO cadres, as well as increased militarization and the imposition of martial law in the Territory.

20. The propping up of surrogates and their imposition on the people of Namibia under the guise of a so-called internal settlement are a corollary of the maintenance of such a situation. Further, the decimation of the population, fragmentation of the nation into tribal groupings and dismemberment of the Territory by the annexation of Walvis Bay are all part of the illegal process and constitute a flagrant violation of relevant Security Council resolutions, in particular resolution 432 (1978), and disregard of the opinion of the international community.

21. The escalation of attacks on the neighbouring States is part of the plan to frustrate the efforts to achieve a peaceful settlement. My delegation has consistently condemned, and will continue to condemn, those manoeuvres, as we have in all instances when the racist authorities have sought to divert the international community's attention from the real issue of its illegal occupation of that Territory.

22. Despite the seemingly pessimistic situation created by South Africa, this Organization, with the objective of furthering the cause of the Namibian people, has continued to seek a peaceful settlement. Tanzania, conscious of its commitment to support the struggle of the people of Namibia under the leadership of SWAPO, has fully welcomed all efforts to promote negotiations. Indeed, Tanzania and all the front-line States have been consistent in their support and promotion of a peaceful settlement. More important, the people of Namibia, through their sole and legitimate representative, SWAPO, have fully endorsed and positively participated in efforts to bring about a peaceful settlement. However, it is an undeniable fact that racist South Africa not only is intransigent but indeed is also showing every sign of lack of seriousness or desire to reach a peaceful settlement.

23. Let me briefly recapitulate the efforts which the front-line States, SWAPO and the international community have made in the last two years to reach a negotiated settlement of the question of Namibia and change the attitude of the racist régime.

24. Throughout last year our efforts were concentrated on securing agreement by the racist régime to the implementation of Security Council resolution 385 (1976). The terms of that resolution entailed, *inter alia*, the holding of free and fair elections under United Nations supervision and control. These terms were essentially as proposed by five Western countries—that is, the United States of America, the United Kingdom, France, Canada and the Federal Republic of Germany—which took the initiative aiming at a peaceful settlement.<sup>4</sup> My Government, together with the other front-line States, accepted the proposals of the five Western States. We did so conscious of our commitment to the cause of the Namibian people, and we accepted the proposals because we were convinced that they provided, generally, an acceptable basis for a peaceful settlement.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, Thirty-third Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1978, document S/12636.

25. It is a matter of record that the racist régime of South Africa entered into consultations with the five Western States. It is also a matter of record that the latter sought to convince us that the colonial occupiers of Namibia were serious. The history of such consultations, and the fact that we are today still debating the issue of Namibia in this context, speaks volumes as to the capacity of racist South Africa to create illusions.

26. In July 1978, on the understanding that SWAPO had accepted the proposals and that South Africa, as we were informed, was willing to co-operate, the Security Council proceeded to adopt resolution 431 (1978). That resolution provided, among other things, for the appointment of a Special Representative for Namibia. Tanzania welcomed that decision. We considered it a positive component in the efforts to achieve a peaceful solution. And we have assured the Special Representative of our maximum co-operation in seeking the freedom of Namibia. Following extensive consultations with South Africa through the Special Representative, the Secretary-General formulated proposals for a settlement, which included the establishment of UNTAG.

27. Tanzania and the other front-line States again welcomed the Secretary-General's initiative. It is a matter of record that SWAPO, the sole and legitimate representative of the people of Namibia, has left no doubt as to its acceptance of the proposals. At the same time, it expressed its readiness to sign a cease-fire agreement, thus creating an atmosphere conducive to a peaceful settlement. South Africa, on the other hand, rejected some of the vital aspects of the Secretary-General's proposals for the creation of UNTAG. South Africa, furthermore, proffered unacceptable conditions, requiring SWAPO to commit itself to action tantamount to abandoning its struggle. South Africa was thus seemingly ready for negotiations, but at the same time acting in a manner that effectively frustrated the process of negotiations.

28. In the wake of the Security Council resolutions, the Secretary-General's proposals and the initiative of the five Western Powers, racist South Africa declared its intention to hold bogus elections in Namibia. The Security Council, in its resolution 435 (1978), declared such elections to be null and void. It was symptomatic of the racist régime's attitude that this warning went unheeded. South Africa, following its pattern of seeking to consolidate its colonial occupation of Namibia, proceeded to hold those elections.

29. Yet, despite this effrontery and the equivocating attitude of the racist régime, Tanzania and the other front-line States found it necessary to endorse the return of the Special Representative to Namibia for further consultations.

30. At the front-line summit meeting held at Luanda on 3 and 4 March 1979,<sup>5</sup> my Government and the other front-line States reiterated our acceptance of the United Nations plan for Namibia and undertook a firm commitment to observe a cease-fire arrangement regarding SWAPO forces in the respective territories. This was done to demonstrate the willingness of the front-line States to pursue negotiations on a peaceful settlement, for as long as this was possible.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, Thirty-fourth Year, Supplement for January, February and March 1979, document S/13141.

31. It was in the same spirit that Tanzania agreed to the initiative by the five Western States to hold proximity talks in New York early this year. Tanzania attended those talks, despite some reservations on the manner in which the five Western States were approaching the whole exercise. It is a matter of record that the equivocating attitude of the Pretoria régime made it impossible for any substantive results to emerge from the talks.
32. Last month, at the invitation of the Secretary-General, Tanzania, together with the other front-line States, Nigeria and SWAPO, still desirous of a peaceful settlement, agreed to go to Geneva for simultaneous consultations on the concept of a demilitarized zone as proposed by the late President of Angola. I need not emphasize that the front-line States and SWAPO endorsed the concept of the demilitarized zone. The reply just communicated by racist South Africa, and circulated as Security Council document S/13680,<sup>6</sup> raises serious doubt as to the willingness of the racist régime to co-operate in the processes towards a peaceful settlement. The conditions enumerated by South Africa, explicit and implied, indicate an attitude that closely resembles the attitude adopted by the racist régime that prevented the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).
33. I have found it necessary to dwell on the history of the negotiations and the efforts on the question of Namibia because we consider it necessary that this Assembly reflect on all these efforts to achieve a peaceful settlement. It is also imperative to reflect on why these positive efforts have so far not produced the desired result: that is, the attainment by the people of Namibia of their right to freedom and independence.
34. Our desire for a peaceful settlement must not be construed as licence for intransigence. We supported the initiatives of the five Western members of the Security Council when we believed such initiatives provided a genuine process towards a settlement. We accepted the submission of the five Western members that they were convinced of South Africa's willingness to co-operate. As I stated earlier, South Africa is expert at creating illusions of movement every time action is called for.
35. This Assembly will not fail to record that the efforts to achieve a settlement have not succeeded solely because of the arrogance and intransigent attitude of the racist régime of South Africa. The international community must no longer permit such intolerable behaviour. South Africa must be made to understand that this Organization will not accept flagrant disregard of its decisions.
36. In line with the foregoing observations, my delegation has always insisted that those Western countries with extensive political and economic links with the racist régime of South Africa, especially the five countries on whose initiative the negotiations of the last two years have been conducted, bear a particular responsibility.
37. To the extent that they provide an economic and technological lifeline which has strengthened the racist régime, they bear a grave responsibility. To the extent that this support has in turn enabled it to acquire a military, and now a reported nuclear, capability, they indeed bear a grave responsibility, for South Africa has been using that increased military capability to launch continued aggression against neighbouring African States.
38. South Africa, as I have stated, has been persistently intransigent. The racist régime has shown no serious desire to reach a peaceful settlement, it has disregarded decisions of this Organization and it has been unco-operative as regards the initiatives taken by the very Powers, the five Western Powers, that have consistently given the régime aid and comfort.
39. In view of this, the least that is to be expected of those Western countries is that they should not maintain protective attitudes towards South Africa, but agree to institute appropriate measures against that régime, as provided for under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter.
40. In reaffirming the inalienable right of the people of Namibia to freedom and independence in a united Namibia, my delegation wishes once more to express its unflinching support for the struggle of the people of Namibia through their sole and legitimate representative, SWAPO.
41. In conclusion, my delegation wishes to pay a special tribute to the United Nations Council for Namibia for the role it plays in discharging its mandate as the legal Administering Authority for Namibia until independence. We wish also to pay a particular tribute to its President, the Permanent Representative of Zambia, Ambassador Lusaka, for his untiring efforts in directing the activities of the Council for Namibia.
42. Mr. CORREA DA COSTA (Brazil): It is particularly encouraging to be resuming our debate on the question of Namibia under your wise and competent leadership, Mr. President. It is so not only because the country which you represent has been at the forefront of the struggle against all forms of colonialism and foreign domination, but also because the role you have performed 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 bears witness to your unremitting personal commitment to the cause of freedom and independence for all peoples.
43. Very few, if any, items have been on the agenda of the General Assembly for so long as the question of Namibia. Thirty-four years after the setting up of our Organization, the Non-Self-Governing Territories which had fallen under the trusteeship system have, with very few exceptions, obtained full independence and are now represented in this Assembly with the same rights as those of the founding Members. The United Nations is justified in being proud of its accomplishments in the field of decolonization. Nonetheless, the achievement of the final goal of universality continues to elude us. Although the United Nations is still concerned with the future of a number of peoples which find themselves at present under the yoke of colonialism, no other problem stands in the way of the realization of a completely free world in such a flagrant and defiant manner as does that of Namibia. It is a matter of justice to point out that the United Nations did

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, Supplement for October, November and December 1979.

not fall short in discharging its obligations. The lack of results after a very long time is not due to the absence of intense and continuous efforts by this Organization.

44. And yet, despite the stalemate we seem to face and the apparent ineffectiveness of our endeavours, it is the duty of each one of us to prevent this feeling of frustration and dismay from turning into one of hopelessness and paralysis. On the contrary, now more than ever the people of Namibia expect the United Nations to intensify its action with a view to bringing to an end the illegal South African occupation. After all, the legal responsibility for the Territory of Namibia lies with the United Nations, which cannot fail to live up to the expectations placed in it by the oppressed and suffering people of Namibia.
45. Brazil has been following attentively the initiatives which have been taken since early 1977, when the five Western States members of the Security Council, with the assistance of the front-line States and Nigeria, proposed a settlement based on Security Council resolution 385 (1976). However, despite all the efforts of the last three years, nothing has basically changed in this problem, either from a juridical or a political point of view. By remaining unsolved the question of Namibia tends to aggravate the latent instability in southern Africa. Neighbouring countries are suffering with increased intensity the consequences of such a situation. A settlement concerning Namibia is becoming vital to provide these countries with the necessary conditions to proceed with their political, social and economic development. This is especially true regarding Angola, whose people and economy have been seriously affected by this problem.
46. In this respect, we welcome the recent consultations at Geneva that sought to develop the late President Agostinho Neto's idea concerning the establishment of a demilitarized zone along the borders of Namibia and Angola. It is essential that South Africa's response to the agreement reached by all the other parties to the consultations be carefully examined in all its aspects and implications. My delegation appeals to that country to seize this opportunity, which may not be renewed, to end the fighting in that region.
47. In keeping with its commitment to the cessation of the illegal occupation of the Territory by South Africa, the Brazilian delegation is willing to collaborate in order to find appropriate proposals which will ensure the independence and territorial integrity of Namibia, including Walvis Bay.
48. Mr. NAVA CARRILLO (Venezuela) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Once again, we are embarking on the exercise of evaluation and examination of the case of Namibia, this time with very few new elements which would allow us to discern real improvements in the difficult situation of the Namibian people. In fact, this very circumstance adds to our concern over the already deplorable and delicate situation caused by the absence of progress and we concur in the wish and aspiration to contribute with our own protest.
49. As my colleague of Tanzania has just stated, this is a subject which requires no further debate.
50. The illegal actions of the Government of South Africa continue to place peace and security in ever increasing danger. They contribute to exacerbating the climate of unrest and insecurity. Further, the lack of effective initiatives unquestionably diminishes the credibility of the international Organization.
51. The United Nations Council for Namibia, under the leadership of Mr. Lusaka, of Zambia, has continued its task of trying to ensure the rapid attainment of the aspirations of the Namibian people to freedom and independence. It acts by performing its regulatory functions, by working as Administering Authority, by cooperating with the OAU and with all United Nations bodies, by strengthening the Fund for Namibia and by applying a series of measures which relate to foreign economic interests in the region and to the military situation, among other things. Its work also includes disseminating information and conducting special campaigns with the object of drawing the attention of international public opinion to the current state and the possible future of Namibia.
52. But this effort by the Council and the good faith and energy it devotes to Namibia are frustrated when we see that there is no development in the region and when the expectations of an arrangement seem impossibly remote. Within that context, the Council's work in preparing leaders should be reclassified so as to prevent future frustrations in the face of what increasingly appears to be a distant final solution for Namibia.
53. We see today that the elements we have before us for study of this matter are meagre and not very encouraging. We see no response to resolution 435 (1978) of the Security Council. No progress has been made concerning the withdrawal of the illegal administration in Namibia and it has not yet been possible to set up UNTAG.
54. Nor have we observed any sign of a true readiness to implement the plan of the five Western countries for a negotiated solution, which was endorsed by the Security Council. As a member of the Council, we supported that compromise which we define as being a product of negotiations falling somewhere between the desirable and the possible and the fruit of a long process of maturation.
55. We understand that the recent negotiations at Geneva were focused mainly on the concept of the demilitarized zone in the northern part of the Territory, with the aim of complying with Security Council resolution 435 (1978), and that as regards the cessation of all hostilities and the supervision of the movement of all the armed forces of both South Africa and SWAPO no agreement was reached, notwithstanding the acceptance by the front-line States and SWAPO of the establishment of such a zone on the Angola-Namibia and Zambia-Namibia borders, which would have contributed to the peaceful solution of the problem. There is as yet no tangible evidence of the effectiveness of the latest meeting at Geneva, but we are still hoping for results. We call for reflection, so that South Africa's response does not involve evasive tactics designed to hinder the solution of the problem.
56. That is why our participation in this debate, as a witness that is deeply concerned about the outcome of the situation of the people of Namibia and as a member of the Council for Namibia, is due to our genuine in-

terest in ensuring recourse to all available means of ending the deadlock on the Namibian issue, respect for the true role of the United Nations Council for Namibia and more effective action to make South Africa comply with the decisions of the international community.

57. We believe that the Assembly should set a deadline for South Africa to comply with the proposals of our Organization on Namibia's transition to independence; that South Africa should comply with the demands of the Security Council resolutions; and that South Africa's irresponsible attitude, lack of respect for and contempt for human rights, insolent arrogance and disdain for our Organization's resolutions, and premeditated deceit should be continually condemned.

58. We recognize the fundamental role of SWAPO, as the representative Organization of the people of Namibia, which should continue to play an essential part in the negotiations with South Africa, and we vehemently reject attempts to divide the opposition to South Africa by including in the negotiations political groups sponsored by South Africa and which are not representative of the legitimate aspirations of the Namibian people.

59. In conclusion, this brief statement has been aimed basically at reiterating once again my Government's respect for the people of Namibia and drawing attention specifically to those actions which should be undertaken in the efforts to secure the independence of Namibia and the freedom and dignity of its people.

60. Mr. CAMPBELL (Ireland): I have the honour to make the following statement on behalf of the nine member States of the European Community.

61. Recalling their statement of 29 May 1979 [103rd meeting] at the resumed thirty-third session of the General Assembly, the nine States reiterate their firm position that the people of Namibia must be allowed, without further delay, to determine their own future by means of free elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations, in accordance with the settlement plan adopted by the Security Council in resolution 435 (1978). The nine States support the efforts made by the Secretary-General, the five Western States and the front-line States to implement the settlement plan, which remains the best way to bring South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia to an end. The nine States commend the untiring efforts of Mr. Ahtisaari, the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, for the attainment of that objective.

62. In recent months, continuing efforts have been made with a view to overcoming the obstacles which to date have thwarted the implementation of the plan. Last month, representatives of the Secretary-General held further consultations with the representatives of the five Western States, South Africa, the front-line States, SWAPO and other interested parties with a view to finding a way out of the current impasse.

63. The Community members appreciate the complexities involved in the implementation of the settlement plan and the importance of the effective deployment of UNTAG, with clearly defined instructions and areas of operation. Consultations and clarifications have been undertaken to that end and additional practical elements have been elaborated. The nine members

consider the concept of a demilitarized zone, put forward by the late President Neto of Angola, to be a useful supplement to the settlement plan. They welcome its acceptance by the front-line States and SWAPO. They also welcome its recent acceptance by South Africa and thus hope that the necessary detailed technical discussions can be brought to an early and successful conclusion. The nine States wish to point out, once again, the serious consequences of any further delay in the implementation of the settlement plan. In their opinion, this chance of a solution by peaceful means should not be jeopardized. Certainly no one should be under any illusion as to the violence and repression which would then be inflicted upon the people of Namibia.

64. The nine members have noted with the utmost concern recent developments within Namibia. In particular, the creation of a "National Assembly" suggests that South Africa has not abandoned the idea of an internal settlement. The nine countries reject any attempts to impose an "internal settlement" on Namibia. They remain firmly opposed to any settlement plan which is not internationally acceptable and which would condemn Namibia to isolation. This is consistent with the refusal of the nine European countries to recognize the validity of the unilateral elections in Namibia in December 1978. These developments are contrary to the spirit of the efforts which have been made by the Secretary-General, the five Western Powers and others.

65. The nine members attach paramount importance to the achievement of conditions within Namibia which would enable all Namibians to participate freely and without fear in a genuinely democratic political process. They deplore therefore the arbitrary arrest and detention without trial, earlier this year, of 72 prominent officials of SWAPO—most of its national executive—by security police. This attempt to stifle the voice of a significant segment of political opinion within Namibia places further obstacles in the way of the objectives of the United Nations. The nine members call for the immediate and unconditional release of all those in Namibia who have been arrested and are still detained because of their political beliefs.

66. The nine States condemn the attacks on neighbouring countries and the acts of intimidation and violence which are taking place in the Territory. It is essential that all the parties concerned refrain from recourse to violence and show restraint in order to create an atmosphere suitable for the implementation of the United Nations plan.

67. The nine States wish to emphasize their support for the continuing efforts which are being made to implement the settlement plan which will, in accordance with Security Council resolution 385 (1976), enable the people of Namibia to participate in free and fair elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations. Such elections must be held in an atmosphere which will allow for full and equal participation by all the political parties in Namibia. The nine States will not accept any settlement which does not take into account the right of the people of Namibia to self-determination and independence.

68. Mr. HA VAN LAU (Viet Nam) (*interpretation from French*): First of all, my delegation wishes to

convey its warm greetings to the dauntless people of Namibia and its sole and authentic representative, SWAPO, which for several decades now have been waging a just struggle to regain their independence and freedom.

69. My delegation would also like to express its admiration for the signal efforts which have been made by the United Nations Council for Namibia which, under the presidency of Zambia, has made such a dynamic contribution to the accomplishment of the mission entrusted to it by the General Assembly.

70. Since 1966, when the item on Namibia became a matter of priority on the agenda of every session of the General Assembly—following the Assembly's adoption of resolution 2145 (XXI) which revoked South Africa's Mandate over Namibia and proposed that the United Nations assume direct responsibility for the Territory of Namibia until the achievement of genuine independence—the international community has constantly devoted special interest to the question of Namibia. The non-aligned movement also has displayed particular interest: all the conferences of the non-aligned countries have adopted resolutions or declared their firm support for the struggle for independence being waged by the Namibian people. In particular, in the United Nations, several resolutions have been adopted, by the General Assembly as well as by the Security Council, with a view to aiding the people of Namibia to attain their right to self-determination and independence in a unified Namibia. In the past, apart from the adoption of resolutions and declarations, special commissions have been set up and negotiations have been undertaken; however, they have yielded no result.

71. What is the reason for that? All the discussions and a number of statements make one unanimous conclusion quite clear, and that is that Pretoria's insolent racism constitutes an arrogant challenge to the international community. Far from complying with the resolutions of the General Assembly, the racists in Pretoria have further intensified their manoeuvres in order to legalize and prolong their colonial domination in Namibia.

72. The South African administration took the insolent decision to annex Walvis Bay, which is an integral part of the Territory of Namibia; it has formed tribes and created bantustans in pursuance of the policy of bantustanization; it has become militarily stronger and has even done everything it can to acquire nuclear weapons, in order to intensify its criminal activities against the national liberation movement in southern Africa.

73. In spite of the protests of world opinion, the South African racist authorities proceeded to carry out so-called elections in order to impose on the people of Namibia an "internal solution" along the lines of the unilateral declaration of independence imposed by Ian Smith on the people of Zimbabwe.

74. It is quite obvious that the racist minority régime of South Africa has turned a deaf ear to the condemnations of public opinion in the country and in the world at large, and has attempted to pursue its policy, which is directly contrary to the aspirations of the Namibian people and to any solution to the Namibian problem in

conformity with the pertinent resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. Therefore it is perfectly clear that that racist régime continues to reject any peaceful solution of the problem of Namibia.

75. In view of that situation, one may wonder why the international community has proved powerless in the face of such insolence displayed by a minority of South African racists who continue to occupy Namibia illegally, to violate the United Nations Charter, to refuse to implement the United Nations resolutions and to pursue stubbornly their colonialist and racist policies in Namibia. The facts have shown that, if the minority racist régime in South Africa did not enjoy the full support of the imperialist Powers, if Western multinational corporations were not clinging to their own selfish interests in South Africa, the racist authorities of Pretoria would never have been able to indulge in such acts of insolence by themselves or to adopt such a contemptuous attitude towards the international community.

76. If we bear in mind those multinational corporations which have exploited the natural resources of South Africa and which have supplied the Pretoria régime with armaments and strategic materials, if we carefully analyse the common ground in strategic interests in that area shared by the imperialists and the international reactionaries, in the same way as there exist interests common to the Fascist régimes of Smith and Botha, we can very clearly identify those who have supported the racists and have prevented the United Nations from taking appropriate steps to impel Pretoria to bow to the will of the international community on the question of Namibia as well as on the matter of *apartheid*.

77. The racist minority régime in South Africa has for 13 years obstinately refused to implement the resolutions of the General Assembly, but it should be recalled that so far the Security Council has failed to reach any decision in conformity with the role and responsibility vested in it by the Charter, and this, as we all know, is due to the fact that the Western Powers have the right of veto.

78. The delegation of Viet Nam believes that it is high time the international community took specific and effective steps to stay the criminal hand of the racist régime of Pretoria in Namibia and adopted economic and other sanctions under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter against South Africa, in order to put an end once and for all to the illegal occupation and colonial oppression practised against the people of Namibia, as well as to the constant threat to peace and security in Africa and throughout the world.

79. Moved by a desire to wage a heroic struggle for the liberation of their country and to defend their unity and territorial integrity, and firmly supported by all the revolutionary and progressive forces throughout the world, the people of Namibia, under the leadership of SWAPO, have scored victory after victory both in their armed struggle and in their political and diplomatic struggle against the illegal occupation by the Pretoria racists. SWAPO has been recognized by the General Assembly as the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people, and by the non-aligned movement as a full-fledged member. The Sixth Conference of Heads

of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held from 3 to 9 September 1979 at Havana,

“called on all countries, and especially on all the progressive and peace-loving forces, to increase immediately their material, military and financial support to SWAPO so that it could intensify the armed struggle for liberation and frustrate the imperialists’ designs; remain alert to the South African racist régime’s manoeuvres; and reject any new attempt by Pretoria to extend its illegal occupation, delay the attainment of real independence and undermine the efforts for achieving a just and lasting solution to the Namibian problem”. [See A/34/542, annex, sect. I. Para. 69.]

80. The Government and people of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam fully and firmly support the just struggle—a struggle that will undoubtedly end in victory—being waged by the courageous people of Namibia under the leadership of SWAPO, its sole authentic and legal representative. We followed with great interest the consultations on Namibia that took place recently at Geneva. We firmly support the position expressed at Geneva by the President of SWAPO, Mr. Sam Nujoma, on 16 November 1979:

“While desirous of the early and speedy implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), SWAPO is strongly opposed to any attempt to use the machinery of the United Nations to negate the achievements of the struggling Namibian people and give undue advantage to the military occupationist régime in our country.

“In this connexion, SWAPO is vehemently opposed to the sinister idea of disarming its armed freedom fighters in Namibia or removing them from their beloved and only fatherland into neighbouring countries, while allowing foreign military occupationist forces to remain armed on Namibian soil. This is unjust, unfair and thus an unacceptable proposition. It is intended to appease and give undue advantage to the illegal occupationist forces in our country. If accepted, this idea will destroy the essence of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). Therefore, SWAPO resolutely rejects this sinister scheme.”

81. We request the General Assembly to take specific and effective measures to respond to SWAPO’s demands.

82. The Vietnamese delegation would like to reaffirm its unreserved support for the inalienable rights of the Namibian people to self-determination, freedom and national independence in a unified Namibia, including Walvis Bay. We energetically condemn the South African administration, which, with the support of the international imperialists and reactionaries, continues to oppress and subjugate the people of Namibia. We condemn outright the acts of aggression committed by the South African racist minority régime against the countries neighbouring Namibia, and we demand that the South African racists put an immediate end to their crimes against the Namibian people, that they free the political detainees, that they immediately and unconditionally withdraw their armed troops and police forces

that have illegally occupied Namibia, and that they respect the true independence and freedom of the Namibian people.

83. The delegation of Viet Nam is convinced that, with the firm support of the international community and progressive mankind, the just struggle of the Namibian people will be crowned with success and that the Namibian people will regain its independence in a free and unified Namibia.

34. Mr. HOLMES TRUJILLO (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Colombia wishes to make some comments on the activities of the United Nations Council for Namibia, as reported on in document A/34/24, as well as on other events which have taken place outside our Organization but which relate to the present item.

85. My delegation wishes to congratulate the Council on the excellent work it has done this year. In particular, we wish to point to the intelligent and tireless work done by its President, Mr. Lusaka, who has guided it very constructively and with particular faithfulness to the guidelines set for it by the General Assembly. For, indeed, faith in the destiny of Namibia is required if we are not to fall into a state of discouragement and scepticism, given the delays which we see in other United Nations bodies in regard to the solution of this urgent problem. What is involved is the independence of a people still subjected to the humiliation of colonialism, a people that asks the members of the United Nations to fulfil the obligations of the Charter and hopes that a State like South Africa, which has rebelled against the principles of the Organization, will suffer the consequences of international condemnation. The instruments of defence provided for in the Charter should not be used selectively by the United Nations; rather, they should be accessible to all nations, no matter how small.

86. The Council for Namibia has devoted most of its attention to the essential aspects of the future of Namibia, to securing and ensuring its genuine independence, to preparing it for national life when its people accedes to independence and to keeping the international community informed about the so-called problem of Namibia, which is so often forgotten or misinterpreted by the communications media that control information in the world.

*Mr. Al-Haddad (Yemen), Vice-President, took the Chair.*

87. Within the programme for assisting and encouraging the Namibian people to attain its independence, the Council has been in constant contact with the neighbouring States, States which have borne the tremendous burden of military aggression, and also with the OAU.

88. Similarly, it has co-operated in training the people who are to lead the State, through the Institute for Namibia, and in order to explain the problem it has attended many conferences of international bodies, and has travelled through several continents, holding talks with important heads of Member States.

89. Also, in co-operation with the Special Committee



on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and the Special Committee against *Apartheid*, it has found forums in which to present problems concerning the exercise of sovereignty in compliance with the principle of the self-determination of peoples.

90. My delegation wishes also to stress the important research done by other United Nations bodies concerning foreign investments in Namibia, which have resulted in surprising discoveries.

91. As we have seen in this brief summary, the United Nations, through the Council for Namibia, is actively participating in assisting the people of Namibia to attain its genuine independence and in preparing it for its existence as another State Member of the Organization. Because of the Council's fidelity to the purposes of the United Nations as expressed in the Charter, the General Assembly should back it fully, approve its programme, provide it with a generous budget and, above all, give it political backing so that it may continue its difficult task.

92. Indeed, in the documents that have been submitted to us for consideration we clearly see that only the Council for Namibia and the Secretary-General have shown an interest in complying with the decisions of the General Assembly on the independence of the former Territory. Five States were given special powers to agree with the Government of Pretoria on a plan for the independence of the Territory. Very little or nothing has been done. The negotiations are proceeding at a snail's pace, and the only thing that continues is the rapid exploitation of the wealth and resources of Namibia by the multinational corporations with headquarters in the capital cities of the former metropolitan States. The only cause for surprise is that this year so far we have not seen the usual ceremony that we witness here periodically, in which one spokesman of the five negotiating States says that the South African Government has agreed to come to New York once again to initiate talks, or that it has promised to study the proposals of the neighbouring States. This situation reflects the impotence of our Organization when its decisions come up against major interests. However, the Namibian people should know that, despite those frustrations, the General Assembly will continue to defend its just aspirations to independence and will continue to defend its natural resources, if only with the fragile weapon of words, from the merciless plunder to which they are submitted. One day the conscience of mankind will be roused from its indifference to the fate of a people that day by day makes heroic sacrifices to overcome backwardness, exploitation, *apartheid* and racial discrimination.

93. As regards the negotiating process, the delegation of Colombia wishes to emphasize the efforts made by the front-line States to reach a peaceful solution to the Namibian problem. Through the five Western negotiating States and the Secretary-General, they have proposed to the South African Government concessions that touch upon the limit of their national dignity, and they have not received an appropriate response. The establishment of a demilitarized zone in northern Namibia, as suggested by President Agostinho Neto in one of the last acts of his fruitful existence, has been all but rejected by the Pretoria Government, again proving

its scorn for the search for a prompt and peaceful solution to the problem. Arrogant South Africa demands that its military units be deployed within that demilitarized zone. Thus the doors to a peaceful solution are closed one after another. But in the passivity of those who are responsible for international security we discover ambiguous acquiescence in the South African designs.

94. There is no longer any doubt that it is necessary to return the negotiating process to the General Assembly, through the Council for Namibia, and to the Security Council, which should assume the responsibility assigned to it under the Charter and apply sanctions against a Member State that openly challenges the fundamental principles of our Organization.

95. As in other similar cases, my delegation is opposed to not allowing the people of Namibia to choose their legitimate representatives. The choosing of its own leaders is a sovereign right of every people, and it has been exercised by the Namibians.

96. Finally, my delegation reiterates its unconditional support for the cause of just and genuine independence for the people of Namibia. The Territory must be returned to its legitimate owners. Its natural resources, including the largest and most important of them, Walvis Bay, must also be returned, and the practices of racial segregation and *apartheid* must be erased for ever from that region of the earth under United Nations administration. Only then shall we be able to say that the United Nations has fulfilled one of its duties to mankind and that it is not the court jester that the South African Government and its voracious partners wish to make of it in the exploitation of this Territory. In other words, only when principles are placed above economic interests will that be possible. There are no signs that that will happen in the immediate future, for the struggle of peoples for freedom follows a long and painful path, and the only ones to reach the end victoriously are those who have heroically persisted in the struggle.

97. Mr. SOEPRAPTO (Indonesia): Despite determined efforts by the United Nations since 1966 to discharge its responsibility for bringing independence to the Namibian people, the results have so far been less than encouraging. The Namibian people are still being denied the attainment of their legitimate aspirations, and are being subjected to various kinds of persecution by South Africa in its illegal occupation. This situation is deplorable and should be ended forthwith.

98. In this regard, the international community should be more united than ever before in firmer action in dealing with the obstinate Pretoria régime, since previous experience has shown that any appeals, including those in resolutions of the United Nations, are blatantly ignored. In this connexion, my delegation would like to recall Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which approved the outlines of a plan for the attainment of independence by Namibia, to which South Africa previously gave a positive response. Unfortunately, implementation was obstructed by Pretoria's continuous manoeuvres to delay Namibian independence in order further to exploit the Territory. It is imperative, therefore, that the Security Council urgently adopt concrete and effective enforcement measures against South Africa, as stated in General Assembly resolution 33/206 of

31 May 1979 and as provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter, in order to ensure South Africa's compliance with the resolutions and decisions of the United Nations. Such action would put great pressure on the Pretoria régime to be more receptive to the express wishes of the international community, especially as regards the early implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), and would thus prevent the continued deterioration of the Namibian situation, which could pose a threat to international peace and security.

99. It is my delegation's view that, in order to avoid such a situation, the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) offers the best means of arriving at a just and peaceful settlement of the issue. For that reason, my delegation is pleased to note the initiative taken by the Secretary-General to convene at Geneva high-level consultations among all the interested parties concerning all aspects of the concept of a demilitarized zone.

100. My delegation appreciates and commends the good will and flexibility of SWAPO and the front-line States in accepting the concept of the proposed demilitarized zone and regrets that South Africa has so far not shown a similar willingness to reach a speedy solution of the issue. My delegation therefore strongly urges South Africa to realize the benefits of such a peaceful solution and reconsider its position on the resolution with a view towards achieving an expeditious settlement of the problem.

101. As a member of the Council for Namibia, my delegation has a particular concern in following the developments on the question and, along with the rest of the international community, seeks a just and peaceful solution to it. As a result, we shall not recognize any internal settlement imposed by South Africa in Namibia which goes counter to the relevant United Nations resolutions and does not reflect the true desires of the Namibian people.

102. In conclusion, my delegation wishes to reiterate once again its support for the struggles of the oppressed peoples of Namibia, Zimbabwe and South Africa. We earnestly appeal to the international community to render to the Namibian people, under the leadership of SWAPO, its sole and authentic representative, greater political, economic and other support so that their inevitable day of freedom and independence can be achieved immediately. On this occasion, my delegation wishes also to condemn South Africa's use of the Territory of Namibia as a spring-board for its attacks against neighbouring countries as being not only a violation of the sovereignty of those States, but also a threat to international peace and security.

103. Mr. RAZAFINDRATOVO (Madagascar) (*interpretation from French*): Once again the international community is called upon to take up the question of Namibia. Throughout the current year, the situation in southern Africa has been characterized by acts of aggression by South Africa against the States of the region alternating with periods of calm which the racist régimes use to consolidate their domination and to resort to further delaying tactics.

104. In Namibia, the South African régime does not cease to build up its military forces and is engaged in arousing tribal hostilities so as to undermine the unity of

the Namibian people which was reaffirmed in Security Council resolution 385 (1976).

105. More seriously, by carrying out acts of aggression against the States which border on Namibia, particularly against Angola and Zambia, South Africa is maintaining in the region a state of dangerous tension which threatens international peace and security.

106. Within Namibia, the acts of the South African régime are aimed at thwarting efforts to achieve a negotiated settlement.

107. The adoption of repressive laws involving the arrest and imprisonment of SWAPO militants and sympathizers, the unconditional support for the puppets of the Democratic Turnhalle Alliance, the campaign of terror and aggression against neighbouring countries are all part of a plan aimed at turning Namibia into a nominally independent State that in fact would be closely controlled by Pretoria and would thus constitute a "glacis" of security for the *apartheid* régime.

108. The present situation is not, however, the result solely of the policies pursued by the racist South African régime. It is also the direct consequence of the support which it receives from its powerful Western protectors. All the plans of action which have been determined by the General Assembly and the Security Council have remained dead letters because certain Member States have used their powers in order to prevent the implementation of the decisions taken by our Organization.

109. On 30 January 1976 the Security Council unanimously adopted resolution 385 (1976) in which it stated, *inter alia*, that

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

The Security Council also demanded that South Africa

"... make a solemn declaration accepting the foregoing provisions for the holding of free elections in Namibia under United Nations supervision and control".

and also that they recognize "the territorial integrity and unity of Namibia as a nation".

110. Everyone acknowledges that Namibia should be free and independent. No one questions the need for a peaceful settlement to the Namibian problem, provided, however, that that settlement responds above all to the interests of the Namibian nation, and in the first place to its unity and its territorial integrity.

111. SWAPO, the sole authentic representative of the people of Namibia and recognized as such by the entire international community, has just given the world an example of its breadth of vision and its sense of responsibility when, together with the front-line States, it accepted the idea of a demilitarized zone on the borders which separate Angola and Zambia from Namibia. We are all aware that the creation of such a demilitarized

zone was an idea put forward by the late President of Angola, Agostinho Neto, in order to facilitate the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). Conditions therefore seem to be rather propitious at the present time for a peaceful and just settlement of the Namibian question and it is now up to the South African régime to demonstrate its good faith before the world.

112. If we refer to the letter from the South African régime reproduced in the annex to document S/13680 of 5 December 1979, we see that South Africa would only accept the idea of a demilitarized zone if certain conditions were met, *inter alia*:

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

“2. Acceptable arrangements regarding the disarmament of SWAPO personnel on the closure of bases, i.e., seven days after certification of the election;

“3. The deployment of an acceptable percentage of UNTAG inside the DMZ in the light of practical requirements;

“4. Agreement on practical arrangements between the UNTAG military commander and the South African military authorities.”

113. In other words, these conditions are only a partial list of the South African requirements and the Secretary for Foreign Affairs of SWAPO has already stated here [91st meeting] that those conditions were “totally unacceptable” to SWAPO.

114. If the efforts made both by the United Nations Secretary-General and by other parties to find a reasonable outcome to this conflict should fail, it is quite obvious that SWAPO has no choice but to continue waging its heroic armed struggle in order to claim its legitimate rights.

115. As far as we are concerned, our duty is quite clear. The first objective of our Organization is, after all, to place the international Territory of Namibia under the effective control of the Security Council in order to lead the Namibian people towards genuine independence.

116. Since 1966, when the General Assembly put an end to South Africa's Mandate in Namibia, that Territory has been the direct responsibility of the United Nations. That decision, which was confirmed by the International Court of Justice,<sup>7</sup> shows the complete illegality of South Africa's occupation of Namibian territory.

117. Is it necessary to recall that, in adopting resolution 1514 (XV), the General Assembly reaffirmed the rights of peoples to freedom and independence?

118. My delegation would therefore once again like to recall the full responsibility borne by our Organization towards Namibia and its duties vis-à-vis the Namibian people, in accordance with Security Council resolu-

tions 385 (1976), 431 (1978), 432 (1978), 435 (1978) and 439 (1978).

119. The delegation of Madagascar endorses the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia and supports all the recommendations contained therein.

120. For my delegation, the Council for Namibia is the sole administering authority which can legally administer Namibia until independence.

121. Any action undertaken outside our Organization and not controlled by it, and which is not approved by SWAPO, can lead only to a false solution.

122. Therefore, we denounce any attempt to install in Namibia any administration or entity which is not the direct outcome of free elections, organized under the supervision and control of the United Nations, or any other attempt to jeopardize Namibia's territorial integrity.

123. We regard Namibia as an indivisible State which includes Walvis Bay.

124. In welcoming the initiatives of the Secretary-General to find an urgent and just solution to this problem, my delegation feels it should recall its attachment to the principles and purposes of the Charter and to the various relevant resolutions adopted by our Organization.

125. Mr. SALLAH (Gambia): As we meet yet again to discuss the problem of Namibia, my delegation is deeply disturbed by the rising unrest and the precarious situation that are prevalent in southern Africa. Genuine efforts by this General Assembly to ensure a peaceful and progressive accession to independence for Namibia have been frustrated by South Africa's adamant resolve to abort any realization of such a noble goal simply to serve its own selfish ends. South Africa's disguised motives are synonymous with a desire to maintain its control in the region at the expense of a weak and fragile neighbour, Namibia.

126. The South African Government has, by design, repeatedly impeded every positive step elaborated by the General Assembly and constantly flouted Security Council resolutions with impunity. The ruse that it has employed in organizing its own voter registration campaign and conducting its own elections, in violation of Security Council resolution 385 (1976), after having apparently agreed to the principle of elections supervised by the United Nations, is characteristic of its dubious designs.

127. It is my delegation's view that the holding of fraudulent elections by South Africa with impunity, in total defiance of the world community and in particular of the five Western Powers, marked the turning-point in the negotiations sponsored by those Powers. Before the elections, a general belief in their good faith and that of South Africa existed in the minds of many delegations, but the unwillingness of the five Powers to apply the slightest pressure on South Africa has given the appearance of collusion.

128. A striking coincidence also, in my delegation's view, is the vigour with which some countries and

<sup>7</sup> *South West Africa, Second Phase, Judgement, I.C.J. Reports 1966*, p. 6.

South Africa appear to propose and support proposals at each session of the General Assembly and at Security Council meetings dealing with Namibia, but overtly fail to match those proposals with effective action. That "red herring" tactic has been evident during the special session in 1978, the resumed thirty-third session of this year and at various Security Council meetings. This thirty-fourth session signals a repetition of the process, and my delegation wishes to call upon the General Assembly to be wary of such an evasive approach to this burning issue. What is needed are concrete and sincere measures that would ensure the total liberation of Namibia from South African domination.

129. My delegation is of the firm conviction that self-determination is a right that all peoples of the world should exercise. The professed claims that Namibia's independence would constitute a threat to South Africa cannot be accepted. South Africa's acquisition of nuclear-weapon technology, apparently with the assistance of some Members of the United Nations, constitutes the real threat to international peace and security.

130. Because we were convinced that the five Western Powers were amongst South Africa's best friends in the world and therefore most influential with it, we were hopeful that the protracted negotiations conducted by very eminent representatives of those countries with the South African régime would have made some headway in convincing that régime to abandon its unjust claims to the Territory of Namibia. As we all know, those claims have been rejected and declared groundless by the International Court of Justice. But, alas, the South Africans will not be persuaded even by their own best friends. It is my delegation's opinion that that is one more proof of the contempt and ridicule in which the South African leaders hold the international community.

131. Despite South Africa's refusal to co-operate with the representatives of the five Powers, we find it rather intriguing that the representatives of those same Powers invariably refuse to join any move to condemn or adopt punitive resolutions against South Africa, either in the General Assembly or in the Security Council. We are tempted to regard that attitude as one of double standards and wish to express regret over it and to warn this Assembly against it. What is needed is a decision of this Assembly by consensus to impose concrete and sincere measures, including the application of Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter, that would ensure Namibia's liberation from South African domination.

132. We have been obliged to adopt this position because over the years, as we have surveyed the developments on the question of Namibia, characterized by four years of so-called negotiations, on the one hand, and by a massive military attempt to eliminate SWAPO and replace it with South African Turnhalle stooges, on the other, we have been convinced that South Africa's policy in Namibia is an attempt to defraud the international community and especially the people of Namibia.

133. That attitude of South Africa has not only called into question the credibility of the negotiations being conducted by the five Powers but, in our view, has also undermined those negotiations and brought them to the edge of collapse. We are fearful that, faced with the intransigence of the South African authorities and their determination to install their own puppets in Namibia,

the five Powers are apparently aiding those authorities, perhaps unwittingly, as they keep attempting to peddle what, to all appearances, could turn out to be a false solution.

134. This is an appropriate moment for me to draw attention to and denounce South Africa's latest attempt at securing international recognition for its puppets in Namibia, when it tried to provide for their representation in the negotiations which took place in May and November of this year. It no doubt intends to hand the country over to them. That is why, four years after the adoption of Security Council resolution 385 (1976), it has still not formally accepted the United Nations plan for United Nations-supervised elections in Namibia; and, no doubt, as soon as this session of the General Assembly concludes its work, the South African authorities will launch a renewed aggressive drive to eliminate SWAPO as a potential leader in Namibia.

135. There is no doubt in our minds that some Members of the United Nations have considerable economic and political leverage with South Africa. It is high time that they employed all such leverage to secure the human rights of the people of Namibia and enable them to enjoy self-determination and social and economic justice.

136. In the absence of such action by South Africa's friends, the conflict in that region of our continent will be intensified and the threat to international peace and security will become even more visible.

137. The protracted injustices perpetrated by the South African Government and the growing struggle of the people of Namibia make it imperative for a solution to be found immediately. Namibia is at the threshold of independence and that even the provocative gestures of the Pretoria régime can impede the march to freedom; nor can any degree of aggression, threat, plunder or terrorism by South Africa against the front-line States sap their joint and determined will to secure peace and freedom in the region.

138. Mr. PALMA (Peru) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation is once more taking part in the debate on the question of Namibia. It is doing so in the same spirit as on the occasion when it took part a few months ago in the resumed thirty-third session of the General Assembly, somewhat over a year ago in the ninth special session of the General Assembly, devoted to Namibia, and in the Extraordinary Ministerial Meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Countries, which was held at Maputo from 26 January to 2 February this year.

139. Therefore, we wish to reiterate today the right of the people of Namibia to independence, national unity and territorial integrity. We shall never tire of denouncing the occupation and illegal exploitation of Namibian territory by South Africa's racist régime, in open violation and manifest contempt for the resolutions of the Security Council and of the General Assembly, and we note that it constitutes a further expression of the aggressive and oppressive policy of the Pretoria régime, a policy that is abhorrent to the international community.

140. Once again, with growing concern, we note that the hopes of the Namibian people, as well as those of the international community, have been dashed by the

intransigent attitude of the illegal occupiers, who stubbornly disregard the fact that Namibia is under the direct responsibility of the United Nations and the fact that the legal Administering Authority for the territory is the United Nations Council for Namibia.

141. This attitude gives rise to divisive and confusing actions on the part of the South African Government, which is striving by all means to install a puppet régime which would support the occupation and exploitation of the Territory, as part of its aberrant and already condemned policy of establishing a constellation of States as a defensive barrier against the efforts of the free peoples of Africa who are striving to eliminate the hateful system of *apartheid* and the colonial system. To that end, so-called elections were organized and carried out to establish what was termed the "Windhoek Constituent Assembly", with legislative and executive powers, all of which has been unanimously condemned by the international community.

142. Therefore, we must remain alert in order to denounce and counter any attempt which may be aimed at undermining, by means of unilateral acts on the part of South Africa, the efforts to achieve a negotiated settlement on Namibia.

143. In this regard, and taking advantage of this opportunity, my delegation wishes to express firm adherence to the laudable work being carried out by the United Nations Council for Namibia, under the wise presidency of Mr. Lusaka, of Zambia, work which is aimed at raising support for the just cause of the Namibian people at the international level and at countering Pretoria's determination to occupy that Territory against the manifest will of that people in order to use it as a spring-board for aggressive adventures against the front-line States.

144. The Council for Namibia also deserves the decided support of the Members of our Organization in the continued provision of valuable humanitarian assistance to the refugees and in the most important aspect of training technical cadres able to participate in the building of an independent and free Namibia within the concert of nations.

145. Resolution 33/182 C of the General Assembly proclaimed this year as the International Year of Solidarity with the people of Namibia and expressed the conviction of the international community that 1979 would be of decisive importance for the Namibian people's attainment of independence and self-determination on the basis of the United Nations transition plan.

146. In this regard, in the view of my delegation, any political settlement must have the broadest possible base and must include all parties interested in the problem. We are aware of the fact that, in the last analysis, it is the international community which must ensure that the parties directly involved will accept the process advocated by the United Nations for the transfer of power to those who may emerge from legitimate elections as the authentic representatives of the Namibian people.

147. At the Ministerial Meeting of the Co-ordinating

Bureau of the Non-Aligned Countries, held at Maputo, my delegation pointed out however, that:

"present circumstances should not make us lose sight of the fact that some Western countries bear a special responsibility for ensuring that the illegal occupier abides by the terms of United Nations decisions and we trust that to that end they will not fail to use all means prescribed in the Charter of the international Organization for the maintenance of international peace and security".

148. We have followed with great attention the initiatives taken by five countries to find a possible basis of negotiation inspired by resolution 385 (1976) of the Security Council. However, the solution still appears to be remote, and this is due solely and exclusively to one factor: South Africa's attitude. The Assembly will take due note of that fact.

149. At this time my delegation wishes to emphasize and once again to praise the spirit of frank understanding and the sense of responsibility shown by SWAPO, which has thus given more than sufficient proof of its will to negotiate and of its constructive spirit.

150. In conclusion, I wish to state that my delegation hopes that it may still be possible to have an orderly and peaceful transition towards a free Namibia, independent and sovereign, which may fully enjoy its right to self-determination, to its national and political unity, to its territorial integrity, including Walvis Bay, and to the legitimate use of its natural resources.

151. Mr. BEDJAOUI (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): At the outset Algeria wishes to reiterate, as a duty and an honour, its constant solidarity with SWAPO, the sole and legitimate representative of the people of Namibia. We wish particularly on this occasion to recall our unconditional support at this decisive stage in the struggle which is being waged by that authentic national liberation movement to win back the imprescriptible national rights of the Namibian people. The time has now come for SWAPO to call the roster of its friends and allies in its anti-colonialist fight and to evaluate the consistency and weight of their solidarity, before engaging as resolutely as ever in the final stage of its political and diplomatic struggle in the present negotiations and victoriously confronting the manoeuvres which are intended to eviscerate the independence of the Namibian people.

152. Algeria most earnestly wishes to see a peaceful settlement of the Namibian affair. But we are equally firmly convinced that only complete and effective independence for Namibia would be a proper response to the legitimate expectations of the people of Namibia and their exclusive leader, SWAPO. Thus, we wish to express our profound conviction that the national liberation struggle waged by the Namibian patriots will undoubtedly lead to authentic independence, with strict respect for the territorial integrity of that country, in accordance with the ideals of justice and liberty which are enshrined in the Charter as well as with the principles contained in numerous resolutions and decisions adopted by the United Nations over a period of two decades.

153. I also wish to voice our appreciation for the United Nations Council for Namibia. Under the skilled

and perceptive leadership of Mr. Paul Lusaka, of Zambia, that body has spared no effort to discharge the mandate given it in 1967 [resolution 2248 (S-V)] to take charge of the Namibian case in the United Nations and to promote conditions under which the people of the Territory can shortly accede to independence, in accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

154. The Algerian delegation does not wish to keep silent about the fact that once again the General Assembly is beginning the debate on the question of Namibia is something of a rush, in the final stages of its regular session, in conditions very similar to those we experienced at the thirty-third session. It may be recalled that in 1978 various considerations, some objective, but others subjective, caused the United Nations to resume the session immediately after the year-end holidays and to go then into the questions of substance of the Namibian problem, notably because the elements of the Namibian case in the United Nations were insufficiently clear.

155. We venture to hope that the present debate, which began on 6 December, will finally provide an opportunity to put forward the real problems and will make it possible to clarify circumstances which, because of the nature of the further data which have been added to the colonial fact itself, threaten to create a situation which has been deliberately complicated, purposely distorted and made practically insoluble through weakness. In addition to the inflexible and cavalier attitude of South Africa, the behaviour of certain Powers which sustain it in various ways in its aggressive attitude cannot fail to disturb and disquiet us, as this presents a problem of political and ethical conduct. If the situation continues in this way, the full data on this affair will have to be revealed so that world opinion as a whole may be properly informed.

156. The background of the question of Namibia within the United Nations need not be given again. It is too well known to all members of the international community for it to be useful to be repeated once again. This question is like the conscience of Cain: it should keep all of us awake, and particularly the direct or indirect accomplices of South Africa, for as long as the damage inflicted upon the Namibian people in the realm of its national rights, its fundamental freedoms and its national resources is not repaired. Each and every one of us must assume some responsibility for the intolerable suffering inflicted on this people, whose territory is illegally occupied by the most retrograde country on earth, while the United Nations, since its revocation of South Africa's Mandate over Namibia in 1966, has not ceased to be the legal administrator and protector of the Namibian people, the victim of the South African occupation and the racist oppression of the *apartheid* régime.

157. The South African oppression of the people of Namibia was a challenge to the will for freedom and independence of that people, which intends to be free. That oppression necessarily involved the appearance and growth of armed resistance, which gained its legitimacy from the long tradition of anti-colonial struggle by the Namibian people in the nineteenth century against its first invaders, the Germans. The success achieved in the field by the Namibian patriots has unfortunately not been properly reflected in world public opinion, which is conditioned by the selective and biased information it

receives. We need only consider the ferocious reactions and the systematic and inhuman extermination of the Namibian population by South Africa at each victorious attack by SWAPO to see beyond the conspiratorial silence of the mass media and understand the vitality and combativeness of a people and a movement that do not intend to die.

158. In SWAPO's efforts to find a peaceful negotiated solution, that authentic representative of the popular will has on more than one occasion proved its understanding of dialogue, its capacity to negotiate realistically and, above all, its tremendous political maturity by the way it has assumed its historic responsibility to the entire Namibian people.

159. This maturity and far-sightedness of the leaders of SWAPO, particularly of its President, Sam Nujoma, have won the admiration of the international community and impressed the group of five Western countries that took the initiative of submitting a plan for a negotiated settlement, which, once it was made specific, was to become the United Nations plan for the settlement of the question of Namibia, contained in Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

160. This marked the beginning of the realization of our hopes for speedy independence for Namibia. But at the same time, unfortunately, it was the prelude to a series of new delaying tactics by South Africa. Hidden, disguised, obscure, and then openly revealed, those manoeuvres ranged from equivocation aimed at gaining time in order to reinforce the position and the alleged popular support for its irregularly elected puppets, to endless Byzantine discussions carried out by South Africa with the Secretary-General of the United Nations, as if to try the patience of the political leaders of SWAPO and to put to the test African and international solidarity in the noble cause of Namibia. The letter of 9 November last, addressed by the South African Minister of Foreign Affairs to the Secretary-General,<sup>8</sup> which in places smacks of *diktat*, is the most recent unacceptable example of this.

161. It is clear that the way in which South Africa has succeeded in preventing the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) has had the result, first, of increasing the repression of the Namibian people and South African aggression against the neighbouring countries, either directly as in the case of Angola, or through the intermediary of Rhodesia, in the cases of Zambia and Mozambique. Furthermore, those manoeuvres have resulted in complicating the rather simple process of implementing resolution 435 (1978) by introducing additional elements which, meant originally to facilitate acceptance by South Africa, have eventually been used by the latter to call into question once more the very substance of the United Nations settlement plan.

162. Therefore the Algerian delegation has had occasion, in various circumstances, to draw the attention of the international community to the amalgamating technique which is used by Pretoria constantly to link technical details, not to the actual substance of the plan, which in any case South Africa has never accepted, but

<sup>8</sup> See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-fourth Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1979*, document S/13614.

to other technical details, and so on *ad infinitum*, until the real answer that was awaited from it gets lost or is forgotten in the labyrinth of secondary problems.

163. In that connexion, the most recent of the documents sent by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the South African racist régime and circulated in document S/13680 is in itself an indescribable affront to the whole international community and more specifically to the United Nations and to the Western countries which have been trying for the last three years to get an agreement in principle from Pretoria which could make possible the implementation of a plan for the peaceful settlement of the Namibian problem.

164. South Africa's reply to the latest technical proposals connected with the functioning of the demilitarized zone gave that régime the chance to raise other problems, thus creating a chain reaction, which the Swedish Ambassador so rightly discerned when he said:

"South Africa declares that it accepts the concept of the zone, but makes its acceptance subject, as usual, to a number of conditions. It is, in other words, the same choice of tactics and timing that South Africa has displayed so many times before." [91st meeting, para. 111.]

165. So here we are at the end of this session, at this final stage of the debate on the question of Namibia, worried and even distressed at the way events have developed with regard to the implementation of the United Nations plan for the settlement of the question of Namibia. Once again, South Africa has lost none of its intransigence. It continues to involve the United Nations in endless delays and evasions with the frenzied hope, on the one hand, of defeating the SWAPO fighters and, on the other, of strengthening the position of the puppets recently installed in Namibia.

166. Algeria wishes to take the opportunity provided by this debate to insist, once again, on its approval and support for any effort aimed at the loyal, rapid and complete implementation of the United Nations plan for a peaceful settlement as contained in Security Council resolution 435 (1978). In that connexion, we wish to pay a tribute to the Secretary-General of the United Nations for his efforts to establish the necessary conditions for the practical implementation of this plan. The Algerian delegation, however, wishes to reiterate here that our support for SWAPO will prompt us to denounce whenever necessary any attempt, no matter whence it comes, to deprive the Namibian people of the fruit of its struggle for national liberation.

167. Such a struggle can only lead to real independence in a unified territory. Until that objective is achieved, Algeria will continue to give its comprehensive support to the valiant SWAPO, the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people.

168. Mr. SOURINHO (Lao People's Democratic Republic) (*interpretation from French*): No question in the history of the decolonization efforts undertaken by the United Nations has given rise to so much resistance, so many new developments and so many delaying tactics, in short, so much diplomatic manoeuvring, as has that of Namibia, a Territory which is the direct responsibility of our Organization and thus of all Member States.

169. Indeed, for more than 12 years the United Nations has been trying to lead the Namibian people to self-determination and independence. But the efforts deployed so far have been vain and the responsibility for this in no way rests with the Secretary-General or the United Nations Council for Namibia, who have worked selflessly and devotedly for the just cause of the Namibian people. Nor does it rest with the non-aligned countries, the socialist States or States that cherish freedom and justice and have always supported and aided the struggle of the Namibian people, under the leadership of SWAPO, its sole legitimate and authentic representative, to regain its independence and sovereignty.

170. Responsibility for the failure of the efforts made obviously rests, first and foremost, with the minority racist régime of South Africa, which, trampling underfoot all the relevant resolutions of the United Nations on Namibia and all the elementary standards of international law, obstinately continues to maintain its illegal occupation of Namibia, thus defying with the utmost arrogance and without discrimination—a unique exception to its policy and practice—all the Members of our Organization, including of course those which have helped and supported it diplomatically, militarily and financially. That responsibility also falls—it goes without saying but it goes better saying it—on the three Western permanent members of the Security Council, and the friends that back them, which have often in the Council abused their right of veto to block the adoption of just and reasonable proposals by the non-aligned countries, supported by the socialist countries, for the adoption by the Council of enforcement measures, against the minority racist régime of South Africa, in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter.

171. Although it is true that, in the interest of the cause of the Namibian people, we are not gathered here to attribute blame and condemnation, because that kind of exercise does not always lead to the desired result, it is nevertheless important to place the problem, and in particular facts that characterize it, in their true context.

172. Moreover, as far as the minority racist régime of South Africa is concerned, mere blame and verbal condemnation will never be enough; all the radical measures authorized by the Charter must be adopted without delay to bring it to its senses before the African continent and the whole world are subjected to fire and blood as a result of its demented actions.

173. Thus, any further hesitation or refusal on the part of the three Western permanent members of the Security Council and their friends to embark on this course, in the event of the *apartheid* régime still refusing to comply in good faith with the decisions of the United Nations, particularly resolution 385 (1976) of the Security Council, and with the internationally accepted settlement, would only prolong the sufferings of the Namibian people and increase the threat which weighs on Africa and the entire world.

174. While an entire people is living under the yoke of the most brutal and fanatical oppression, it is not fitting for our Organization to continue indefinitely to indulge in rhetoric. This is a game that has lasted for more than 12 years, to the great satisfaction of South Africa, and throughout this time the plight of the Namibian people,

instead of improving, has tragically worsened. On the pretext of bringing about a negotiated settlement of the Namibian problem, which is extremely desirable and desired, the United Nations and the entire international community have allowed themselves to be led, albeit reluctantly, into the trap of the advocates of *apartheid*, who have made very clever use of these negotiations in order to consolidate their illegal occupation of Namibia and crush once and for all the liberation struggle of the Namibian people.

175. Indeed, our routine consideration of the report of the Council for Namibia [A/34/24] clearly shows us that in recent months the minority racist régime in South Africa has further stepped up its acts of bloody repression against the Namibian people by a deliberate resort to torture, murder and assassination, particularly of the members of SWAPO. It has stepped up the process of dismemberment of the territorial and national unity of Namibia by means of measures involving the annexation of Walvis Bay and the policy of setting up tribal armies and bantustans. It has repeatedly perpetrated acts of savage aggression against the front-line countries, causing them considerable losses, both human and material. It has stepped up the internal settlement process by organizing rigged elections and it has set up a so-called constituent assembly in order to establish a typical puppet government which will be completely subservient to it.

176. Recently the world was surprised and disturbed to learn that South Africa had carried out a nuclear explosion.

177. All these acts clearly prove that the *apartheid* régime is determined, despite universal condemnation, to continue to occupy Namibia and to use that Territory as, in the words of President Kaunda of Zambia, "a buffer for its vicious *apartheid* policies and practices".<sup>9</sup>

178. Through its numerous acts, the minority racist régime of South Africa has made the situation in southern Africa more explosive than ever. A serious threat, therefore, affects the peace and security of the world.

179. In the face of this grave peril, the United Nations must react, and react in a logical way. An end must be put to the delaying tactics and the criminal acts of South Africa and new hope must be given to the Namibian people. As the United Nations Council for Namibia, supported by the overwhelming majority of the members of this Assembly, has been advocating for some time, the only way to achieve this, we repeat, is by adopting effective measures, particularly comprehensive economic sanctions, including an embargo on petroleum, as set forth in Chapter VII of the Charter, to force South Africa to conform to the pertinent decisions of the United Nations.

180. To act in this way is not only to be fully responsive to the gravity and urgency of the situation but also to fulfil one of the noble purposes of the Charter, namely, to ensure respect for human rights, beginning with the right to self-determination and independence, everywhere and for the benefit of all people, whatever the colour of their skin.

181. Now more than ever, we believe, it is for the

ardent defenders of human rights to bring their actions into line with their words by joining in the efforts of the international community to pave the way resolutely to freedom and independence for the Namibian people in a unified Namibia which would include Walvis Bay.

182. In view of this, the Namibian people, through its sole legitimate representative, SWAPO, will be able to count on the unflinching support of the people and Government of the Lao People's Democratic Republic.

183. Mr. AKIMAN (Turkey): Thirteen years ago, in 1966, the United Nations General Assembly took the important decision to terminate the Mandate of South Africa over Namibia [*resolution 2145 (XXI)*]. It was in 1967 that the General Assembly established the United Nations Council for Namibia [*resolution 2248 (S-V)*], of which Turkey is one of the founding members, as the sole legal authority for the Territory until Namibia attains its independence.

184. During the last decade the question of Namibia has continuously engaged the concern of the international community, within and outside the United Nations, through the activities of the United Nations Council for Namibia and the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia and, during the past two years, through those of the five Western countries. The Security Council, in the discharge of its primary responsibility for maintaining international peace and security, has on several occasions considered the prevailing situation in Namibia and the future of that Territory. The annals of the United Nations and the resolutions adopted by both the General Assembly and the Security Council concerning Namibia clearly indicate the determined and dedicated efforts of the international community to terminate South Africa's illegal occupation of the international Territory of Namibia, to end South Africa's cruel and inhuman suppression of the Namibian people, to prevent South Africa's attempts to install a puppet régime in that Territory and, above all, to ensure that the people of Namibia achieve their inalienable right to self-determination and independence.

185. During the course of the past decade, however, South Africa has always managed to flout those resolutions and challenge the will of the international community through its defiant and intransigent attitude. During that period South Africa not only has continued its illegal occupation of Namibia but has also consistently stepped up its brutal repressive measures against the people of Namibia and imposed on them its policy of *apartheid*. Detentions and arrests of patriotic Namibians and plans for bantustanization have continued. SWAPO members have been sentenced. This behaviour on the part of South Africa has certainly violated the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, and at the same time has constituted a serious threat to international peace and security.

186. Since early 1978 we have had before us the United Nations transition plan for an internationally acceptable settlement of the question of Namibia. The international community has welcomed the plan, initially prepared and produced as a result of intensive work by the five Western countries, in consultation and co-operation with the parties concerned. The initial

<sup>9</sup> See A/33/565-S/13326, annex, p. 21.



proposals presented in March 1978, which envisage a transition to independence after elections held under the supervision and control of the United Nations, have been endorsed by the Security Council in resolutions 431 (1978) and 435 (1978). The plan, which was the result of unprecedented efforts to achieve a negotiated settlement, has involved the Secretary-General of the United Nations, his Special Representative and the front-line countries, in addition to the five Western countries and the parties directly concerned. In spite of all efforts, the plan has, unfortunately, not been implemented, because of the numerous questions and problems raised by South Africa at each and every phase of the peace initiative.

187. During the thirty-third session of the General Assembly and last May when the General Assembly resumed that session to discuss the question of Namibia, my delegation pointed out the disappointment and frustration caused in the international community by the intransigent attitude of the Government of South Africa. My delegation feels that South Africa should not be allowed to defy the will of the international community and obstruct the independence of Namibia. The international community is well aware of the duplicity and lack of a sense of responsibility which have underlain the South African attitude since the very beginning.

188. We have seen the efforts for a negotiated settlement frequently undermined by the unilateral measures resorted to by South Africa, as well as by its manoeuvres. These measures culminated in the unilateral elections held by South Africa and the legislative powers later conferred upon the National Assembly with a view to installing a puppet régime in Namibia, in complete defiance of Security Council resolution 439 (1978) that declared the election and its results null and void. We are convinced that South Africa has, through delaying tactics, used the time since the beginning of the peace initiative to enhance its position within Namibia. Over the last few months we have seen increased evidence of deliberate measures taken towards SWAPO members in the way of detentions and arrests. Furthermore, South African aggression against the front-line countries has continued to escalate. All those developments confirm our conviction about South Africa's intentions.

189. In spite of that background and the impasse caused by South Africa's intransigent attitude as far as the implementation of the United Nations plan is concerned, the late President Neto of Angola proposed in mid-1979, showing great political wisdom, the concept of a demilitarized zone on the northern frontier of Namibia, to solve the last remaining problems concerning the implementation of the plan. That proposal has constituted a sound basis for further negotiations. The establishment and monitoring of a demilitarized zone has been accepted by the front-line States and by SWAPO. The Secretary-General succeeded in bringing the parties together at Geneva in November 1979 to clarify their positions on this question. Other parties having given their approval at that meeting, it was only the Government of South Africa whose response was still to come. That response arrived on the eve of this debate in the plenary Assembly. The South African reply is not conclusive; it still needs clarification. South Africa's final attitude in this regard will certainly be the

most important test of its intentions in regard to the peace initiative.

190. My delegation feels that every effort should be made and every kind of pressure should be exerted on South Africa pending this final clarification. In our statement last year<sup>10</sup> we emphasized the necessity of Security Council action in the way of mandatory economic sanctions against South Africa, as provided for under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter, because of its flagrant defiance of the will of the international community. We still feel that this possibility should not be excluded: parallel action in the Security Council may serve to provide the necessary pressure on South Africa to give the required clarifications on its concurrence with the plan and to ensure its prompt implementation of the plan from this point on. We feel that this is a must, not only because of the nature of the prevailing situation in Namibia, but also because of the credibility of this Organization, which could be at stake if the plan were to be doomed to failure at this late stage.

191. In this connexion, I find it a pleasant duty to commend the untiring and devoted efforts of the five Western States, the constructive role played by the Secretary-General and his staff, the exemplary statesmanship demonstrated by the front-line States and the spirit of co-operation and flexibility shown by SWAPO during the negotiating process. We continue to believe that a peaceful settlement can best be reached under the conditions spelled out in the relevant Security Council resolutions which call, among other things, for the free and unfettered exercise by the Namibian people of their right to self-determination and independence within a united Namibia. We support all the efforts that have been and are being made in that direction and certainly hope that the golden opportunity which seems to be almost at hand, especially at this juncture, in the immediate aftermath of the agreement on the Zimbabwe cease-fire, will not be lost, so that 1979, the International Year of Solidarity with the People of Namibia, will also be marked by the solution of this question, thus considerably easing the tension in southern Africa.

192. I should like to seize this opportunity to reiterate that we fully and unconditionally support the people of Namibia in their just struggle, under the leadership of SWAPO, for national independence based on majority rule. We recognize SWAPO as the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people. We commend SWAPO's courageous struggle for its just cause, as well as its conciliatory attitude in the negotiation process. Furthermore, we believe that the territorial integrity of Namibia should be reaffirmed and we unequivocally condemn the illegal annexation of Walvis Bay by South Africa.

193. Finally, I should like to state how much importance we attach to the successful efforts of the United Nations Council for Namibia, of which, as I have already mentioned, Turkey is a founding member, in protecting and promoting the legitimate interests of the Namibian people. I should like at this point to pay a special tribute to the President of the Council, Ambassador Lusaka of Zambia, for his inspiring and dynamic leadership as well as his sincere and dedicated efforts in the cause of the Namibian people.

<sup>10</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-third Session, Plenary Meetings*, 80th meeting, para. 248.

194. As a member of the United Nations Council for Namibia, we are happy to take part actively in its work. We support the recommendations contained in its report before us, which envisage a wide scope of activities during 1980. Before I conclude, I find it a pleasant duty also to pay a special tribute to the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia, Mr. Martti Ahtisaari, for his constructive efforts in preparing the Nationhood Programme for Namibia, which is of significant importance for the training of the Namibian patriots who will be assuming their responsibility—soon, we hope—in an independent Namibia. In this context we should like equally to welcome the valuable support provided by UNDP, FAO, UNESCO and other international organizations for the successful implementation of the Programme.

195. Mr. ILLUECA (Panama) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Panama comes to this Assembly once again to reaffirm the inalienable right of the Namibian people to self-determination, freedom and national independence in a united Namibia, including Walvis Bay, under the leadership of its sole authentic liberation movement, SWAPO, which at the Sixth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Havana in September 1979, became a full-fledged member of the non-aligned movement.

196. The decisions on the question of Namibia adopted by the General Assembly, the Security Council, the International Court of Justice, the Economic and Social Council, the summit conferences of the non-aligned countries, the summit conferences of the OAU, the United Nations Council for Namibia, the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, and the Human Rights Commission contain the following conclusions, supported by the overwhelming weight of international public opinion.

197. First, the occupation of the Territory of Namibia by South Africa is illegal and therefore must be condemned.

198. Secondly, the application by South Africa of racially discriminatory and repressive laws and practices, such as the *apartheid* system, to Namibia is illegal and arbitrary and therefore must be condemned.

199. Thirdly, the intensification of South African military power in Namibia and the use of the Territory as a spring-board for attacks on neighbouring countries—and I have in mind particularly Angola and Zambia—are violations of international law, since they entail the militarization of Namibia by the South African illegal occupation régime.

200. Fourthly, the policy of bantustans and so-called homelands is intended to violate the national unity and territorial integrity of Namibia, and therefore that policy must cease immediately.

201. Fifthly, South Africa's attempts to find a way around the ambiguous demand of the United Nations that free elections be held in Namibia under United Nations supervision and control are unacceptable.

202. Sixthly, it is imperative that free elections under

United Nations supervision and control, be held in Namibia, which should be considered a single political entity.

203. Seventhly, the holding of such elections must take place at an appropriate date, due regard being paid to ensuring that the United Nations may establish within Namibia the necessary mechanisms for the supervision and control of the elections and to enabling the people of Namibia to organize itself politically for the elections.

204. Eighthly, South Africa is committed to compliance with United Nations resolutions and decisions and the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of 21 June 1971.<sup>11</sup>

205. Ninthly, South Africa must without delay undertake the withdrawal of its illegal administration in Namibia and must transfer power to the people of Namibia with the assistance of the United Nations.

206. Tenthly, until the transfer of power is effected, it is imperative that South Africa: comply fully, in spirit and in practice, with the provisions of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights; free all Namibian political prisoners, including all those who are under arrest or in prison in connexion with violations of the so-called internal security laws; abrogate the application in Namibia of all laws and practices involving racial discrimination and political repression; unconditionally grant to all Namibians at present exiled for political reasons all necessary facilities for them to return to their country without any risk of being arrested, detained, intimidated or incarcerated.

207. In recent days we have seen some positive signs in the efforts undertaken by the five Western Powers to bring about a settlement of the Namibian question under the auspices of the United Nations. However, there have been so many occasions on which the possibilities of a peaceful settlement have come to naught, given the obstinacy and persistent stand of the Pretoria régime, that we do not believe it that it is advisable to be carried away by enthusiasm. We must rather insist, cautiously and soberly but at the same time firmly, that all measures be taken to ensure that South Africa will not press ahead unilaterally with a fraudulent internal settlement project.

208. In recording the appreciation of the international community for the excellent work done by the United Nations Council for Namibia and by its President, Mr. Paul Lusaka, we believe it our duty to state that we agree with the Council that the situation in Namibia has deteriorated seriously and is therefore a grave threat to peace and security.

209. We also wish to express appreciation to the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia, Mr. Martti Ahtisaari, for the excellent work he has done in promoting the objectives of the United Nations.

210. In conclusion, the Government of Panama believes that, unless South Africa gives proof of seriousness and good faith with regard to the application of the

<sup>11</sup> *Legal Consequences for States of the continued presence of South Africa in Namibia (South West Africa) notwithstanding Security Council resolution 276 (1970), Advisory Opinion, I.C.J. Reports 1971, p. 16.*

proposal concerning the settlement of the Namibian question, the Security Council is committed to meeting urgently to adopt coercive measures against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter, to bring about South African compliance with the resolutions of United Nations organs on Namibia.

211. Mr. YANKOV (Bulgaria): Consideration of the question of Namibia at the current session is highlighted, on the one hand, by the further upsurge in the national liberation struggle of the Namibian people under the leadership of SWAPO and, on the other, by the increase in the attempts of the racist régime of South Africa and certain *milieux* in Western countries to find a so-called "internal" solution to the problem.

212. In our view, a just and complete solution of the Namibian question is feasible provided that the illegal occupation of that country by South Africa is terminated and such termination is accompanied by an unconditional withdrawal of all South African troops, police forces and administration personnel. May I be allowed to recall once more the stark truth known to all, that without SWAPO, and without its direct participation in determining the future of Namibia, it is impossible to carry out any plans whatsoever for the resolution of Namibia's problems in conformity with the spirit and provisions of the United Nations Charter and the historic Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. SWAPO is the sole legitimate representative of the Namibian people and it has been recognized as such by the OAU, the United Nations and the non-aligned countries.

213. It is well known that South Africa has scorned Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978), using delaying tactics aimed at achieving its objective of imposing a puppet régime in Namibia. The Bulgarian delegation is therefore ready to support any action by the General Assembly, including condemnation of South Africa's racist régime for its stubborn refusal to withdraw from Namibia and for the manoeuvres it has been carrying out with the complicity and encouragement of imperialist circles to continue the illegal occupation of Namibia, to violate its territorial integrity, to break its national unity and to perpetuate the oppression and exploitation of its people.

214. The continued illegal occupation of Namibia by the racist régime of South Africa constitutes not only an aggression against the people of Namibia itself but also a gross provocation to all the independent sovereign States of Africa, and it represents a threat to international peace and security with its open defiance of all the decisions and resolutions of the United Nations on Namibia. The main reason for the survival of colonialism and racism is the continuation of military, technological, economic, political, diplomatic and other forms of aid that is provided to the racist régimes. In this connexion, the Bulgarian Government fully shares the view expressed by the Council of Ministers of the OAU at its thirty-third ordinary session, held at Monrovia from 6 to 20 July 1979, in which it condemns

"all those countries which continue to have political, diplomatic, economic, trade, military, nuclear and other relations with South African and Rhodesian régimes in violation of the relevant UN and OAU resolutions . . ." [see A/34/552, annex I, CM/Res. 734 (XXXIII)].

The Bulgarian delegation also fully shares the views expressed at the Sixth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held from 3 to 7 September 1979 at Havana, which concluded that

"southern Africa is one of the focal points of tension in international relations and the centre of confrontation between the imperialist forces of aggression and the forces of liberation, progress and peace" [see A/34/542, annex, sect. I, para. 50].

215. The so-called Defence Act, recently promulgated by the Pretoria régime, under which it arrogates to itself the right to intervene in any African country south of the Equator, is part of that imperialist global strategy which constitutes a serious threat to the entire African continent and to world peace.

216. In that connexion, my Government feels that there is sufficient reason to be concerned over the further build-up and expansion, both in numbers and in weaponry, of South Africa's troops in Namibia. Any unbiased observer can easily realize that South Africa's presence in Namibia, military and otherwise, is targeted primarily against the freedom forces led by SWAPO, against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of neighbouring countries and above all against the People's Republic of Angola and the Republic of Zambia.

217. Of greatest concern, however, is the fact that despite South Africa's overt defiance of the international community, certain countries in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization [NATO] still maintain close relations with the racist régime and assist it in the promotion of its military-industrial complex. It is precisely with the help of those countries that South Africa was able to make its own nuclear weapons, a development which cannot but further worsen the relations with neighbouring African countries and increase the threat to peace and security in the world. South Africa also gets a major portion of such aid from foreign transnational corporations, which have rapaciously spread their tentacles into Namibia too. South African and foreign monopolies continue mercilessly to exploit the human and natural resources of the Territory, amassing profits in the millions, at the expense of the people of Namibia.

218. Security Council resolution 418 (1977) of 4 November 1977 clearly stated that "all States shall refrain from any co-operation with South Africa in the manufacture and development of nuclear weapons". Despite this clear-cut position of the Security Council, a number of Western Governments continue to extend their collaboration and assistance to South Africa, particularly in the nuclear field. Those are the facts that underlie the following conclusion reached by the United Nations Seminar on Nuclear Collaboration with South Africa, held in London on 24 and 25 February 1979:

"South Africa could never have reached its present nuclear capability without the substantial and comprehensive nuclear assistance it received from the major Western Powers."<sup>12</sup>

<sup>12</sup> See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-fourth Year, Supplement for January, February and March 1979*, document S/13157, para. 78.

219. South Africa's attempts to settle the Namibian issue by a so-called internal solution—by setting up a puppet régime as an alternative to SWAPO which is fighting for the national and social liberation of Namibia as one indivisible political entity—are doomed to failure. These attempts can only prolong the misery and suffering of the Namibian people but cannot arrest its march onward to national self-determination and independence.

220. The People's Republic of Bulgaria, which is a member of the United Nations Council for Namibia, maintains that any internal solution under South African prescription, along the Southern Rhodesian lines or akin to the identical plans of other States, ought to be rejected by the international community as an unacceptable and ill-concealed means of perpetuating the illegal occupation of Namibia.

221. In our view, objective possibilities exist for solving effectively and rapidly the problem of Namibia's liberation and creating in that country a Government of the black majority, headed by SWAPO. The strict implementation of the decisions and resolutions adopted by the Security Council and the General Assembly, as well as the decisions of the United Nations Council for Namibia, would pave the way for a resolution of that problem. The earliest possible termination by all States, without any exception, of all contacts with South Africa, especially economic and military collaboration, would contribute to putting an end to the illegal occupation. Independent and democratic Namibia will then take its place as a full-fledged Member of our Organization.

222. The Bulgarian delegation is firmly convinced that the day is not far off when we shall have the opportunity of welcoming in our midst the representatives of independent, democratic and prosperous Namibia. The positive impact of the national liberation struggle, the process of détente which creates conditions propitious for deepening and expanding that struggle, and the cohesion of international solidarity among all anti-imperialist and anti-colonialist forces are indeed the decisive factors which will make this expectation a reality.

223. Bulgaria's position of principle on the Namibian issue rests on the fact that we long ago took a position in favour of the immediate realization by the people of Namibia of its inalienable right to self-determination and independence, based on respect for the unity and territorial integrity of that country. We support the struggle of the people of Namibia, under the leadership of SWAPO, against the illegal occupation of that country by racist South Africa, and we stand firmly for the full transfer of power in Namibia to the Patriotic Front forces, led by SWAPO.

224. In the present situation, we consider that all the Member States of the United Nations are duty-bound not only to adhere, but also to give real-effect to the resolutions already adopted by the Security Council, the General Assembly and the United Nations Council for Namibia.

225. Mr. TLOU (Botswana): My delegation, like the rest of the international community, attaches the greatest importance to the question before us, that of

the total liberation of our neighbouring country, Namibia.

226. The long history of United Nations involvement in Namibia is too well known to merit any detailed retelling by me. Equally well known is South Africa's record of continued frustration of United Nations efforts to decolonize that international Territory, which it usurped and stubbornly refuses to leave despite the numerous United Nations resolutions demanding its withdrawal. Equally familiar is the valiant struggle of the Namibian people to free their country, led by their liberation movement, SWAPO, and their readiness to seek a negotiated settlement, as shown by the long, arduous history of negotiations culminating in the recent Geneva consultations. All this, together with the commendably comprehensive information given by the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, Ambassador Lusaka of Zambia [*91st meeting*], and by SWAPO's Secretary for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Peter Mueshahange [*ibid.*], about the tragic events currently taking place in Namibia, enables me to be brief, confining myself only to a few observations which relate mainly to the efforts aimed at finding a settlement.

227. For well over two years now—and I am talking here only about the period beginning with what has now come to be referred to as the initiative of five Western Members of our Organization—for well over two years, as I said, very tortuous, difficult negotiations have dragged on, aimed at decolonizing Namibia. And yet the greater part of those years cannot be said to have been spent on any visible, positive movement forward. Rather the international community, and I refer to the United Nations, spent those long months waiting for South Africa to make up its mind about whether or not it was prepared to join seriously in the search for a settlement. In a word, the whole international community was virtually held at ransom by South Africa.

228. Viewing the long history of the negotiations just referred to, one must ask: who is for peace in Namibia and who is not? Who, so far, has frustrated all the meritorious efforts towards a peaceful settlement? Who has engaged in delaying tactics and subterfuge? The answer to those questions is found in the attitude and behaviour of the parties concerned throughout the negotiations.

229. For its part, SWAPO has consistently demonstrated its statesmanship and flexibility in an attempt to achieve a settlement. It has accepted both the original proposal on Namibia and the Secretary-General's report of 26 February 1979<sup>13</sup> which detailed the steps for implementing the proposal. SWAPO did that despite serious provocations, including attacks against SWAPO refugee camps and general harassment of its supporters in Namibia by South Africa.

230. South Africa, on the other hand, was the party of procrastination, prevarication and evasiveness. Thus, it rejected the Secretary-General's report of 26 February 1979, which everybody else involved in the negotiations had accepted. Quite clearly, South Africa—and South Africa alone—was responsible for the stalemate in the negotiations. That is why this body is still wrestling with the Namibian problem today.

231. Whereas the other parties used the months of

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, document S/13120.

stalemate to search for a way forward in the face of South Africa's unjustified rejection of the Secretary-General's report, South Africa used that period further to entrench itself in Namibia, to suppress opponents in a bid to wipe out SWAPO in Namibia, to groom its Turnhalle elements, and to launch a series of *faits accomplis*, including the illegal elections and the setting up of the so-called National Assembly, which is being given more and more legislative power. That shows that South Africa has not abandoned the desire to launch an internal settlement. In addition, during that period South Africa unleashed dastardly attacks against Angola and Zambia, countries whose vital role in the search for peace in Namibia is highly commendable. We view all those acts with grave concern and condemn them, since they can only frustrate United Nations efforts.

232. The United Nations, for its part, must continue to reject any unilateral moves by South Africa designed to sidetrack its resolutions on Namibia. The only acceptable path towards a peaceful settlement of the Namibian problem is through free and fair elections under the control and supervision of the United Nations. Botswana will abide by the freely expressed wish of the Namibian people in any such elections.

233. It was in the face of all that that the Angolan Government, supported by the other front-line States, came forward with the demilitarized zone idea. That was a clear demonstration that the front-line States, and in particular Angola, were for their part prepared to go to great lengths to achieve a settlement in Namibia. As this Assembly knows, the front-line States and SWAPO accepted the demilitarized zone concept at Geneva some weeks ago. We did not procrastinate, because we are serious about a settlement.

234. Once again it was South Africa which kept the United Nations waiting until only a day or two ago, and even then it gave a conditional, ambiguous reply, which must be treated with great caution, bearing in mind our gloomy experience with that country's handling of these negotiations. Once again, in the context of Geneva, the front-line States and SWAPO have emerged as the party of flexibility and earnestness, and South Africa as the party of procrastination.

235. I want to reaffirm Botswana's readiness, together with the other front-line States, to assist to the best of its ability in the negotiations relating to the demilitarized zone, aimed at implementing Security Council resolution 435 (1978). In the areas of negotiations within Botswana's competence, we shall give our full co-operation. We stand ready to move beyond Geneva. We remain ready to assist the Secretary-General in his efforts. If South Africa this time wants peace, let it join the negotiations on the demilitarized zone and related matters in a constructive spirit, rather than join the talks once again to raise obstacles to peace.

236. However, we must express our grave concern at the interminable delays in the negotiations caused by that one party. We urge the United Nations to remain vigilant as these negotiations proceed, in order to ensure that a genuine solution is secured which will enable the Namibian people to exercise their right to self-determination. The United Nations should avoid being involved in endless delays caused by the whims of

South Africa. We must be seen to be moving forward towards our desired goal, that is, Namibian independence. The United Nations must retain the trust that the people of Namibia has always placed in it and inertia is not the best way to retain that trust.

237. The heroic people of Namibia deserve to enjoy the freedom that the rest of us here now take for granted. It is therefore our internationalist and moral duty, individually and collectively, fully to back their struggle until they gain their independence. Botswana will play its full part in this regard.

238. In conclusion, I want to pay a tribute to the Council for Namibia and its President, Ambassador Lusaka of Zambia, for continuing to be an effective guardian of the interests of the Namibian people. May I also commend the Secretary-General of the United Nations and Mr. Ahtisaari, the Commissioner for Namibia, for their untiring efforts in the search for a solution in Namibia. Finally, I reaffirm our support for the struggling people of Namibia, led by their heroic liberation movement, SWAPO.

*Mr. Tómasson (Iceland), Vice-President, took the Chair.*

239. Mr. WAPENYI (Uganda): Two days before we began the debate on the question of Namibia we heard a report that the Minister of Foreign Affairs of South Africa had accepted the concept of a demilitarized zone. But, going through the conditional acceptance given by the South African régime, one immediately notes that it is the usual tactical approach which that régime has used to frustrate our efforts in this Organization.

240. The delaying tactics, the timing tactics, coming at the last moment after Geneva cannot fool us because we know what they stand for. South Africa, unsure of itself, is playing for time and trying the patience not only of the Africans but also of the international community, which for some three years has endeavoured to corner it and make it reach a solution on the question of Namibia.

241. The delaying tactics are tied, as we are all aware, to the talks in Lancaster House in London related to Rhodesia-Zimbabwe. They are tied to how much the five Western Powers can achieve, and to the so-called Communist threat to Western investment and Western NATO and other interests, which sometimes do not take account of what Africa needs. What we have been saying, and what has been said by the Secretary-General, by his Special Representative, Mr. Ahtisaari, and by everybody who is engaged in this exercise, has been aimed at reasserting the mandate of the United Nations in a limited form, guiding the Territory and granting independence to the people of Namibia.

242. My delegation has studied very closely the reports of the Secretary-General, 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 on the question of Namibia. We have noted with satisfaction the efforts which are being undertaken by this Organization in an endeavour to achieve full implementation of General Assembly res-

olution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966, which was to terminate South Africa's Mandate over Namibia.

243. In the view of my delegation, South Africa's continued illegal occupation of Namibia and its perpetuation of bloodshed and tyranny against the people of the Territory have always been matters of great concern. This challenge to the letter and spirit of the Charter of the Organization continues to pose a threat to international peace and security. We believe, therefore, that the United Nations, which has a direct responsibility in the Namibia question, pursuant to the relevant General Assembly and Security Council resolutions, must reassert itself and take concrete measures which will bring about a speedy, just and lasting solution of the Namibian question.

244. By Security Council resolution 431 (1978), the United Nations endorsed the proposals of the contact group composed of the five Western members of the Security Council. By those proposals, among other things, a cease-fire was to be created, followed by free and fair elections in the entire territory of Namibia, under the supervision and control of the United Nations. SWAPO, the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people, accepted this peaceful programme. Nevertheless, South Africa, which had earlier indicated that it would co-operate in this United Nations objective and peaceful effort, later on, in its usual racist manner, acted to the contrary. The racist Pretoria régime, in complete defiance of Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978), unilaterally organized and held sham elections from 4 to 8 December 1978, with the intent to install in Namibia a puppet régime that would protect racist and *apartheid* interests in that Territory.

245. Uganda resolutely rejects such slanderous manoeuvres by the racist South African régime and considers those sham elections and their results as null and void and of no consequence whatsoever in the solution of the Namibian question. It is our firm belief that nullification of these sham arrangements by the United Nations, through Security Council resolution 439 (1978), is inadequate. We believe that this should have been followed by concrete measures which would have protected and ensured application of the United Nations decolonization programme for the Territory.

246. This Organization ought to take effective steps, therefore, to put an end to South Africa's continued intransigence and to bring about the realization of independence for the Namibian people, which is so long overdue. It is not news to us that South Africa is attempting to annex Walvis Bay, and yet historically and geographically, as we all know, Walvis Bay is an integral part of Namibian territory. This attempt, which is prompted by the strategic and economic importance of the subterritory to racist South Africa, has already been rejected by the international community through General Assembly resolution S-9/2 and Security Council resolution 432 (1978).

247. My delegation categorically rejects racist Pretoria's ambitious designs to annex Walvis Bay. We believe that South Africa's claims on Walvis Bay can serve only to prolong the liberation struggle in Namibia. Hence, we strongly urge South Africa immediately to renounce its claims over Walvis Bay so that this subterritory can be effectively integrated into Namibia. We

also strongly urge the United Nations, while formulating any programme for the independence of the Territory, always to consider Walvis Bay as part and parcel of Namibia.

248. My delegation is very concerned about the present economic situation in Namibia. This Assembly is already aware that the mining sector forms the largest portion of the gross domestic product and of the source of revenue in the Territory. Yet the resources derived from mining are expatriated by racist South Africa and transnational corporations which operate in Namibia.

249. This exploitation and plunder of the resources of the people of Namibia must be soundly rejected by the international community. It is the belief of my delegation that the exploitation of mineral and other resources in the Territory should be geared to establishing a sound economy and to creating a concrete infrastructure which Namibia can inherit when it attains independence.

250. In particular, the exploitation of uranium by South Africa, in collaboration with certain Western countries, continues to arouse the grave anxiety of my delegation, because we believe that this has enabled racist South Africa to develop and acquire nuclear capability. And that nuclear capability just acquired by South Africa, coupled with its military strength, constitutes a major factor in providing the basis for the continuation of the illegal occupation of Namibia by the racist Pretoria régime and seriously threatens peace and security in the entire region.

251. We have just been reminded here by Ambassador Yankov of Bulgaria that by its so-called new Defence Act South Africa arrogates to itself the power to intervene in any territory south of the equator. This made me wonder where my country would stand, since it lies half to the north and half to the south of the equator.

252. My delegation deplores the action of those countries which have enabled racist South Africa to acquire nuclear capability. We strongly believe that the United Nations must pronounce itself against South Africa and take effective measures to ensure that South Africa never employs nuclear weapons—for the sake of the peace and security of all the States in the region. We should like to urge countries with nuclear technical know-how to halt any measures that could further advance South Africa's nuclear technological programmes, and to withdraw all assistance which will encourage the production and use of nuclear weapons by the Pretoria régime.

253. We know that as well as developing its nuclear armament programmes, South Africa is continuing to strengthen its military presence in Namibia in terms of both men and material, in complete defiance of the relevant United Nations resolutions. It is reported that South African troops in Namibia, which number more than 60,000 men, situated in a network of military bases around the Territory, are equipped with sophisticated weapons including tanks, armoured cars and fighter bombers. In this situation, the independence process, instead of proceeding in accordance with the hopes and aspirations of the Namibian people, becomes more and more dislocated. This kind of situation must not be allowed to continue.

254. The United Nations, which has the sole responsibility for Namibia, must do everything in its power to oblige racist South Africa to withdraw its military build-up from Namibia, and must take effective enforcement measures under Chapter VII of the Charter.

255. Up until now, South Africa has been conducting indiscriminate and generalized wars of aggression against the front-line States with the barbarous and cowardly intention of intimidating them because of their support for the liberation struggle in southern Africa. The United Nations must not keep silent about this phenomenon, which is becoming more and more pronounced. The Organization must come out with a solution that can ensure the security and territorial integrity of all the front-line States.

256. I wish to reiterate that Uganda vigorously condemns racist South Africa for its recent armed aggression against Angola and Zambia and to express our solidarity with the front-line States in their efforts to eliminate colonialism, racism and *apartheid* in that part of our continent.

257. Members will recall that in the simultaneous consultations which took place recently at Geneva, initiatives taken by the Secretary-General included proposals that a demilitarized zone be created along the Namibian-Angolan and Namibian-Zambian borders, a development to which I have already alluded.

258. The proposal can be acceptable to my delegation only if it includes provisions for a complete withdrawal of South African troops from Namibia and guarantees security for the freedom fighters of SWAPO, as well as for Zambia and Angola. Otherwise, it is grossly unthinkable to disarm SWAPO freedom fighters while giving undue advantage to the racist South African forces of occupation.

259. In conclusion, I should like to reiterate that Uganda fully supports SWAPO, as the only authentic representative of the Namibian people, in its relentless and legitimate struggle to achieve the right of the exercise of self-determination, freedom and independence for the people of Namibia. I also wish to state here, once again, that the Namibian question is a United Nations problem to which this Organization must find an urgent solution. My delegation is looking forward to seeing representatives of independent Namibia appear soon among this family of nations.

260. Mr. KAMANDA wa KAMANDA (Zaire) (*interpretation from French*): From the outset, for the sake of clarity and in order to avoid confusion of any kind, it is appropriate to place the debate on Namibia at this thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly in its true legal and historical context.

261. The Mandate of South Africa over Namibia, previously known as South West Africa, expired on 27 October 1966 in accordance with the terms of General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI). Since that time, the Territory of Namibia has been the direct responsibility of the United Nations, which is responsible for ensuring the rapid achievement of the aspirations of the people of Namibia to freedom and independence, in accordance with the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

262. The United Nations Council for Namibia, established pursuant to General Assembly resolution 2248 (S-V) of 19 May 1967, is the legal authority administering Namibia on behalf of the United Nations until that Territory becomes independent.

263. Since 1966, the United Nations has done everything possible to assume in full the responsibilities incumbent upon it for the administration of the Territory of Namibia and has begun the process for the rapid attainment of the aspirations of the people of Namibia, including their preparation for the exercise of their right to self-determination, freedom and independence. The Council for Namibia has the task of facilitating and hastening the accession of Namibia to independence in order to meet the provisions of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

264. This being the case, South Africa's presence in Namibia—military, administrative, political and other—since it derives from a unilateral and arbitrary action, or in other words from South Africa's desire to oppose the entire international community, is improper and therefore unacceptable and constitutes a deliberate act of aggression in violation of the rules of international law. Hence South Africa is there as an aggressive occupying Power.

265. It is this persistent, continual aggression by South Africa which is handicapping the efforts of the international community, working through the United Nations and its Council for Namibia, to ensure accession of the Territory to independence.

266. We all have to realize that when we address ourselves to South Africa or to the Pretoria régime, and when we refer to its letters and respond to the positions it adopts on Namibia in this debate, we are not addressing ourselves to the Administering Authority of Namibia. We are addressing an aggressor State, an aggressor régime, which has imposed upon us its *de facto* presence in Namibia.

267. It is for reasons of political expediency and because we are confronted with a *fait accompli* that we have to discuss and negotiate with a régime, a Government, which is in Namibia illegally. Discussions and negotiations with South Africa on Namibia can thus have no effect whatever of recognition, legalization or legitimization of its presence and *de facto* authority in Namibia. For its part, South Africa should be able to realize that it is not as the Administering Power or the legal authority in Namibia that it addresses itself to the United Nations and to the international community, or has discussions with the Secretary-General of the United Nations or the five Western Powers.

268. For the delegation of Zaire this throws new light on the demands and claims of South Africa with regard to the negotiations on the accession of Namibia to independence, and on its reaction with regard to the demilitarized zone and the proposal for the settlement of the question of Namibia and the arrangements to be made for the deployment of UNTAG, within the framework of the application of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

269. The solution of the question of Namibia therefore depends, on one hand, on the withdrawal of all

South African troops, police forces and administration and, on the other hand, on the strengthening of the powers of the Council for Namibia and of the operational means available to it so as to permit the effective transfer of power to SWAPO, the sole authentic representative of the people of Namibia, and to guarantee the accession of the Territory to independence while maintaining its territorial integrity.

270. Walvis Bay is an integral part of Namibia and its annexation by South Africa is in flagrant violation of the provisions of paragraph 6 of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960, which stipulates that:

“Any attempt aimed at the partial or total disruption of the national unity and the territorial integrity of a country is incompatible with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations”

and of resolution 32/9 D of 4 November 1977, which reaffirms the indivisible nature and character of Namibia and considers Walvis Bay an integral part of Namibia.

271. The delegation of Zaire both thanks and congratulates the Secretary-General of the United Nations, 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 President and members of the United Nations Council for Namibia, as well as the Fourth Committee for the valuable reports, and the useful information and suggestions they have provided to help us make an objective evaluation of the problem.

272. The Republic of Zaire rejects the attempts at an internal settlement of the question of Namibia as well as the elections organized by the Pretoria régime in violation of the principles of the United Nations Charter, the rules of international law and the relevant resolutions of the United Nations which have so often been recalled.

273. Only elections organized by the lawful authority in Namibia, under United Nations supervision and with the full participation of SWAPO, will be recognized by the Republic of Zaire, because they would be conducive to a satisfactory solution of the problem.

274. We consider that the proposed settlement of the Namibian question set forth in Security Council resolution 435 (1978) could lead to a satisfactory solution of the problem if it were to be applied in good faith by all the interested parties, and above all by South Africa in regard to the return of the Namibian people to their homeland, the confinement of armed forces to their billets, the provisions relating to a cease-fire, the composition of the military force and agreement on the status of UNTAG.

275. The Republic of Zaire firmly condemns South Africa's dilatory manoeuvres intended to hold up—indeed to prevent—the implementation of resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) of the Security Council, while maintaining in its letters to the Secretary-General that it is ready to co-operate in the solution to this problem within the framework of the proposed settlement.

276. The Pretoria régime's reply, contained in its letter of 5 December 1979 on the subject of a demilitarized zone, is a patent example of these dilatory manoeuvres. It is hard for us to understand, as it is for many other delegations, how the Pretoria régime can set up as a condition a decision as to the number of South African bases which would remain in the demilitarized zone, since precisely what is not wanted is any military presence in that zone.

277. The disarming of SWAPO personnel upon the closing of the bases, as demanded by the Pretoria régime, together with its statement that there would be no question of SWAPO retaining bases within Namibia, also demanded by the Pretoria régime, are also dilatory manoeuvres totally unacceptable to the delegation of Zaire.

278. The Pretoria régime's insistence on obtaining confirmation that the settlement proposal to which South Africa agreed on 25 April 1978 remains unchanged, gives the impression that South Africa considers that this proposal, in so far as it does not refer to Walvis Bay, authorizes it to annex that part of the Territory of Namibia. This interpretation is absolutely groundless, since the relevant United Nations resolutions on the settlement proposal are supplemented by other resolutions, especially General Assembly resolutions 32/9 D and 1514 (XV), which affirm, on one hand, that Walvis Bay is an integral part of Namibia and, on the other, that any attempt aimed at the partial or total disruption of the national unity and the territorial integrity of a country is incompatible with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

279. In view of this situation, the United Nations must continue to seek all effective measures, including those provided for under Chapter VII of the Charter, against South Africa. At the same time, the international community must increasingly isolate the Pretoria régime in every sphere until it is ready to abide by the decisions and resolutions of the world Organization concerning Namibia.

280. It is appropriate to state here that South Africa would already have left Namibia had it not been assured of support from its powerful economic, commercial and military partners. The countries which co-operate with South Africa in Namibia are taking the risk that they will be increasingly judged to be in complicity with South Africa's forces of aggression and occupation in Namibia.

281. In our statement on the question of *apartheid* [56th meeting], we clearly pointed to the responsibility of certain developed countries which continue to give multifaceted co-operation to South Africa. It is this major support which enables the Pretoria régime to continue to defy the United Nations and the international community on the question of Namibia.

282. This question of Namibia is extremely important. The Republic of Zaire attaches great importance to the future of Namibia, because of the direct bearing that the situation in that part of Africa has on peace, security and stability in central Africa. Just as Zambia needs the true independence of Zimbabwe, Angola needs the true independence of Namibia and Zaire needs the stability and security of Angola and of its other neighbours, so Africa, in its inexorable move-



ment towards progress and development, needs peace and security in central Africa.

283. We therefore wish to issue a friendly warning about any errors of evaluation or judgement—in southern Africa in general and in Namibia in particular—which could be used against the will and determination of the States of our region to pursue and carry out a policy of independence in the face of blocs and to work for the progress and development of their peoples in friendship, understanding and co-operation with all the nations of the world.

284. The delegation of Zaire therefore invites those Powers and countries which, in view of the economic and strategic interests which they share with South Africa and Namibia, continue to flout the decisions taken by the United Nations, to apply the relevant provisions of General Assembly resolutions 2621 (XXV) and 32/35 of 12 October 1970 and 28 November 1977 respectively, concerning the legislative, administrative and other measures to be taken by Governments to put an end to the activities regarded as detrimental to the interests of the inhabitants of territories still under foreign domination.

285. The delegation of Zaire welcomes the efforts of the Secretary-General within his terms of reference, efforts aimed at leading Namibia to true and effective independence. We recognize SWAPO as the sole legitimate representative of the Namibian people. We shall support it, as we always have done, in its struggle for the liberation and total independence of Namibia. We invite all Member States to recognize SWAPO and to provide it with all necessary material and military assistance as well as all political and diplomatic support.

286. We welcome the decisions taken on this subject at the thirty-third ordinary session of the Council of Ministers of the OAU, held at Monrovia in July 1979, particularly the decision to convene the Council of Ministers of the OAU in an extraordinary session to devise a new strategy for the liberation of Namibia, should the Security Council fail and be unable to take effective coercive measures against the South African régime, and impose comprehensive, binding sanctions under the terms of Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter [see A/34/552, annex I, CM/Res. 720 (XXXIII)].

287. We also welcome the decisions on Namibia taken by the Sixth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Havana in September this year, and we declare that the rights of the Namibian people over its natural resources and its territory are inalienable. We call upon all Member States to support the United Nations decisions on the Territory of Namibia.

288. We also call upon all Member States and international organizations to reject any internal settlement in Namibia which is made without the participation of SWAPO, and not to recognize the illegal national assembly which South Africa has attempted to install in Windhoek.

289. Finally, it is by complying with the decisions of the United Nations and other international organizations on the question of Namibia that Member States

may contribute to the liberation of the Namibian people from South African domination and from *apartheid*.

290. Mr. HAGOS (Ethiopia): For over two decades the racist régime in Pretoria has been at loggerheads with the United Nations, the OAU, the non-aligned countries and indeed with all peoples that love freedom and peace throughout the world, over its inhuman policy of *apartheid* and its brutal oppression, exploitation and persistent violation of the fundamental rights of the black masses of South Africa. Indeed, through the illegal occupation of Namibia and through its disciples in Zimbabwe, Pretoria has deviously extended its oppressive apparatus to other territories as well. It has also ruthlessly pursued its heinous scheme of bantustanization, with a view to enslaving the African majority of the region and, to that end, has refined and strengthened its repressive machinery. In all those manoeuvres, the notorious Pretoria régime has enjoyed the continuous support of the major Western countries with which it has maintained strong economic, commercial, political and military ties.

291. Furthermore, the Pretoria régime has so far successfully evaded international economic sanctions, with the connivance of those Western countries whose economic stake in maintaining that infamous régime is rather high, to say the least. It would only be stating the obvious to say that those same Powers are directly responsible for the hawkish and arrogant attitude of South Africa and the inflation of its military posture.

292. In the wake of the demise of the Portuguese colonial empire in Africa, Pretoria increased the size of its occupation force in Namibia, while simultaneously engaging the international community in an apparent search for a peaceful path to Namibian independence. Throughout that period of unprecedented manoeuvres intended to hoodwink world public opinion, the Fascist régime has continued to consolidate its position, building a "seige economy" and developing a highly sophisticated armaments industry, and throughout that time the attitude of the Western Powers has been one of paying lip service to the idea of rejecting racial oppression in South Africa, while continuing to strengthen the criminal racist régime through investments and trade, as well as increased political and military collaboration.

293. It is therefore not an accident that well over 300 foreign companies of Western origin operate in Namibia, depleting that Territory of its mineral, petroleum, fishing and agricultural resources in violation of all United Nations decisions and of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia, enacted by the United Nations Council for Namibia.<sup>14</sup> It is an undisputed fact that Western monopolies are exploiting Namibian resources such as chrome, vanadium, platinum, diamonds, gold, uranium and so on, with the connivance of South Africa and to the detriment of the Namibian people. That Mirage III and F-1 military aircraft constitute the backbone of South Africa's air force or that the inhuman régime is armed with Gabriel surface-to-surface missiles and that these all come from the Western countries is also not an accident. We do not therefore consider Western collaboration with the Armaments Development and Production Corporation of South Africa, which was set up in 1968

<sup>14</sup> Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-ninth Session, Supplement No. 24A, para. 84. The Decree has been issued in final form in *Namibia Gazette No. 1*.

with a view to enabling South Africa to counteract a possible arms embargo, an act of solidarity with the people of Namibia and their authentic and legitimate representative, SWAPO.

294. As indicated in 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], neither *apartheid* South Africa and its offshoot, the so-called Constituent Assembly, nor its Western collaborators envisage a genuinely free and independent Namibia including Walvis Bay. Had they done so, the Special Committee, at its 1145th meeting, held at Belgrade on 27 April 1979, would not have found it necessary to condemn

“... South Africa for its military build-up in Namibia, its recruitment and training of Namibians for tribal armies, its illegal use of Namibian territory for acts of aggression against the independent African countries and the continued forcible removal of Namibians from the northern border of the Territory for military purposes.”<sup>15</sup>

295. Nor would African leaders, meeting recently at the thirty-third ordinary session of the Council of Ministers of the OAU, at Monrovia have declared

“... that in view of South Africa's refusal to cooperate in the search for a negotiated settlement the people of Namibia under the leadership of their National Liberation Movement SWAPO, have no alternative but to intensify their armed struggle against the oppressive and recalcitrant Pretoria régime” [see A/34/552, annex I, CM/Res. 720 (XXXIII)].

296. The unlawful arrest and torture of SWAPO freedom fighters, Pretoria's plan to create paratroop battalions to be manned by some Namibian renegades, its frequent and escalating armed attacks on the front-line States and its recent nuclear explosion prove, if proof is at all needed, that the South African racists are not at all willing to withdraw from their illegal occupation of Namibia, and clearly show the danger posed to international peace and security by the system of *apartheid*—a system based on absolute injustice and known to thrive on the blood and sweat of the African masses of the region. That state of affairs obviously does not provide us with much hope for a peaceful settlement of the Namibian question. The struggle should therefore be pursued with increased intensity until the people of Namibia, under the leadership of SWAPO, attain complete victory and fully exercise their inalienable right to self-determination and genuine independence.

297. Africa and all the peace-loving peoples of the world have already shown that they stand behind SWAPO in its struggle for independence and against the last vestiges of colonialism, racism and *apartheid* in southern Africa.

298. During their summit Conference July last at Monrovia, the African leaders called upon the Security Council to convene urgently to take enforcement measures against the régime in South Africa and to impose comprehensive and mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter. That call is not a

new one; it has been repeatedly echoed by previous summit conferences.

299. In that regard, it is worth noting that whenever the General Assembly is about to discuss the question of Namibia, Pretoria and its well-known collaborators reactivate the process of negotiation, thus invariably forestalling any consideration of enforcement action by the Security Council. We therefore cannot help viewing Pretoria's recent so-called acceptance of the concept of a demilitarized zone in that light and assuming it proceeds from similar motives. The Ethiopian delegation has very serious doubts as to whether the South African response, hedged as it is by so many conditions, is in any way a step forward in the negotiations.

300. It must be obvious by now that Pretoria is not negotiating in good faith. It is, as we have previously asserted, only using the period of negotiations to establish and further consolidate a neo-colonial set-up in Namibia, with the eventual declaration of sham independence by the puppets of Windhoek. It is therefore imperative that the United Nations should cease to play “the South Africa game”. Negotiations could continue as long as the majority of Member States feel that there is any chance for their success. But that should not preclude the Security Council from taking long overdue action under Chapter VII of the Charter against the Fascists of Pretoria.

301. In view of South Africa's record of deceit and treachery, its arrogance and belligerence, nothing short of effective enforcement measures, including the sanctions provided for under Chapter VII of the Charter, can lead to a solution of the Namibian question. Enough time has been wasted so far in trying to persuade South Africa through other means. Any further delay in taking the required enforcement measures would only serve to compound the problem and would lead to an inevitable racial holocaust in Africa, with dire consequences for international peace and security as well as for the credibility and viability of this world Organization.

302. International assistance to SWAPO in every field, including military aid and the simultaneous training of the Namibian people, should also be intensified.

303. The choice of the Western countries at the eleventh hour of Namibia's independence is either to sink their Governments and their multinationals further in the South African racist quagmire and pay the consequence dearly, or to be on the side of independent Africa and the rest of the peace-loving and freedom-loving peoples of the world, thus saving themselves from the ultimate verdict of history and humanity. Africa, as we have indicated time and again, will not allow itself to be an accomplice in the subjugation of the Namibian people, whatever this stand may cost.

304. The plight of the Namibian people has yet to be responded to. We can no longer claim to support SWAPO's cause and the legitimate aspirations of the people of Namibia by merely declaring good intentions, unanimously adopting impotent resolutions or indulging in delaying tactics. The problem at hand is profound and grave. Solving this ominous problem entails taking drastic measures commensurate with the politico-economic and military strength of the oppressive forces at play.

<sup>15</sup> See document A/AC.109/578, para. 24.

305. Mr. SEKYEI (Ghana): Near the turn of the century, the then head of the Settlement Commission for South West Africa wrote:

“The decision to colonize in South West Africa means nothing else than that the native tribes must withdraw from the lands on which they have pastured their cattle and so let the white man pasture his cattle on those self-same lands. If the moral right of this standpoint is in question, the answer is that for people of the cultural standard of South African natives, the loss of their free national barbarism and the development of a class of workers in the service of and dependent on the whites is primarily a law of existence in the highest degree. . . .”

Outmoded and shocking as it may sound, that passage still expresses pretty nearly the pernicious doctrine under which Namibia still labours today. What was then called a law of existence in the highest degree—the ejection of Namibians from their ancestral lands and their transformation into a pool of cheap and dependent labour—might still be recognized today, in a more modish guise, as the supreme law of *apartheid* economics. The Odendaal plan<sup>16</sup> for the bantustanization of the Territory is still pursued with that very aim in view. By the exploitation of labour thus cheapened, it becomes possible to pay the average white 18 times the emoluments of the average black, to attract the foreign investor with unusually low corporate taxes and with abnormally high profits—about two to three times the average return in the United States, according to some estimates—and to siphon off for the benefit of the Pretoria régime, its nationals and the foreign investor a good one third to one half of the gross domestic product of the Territory. We might note here, in addition, that the Territory also serves the Pretoria régime as a source of scarce base metals, as a captive market for its own grossly over-priced exports and as a very large reservoir of uranium. With that uranium the *apartheid* régime will increase its immunity to oil sanctions and make its nuclear bombs.

306. There is nothing in the entire record from which anyone could reasonably conclude that the *apartheid* régime and its joint beneficiaries would voluntarily give up the advantages and proceeds gained by exploiting Namibia. Far from ever wishing to give up anything, South Africa began with an obstinate attempt to annex the Mandated Territory in defiance of the International Court of Justice and the United Nations. When that failed, it proceeded to the further eviction of Namibians to the edges of the desert—under the Odendaal plan—and to the direct filching of those portions of the Territory which seemed richest in diamonds. The lineal successor to that rather transparent trick appears to be the more recent attempt to filch the fisheries to which Walvis Bay, *inter alia*, gives sole access. In utter defiance of the repeated pronouncements of the International Court of Justice and of the resolutions and decisions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, the *apartheid* régime has persistently sought to retain its grip on the Territory, expand its exploiting investments, deplete the Territory's resources in illegal collusion with external investors and entrench its position by massive militarization, repression within the Territory and aggression against its neighbours. So we

may discern that, as the alternative to giving up anything in the economic sphere, South Africa has pursued a policy and aim, first, of annexation and then of bantustanization, combined with variants of the annexation policy, and then of control by the installation and manipulation of puppets, directly or through rigged elections. We are now in the third and, if we could but act rightly, the last phase.

307. What, then, is the right action? We cannot expect with any semblance of reason that the *apartheid* régime will give up its ill-gotten gains without a struggle. It is really absurd to expect that it will now permit itself to be merely talked, cajoled or wheedled out of what it has been struggling or manoeuvring to retain for the last 30 years. It must be forced somehow to give it all up, and for that purpose effective sanctions are the only alternative to a protracted, destructive and dangerous war of liberation. Our persistent inability to proceed to truly effective measures under Chapter VII of the Charter has for some time now been one of the most disappointing and discouraging features of our approach to the Namibian problem. Those who are primarily responsible for blocking such measures generally present three sorts of arguments to justify their action. One is that the Namibian situation does not in itself constitute a threat to international peace and security; another is that, as long as the régime shows a willingness to negotiate, there is no threat to peace and the negotiating process must be allowed to take over and run its course before sanctions could be considered; a third such argument is that to apply sanctions now is to drive the sturdy Boer farmer into his impregnable laager from whose fastnesses he will refuse all further negotiation and choose instead to make a last-ditch stand of indefinite duration. Sanctions should, therefore, be used only as a means of last resort.

308. We find no argument stranger, in the present circumstances, than the contention that the Rhodesian situation 13 years ago was a threat to the peace but that the Namibian situation today is not. Those features which in 1966 made Rhodesia a threat to the peace in terms of Chapter VII of the Charter most certainly exist in Namibia today and in much larger measure. Racism on the full *apartheid* scale, the daily use of torture for effective internal repression, frequent acts of aggression against neighbouring countries, a massive military build-up within the Territory—were these commonplaces of present-day Namibia present in the Rhodesian situation in 1966 and 1968 when the Security Council determined that Rhodesia constituted at that time a threat to international peace and security?

309. Vorster's defiance of the United Nations, the legal successor of the League of Nations, was almost the exact parallel to Smith's defiance of Britain, the administering Power. But over and above that, the mere presence of the *apartheid* régime in Namibia contained an element of aggression lacking in Rhodesia, because it was the aggression of an alien Power against the Namibian people itself. Security Council resolution 269 (1969) stopped just short of calling it plain aggression. For that would certainly have called for measures under Chapter VII, and that surely was taboo where Namibia was concerned. But did the Security Council not plainly recognize the element of aggression when it decided in its resolution 269 (1969) that

<sup>16</sup> For a summary of the recommendations of the Commission of Enquiry into South West African affairs (the Odendaal Commission), see *Official Records of the General Assembly, Nineteenth Session, Annexes*, annex No. 8 (part I) (A/5800/Rev. I), chap. IV, paras. 18-65.

“the continued occupation of the Territory of Namibia. . . constitutes an aggressive encroach-

ment on the authority of the United Nations, a violation of the territorial integrity and a denial of the political sovereignty of the people of Namibia”?

310. That element of aggression then lacking in the Rhodesian situation is certainly present in the Namibian situation, in addition to all those other characteristics by which the latter parallels or surpasses the former. The threat from Ian Smith was a threat from a mere surrogate. The military machine of the *apartheid* régime, that almost nuclear machine which occupies Namibia and menaces its neighbours, is the original, the principal, of which the Rhodesian forces are the mere derivative and subsidiary. By decision of the Security Council, the subsidiary was a threat in 1968—but the principal is not in 1979?

311. It would indeed be helpful if the Security Council could extricate itself from that extraordinary position, which is merely the result of maintaining stoutly, against all the evidence, that the Namibian situation is not, in itself, a threat to international peace and security despite the fact that it is manifestly more serious than the Rhodesian situation ever was, despite the resulting destabilization of the entire region and despite the obviously escalating danger of super-Power involvement and confrontation in that area.

312. Often, again, the plea is offered that the situation is not really dangerous as long as the Pretoria régime shows itself willing to talk and negotiate—and this plea has lately become the stock argument which accompanies the veto of effective measures under Chapter VII, as often as such measures have been threatened, or have seemed to be threatened, against the *apartheid* régime. But this stock argument suits very neatly the stock manoeuvre of the *apartheid* régime. Every time it was used, the United Nations played very nicely into the hands of Vorster; and if it continues to be used, the Organization will continue to play just as nicely into the hands of Botha. Ever since its confrontation with the United Nations over Namibia began, the Pretoria régime has been developing and perfecting the technique of defusing international pressures whenever they reach the point of forcing effective measures against it. The régime does so by making a feint; by mouthing half-promises of compliance; by going through the motions of negotiation and putting up the pretence of dialogue. It is all a time-buying stunt. Once the pressures are thus deflated, the régime reverts to the policy of defiance and trickery until such time as the cycle again reaches the point when another feint must be made—and so on, endlessly.

313. Just to illustrate this, let us take a look at the record. In June 1971, in its advisory opinion, the International Court of Justice declared that the presence of South Africa in Namibia was illegal and should be terminated forthwith. Having accepted that opinion, the Security Council in its resolution 309 (1972), initiated on 4 February 1972, contacts with all parties concerned, aimed at self-determination and independence for the Namibian people. South Africa reacted with 13 months of defiance, until March 1973, when the Security Council met to consider the Secretary-General's report. Then came the first dodge. South Africa undertook to respect the wishes of the whole population in any future constitutional set-up, to refrain from delaying the act of self-determination, to cooperate with the Secretary-General, to consult with the

inhabitants with a view to agreeing on self-determination measures and to assure all political parties full and free participation in the process leading to self-determination. The Security Council accepted the pledge and stayed its hand. That was the end of the first cycle.

314. But this was immediately followed by a defiant process of bantustanization, which lasted from March 1973 to May 1975. That was the period when the Ovambo homeland was established by intimidation and force, when SWAPO and other parties opposed to that policy were proscribed and their leaders persecuted and imprisoned.

315. Again, international pressures built up. The Security Council discontinued its contacts with South Africa over Namibia. The General Assembly appointed a Commissioner for Namibia and recognized SWAPO as the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people. Later, it excluded South Africa from participation in its debates and pressed for the outright expulsion of that régime from the United Nations. South Africa was then saved by the triple veto.

316. But the Security Council then adopted its resolution 366 (1974), the immediate fore-runner of resolution 385 (1976). Resolution 366 (1974) warned in effect that unless South Africa made a solemn declaration of intent to comply with the resolutions of the United Nations and the opinions of the International Court of Justice, unless it repealed its discriminatory and repressive legislation and unless it took steps to withdraw its illegal administration and hand over power to the people of Namibia with United Nations assistance, the Security Council would consider appropriate measures in six months' time.

317. The Pretoria régime then made its second feint. Towards the end of the six-month period, it came forward again with professions of compliance and co-operation of a kind regarded by the entire Security Council as unsatisfactory and equivocal. But Mr. Mulder had professed himself ready to talk further with the Secretary-General. So up went the three negative pencils again, effective measures were again vetoed, and the Security Council was once again paralysed. There ended the second cycle.

318. The next cycle brought in what we might call the Turnhalle I period. In addition to the Turnhalle constitutional trick itself, there was still further and more objectionable bantustanization aimed at entrenching land *apartheid*; there was intensified repression of SWAPO and other opposition parties; and there was the military build-up in the Territory leading to aggression against Angola. Then came resolution 385 (1976), of January 1976, repeating the demands made by its precursor, resolution 366 (1974) of December 1974, calling for elections under United Nations supervision and control and warning, for the second time, that in the event of non-compliance the Security Council would consider appropriate measures in six months' time.

319. After the expiry of that six-month period, those who wielded the triple veto were able again to point to another dialogue, this time between Messrs. Vorster and Kissinger, and on that ground they were able again to veto the effective measures envisaged under resolution 385 (1976). Thus ended the third cycle, in October

1976. The *apartheid* régime was then left to press on with its Turnhalle scheme, on which the Kissinger-Vorster dialogues seem to have had little effect. The régime pressed on. In the following year, 1977, a Turnhalle constitution was produced, firmly based on *apartheid* and the homelands policy, granting a virtual veto to the white minority, making no reference to free elections or to referendums except where the whites were concerned—and the whites overwhelmingly endorsed the scheme.

320. Again international pressures were already building up. The five Western members of the Security Council undertook the attempt to prevail on Pretoria by persuasion to abandon the Turnhalle trick and to fall within the terms of resolution 385 (1976). The world conferences at Maputo<sup>17</sup> and Lagos,<sup>18</sup> and the mandatory arms embargo imposed later, all added to the pressure, and more was to be expected from the forthcoming special session of the General Assembly. In response to those pressures the *apartheid* régime made its fourth dodge, this time of a more complicated kind. It shelved Turnhalle I—that is, the Turnhalle trick in its original form—and it shifted its aim to a form of elections that would evade United Nations control and whose outcome could be safely determined by the influence of its illegal administration, its armed forces and its armed police. And then, on the eve of the ninth special session, devoted to Namibia, the Pretoria régime made the feint—the fourth in the series—of apparently accepting the Western proposals, but with certain reservations that were made to look as innocuous as possible. For the fourth time, the tension had been defused. SWAPO eventually agreed to a cease-fire, and the fifth cycle immediately began.

321. We are now in the fifth cycle. The *apartheid* régime is again recalcitrant. It has insisted on elections outside United Nations control to elect a body which has the option, the means and the motive to proceed to a unilateral declaration of independence and thus to create an additional threat to international peace and security, over and above the threat already inherent in the Namibian situation. Without United Nations supervision and control and without the participation of SWAPO, that election merely produced a body of marionettes controlled by the Pretoria régime. Nor has that régime discontinued its policy of direct or indirect aggression against its neighbours, particularly Angola and Zambia. It continues its policies of internal oppression aimed, *inter alia*, at weakening and decimating SWAPO. Again international pressures have been building up, but at a slow and, on the whole, unsatisfactory rate.

322. Last year the Security Council delivered another of its warnings to South Africa to cancel the internal elections and comply with resolution 435 (1978) or else within two weeks face the possibility of measures under Chapter VII of the Charter. That warning was contained in resolution 439 (1978), which was adopted with five abstentions, and it has led to no significant action.

323. This year, at the resumed thirty-third session, the General Assembly, again called—again without results—for measures under Chapter VII. We are now

<sup>17</sup> International Conference in Support of the Peoples of Zimbabwe and Namibia, held at Maputo from 16 to 21 May 1977.

<sup>18</sup> World Conference for Action against *Apartheid*, held at Lagos from 22 to 26 August 1977.

entitled to ask whether there is to be a sixth or a seventh cycle, and, if so, when it will all end. Is it to be after a unilateral declaration of independence is in full swing in Namibia, or after the *apartheid* régime acquires nuclear energy and weapons capability and therefore becomes far more immune to all sanctions?

324. To sum up, the case of Namibia is one of those cases in which the international community, through the United Nations, in succession to the League of Nations, has assumed a sacred trust whose fulfilment has been successfully frustrated for years. It has been successfully frustrated partly because Namibia is required as one of the defensive buffers of the *apartheid* system, and partly because those who, along with the *apartheid* régime, have invested so profitably in the denudation of Namibia's resources, or who expect strategic advantages from access to its uranium, refuse to relinquish their hold completely for fear of losing the profit and the advantage.

325. It has been determined by the International Court of Justice, by the General Assembly and by the Security Council that South Africa is under an obligation to withdraw its illegal administration from Namibia, and both the Assembly and the Security Council have several times called upon the *apartheid* régime to do so by stated deadlines or else face the possibility of drastic measures, including action under Chapter VII of the Charter. The stock response of the *apartheid* régime to those pressures has been to put on the pretence, and go through the motions, of negotiation whenever the threat of effective measures seemed imminent, and then to revert to its old intransigence as soon as the pressures upon it were thus defused and the proposed sanctions against it were vetoed.

326. The present phase of our dealings over Namibia coincides with the fifth or sixth manoeuvre of this kind which the *apartheid* régime has so far been allowed to get away with. Are we to wait patiently for the seventh, eighth or ninth cycle, while South Africa, with external assistance that is in fact exclusively Western, builds up its economy and its arsenals, banks up its supplies of strategic fuel and develops its nuclear capability to the point where it need no longer bother to negotiate over Namibia? Surely all of us in the United Nations should now sense, and wake up to, the time-limit under which we must now act.

327. The warning in 1976 of effective measures against South Africa, if it failed to withdraw from Namibia in compliance with the appropriate resolution, has still not been carried out. It was made possible to yet again defer or veto the necessary action when, instead of enforcing the resolution, the five Western Powers chose rather to initiate a further round of talks in the hope of persuading South Africa to comply, and perhaps save them a difficult decision in the Security Council. Those talks have certainly proved the most useful so far, the most productive of feasible propositions and near results, but we think they have by now served an even more useful purpose since they show up clearly, if further demonstration were needed, the subterfuge and prevarication of the *apartheid* régime, its pretence at negotiation even when presented with the most serious attempts at compromise and solution, its standing resolve to proceed instead with neo-colonialist solutions of its own choice and preference, its determination to have and to keep at the very least a buffer

State and a puppet régime in Namibia, if not in Zimbabwe as well.

328. Action under Security Council resolution 385 (1976) was delayed as a result of the Western initiative, but that initiative after 18 months yielded no better result than the fifth *apartheid* manoeuvre and the internal settlement in Namibia, the Turnhalle II. Let us, then, proceed to the action that has been long delayed. As sadder but wiser men, let us learn our lesson that to keep on substituting talks with *apartheid* for pressures against *apartheid* and for action against *apartheid* is merely to play the game in the way that *apartheid* wants it to be played, to sell it the time it needs to buy, and time is running out on us. We therefore reiterate the call made at the resumed thirty-third session for a wider range of measures now against South Africa, including economic sanctions under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter.

329. Mr. LOBO (Mozambique): My delegation wishes the President, Ambassador Salim, all the best in fulfilling the tasks that the international community has entrusted to him. We are confident that his experience and wisdom will guide the work of the Assembly and bring us complete success.

330. We find ourselves once again seized of an issue which has for years been a matter of deep concern to all of us. For many years the United Nations has made all possible peaceful efforts, as it has done with other colonial issues, to ease the process leading to self-determination and national independence for the people of Namibia.

331. After many years of resistance to foreign occupation, the people of Namibia, having become aware of the value of their unity and of their important role not only in southern Africa but in the world, and once their peaceful attempts had been frustrated, decided to take up arms to destroy colonialism, which is the most cruel and flagrant negation of human rights. Colonialism survives on the basis of the violation of those rights, of massacres, of arbitrary imprisonments and other forms of oppression, in order to maintain domination over peoples and thus to perpetuate the exploitation of man by man in all fields.

332. The people of Namibia have suffered the scourge of colonialism for over a century. Their population has been decimated by a brutal South African colonial oppressor. The people of Namibia have been deprived of fundamental rights and they have been subjected to all kinds of degradation and colonial humiliation. Moreover, that immense suffering has been aggravated by the inhuman policies of *apartheid* and bantustanization.

333. The co-ordinated struggle against racist oppression of the peoples of Namibia, Zimbabwe and South Africa, supported by peace-loving forces, marks a phase in the history of southern Africa which is dedicated to the elimination of the minority and racist régimes still existing in our zone. The People's Republic of Mozambique considers the struggle of the people of Namibia under the leadership of SWAPO as part of the struggle for freedom of oppressed peoples in the world, and for that reason we shall always lend it our genuine solidarity and total support.

334. In spite of all frustration and repression, the Namibian patriots have never vacillated in their heroic struggle for the attainment of their inalienable rights to self-determination and national independence.

335. In 1966, the General Assembly by its resolution 2145 (XXI) terminated the Mandate exercised by South Africa over Namibia and established direct United Nations responsibility for Namibia until the achievement of independence.

336. However, in spite of unanimous international denunciation and condemnation, South Africa did not give up. On the contrary, in order to reinforce its domination over the Territory, South Africa has increased massively its military presence in Namibia, transforming that international Territory into a dangerous armed camp where it represses the Namibian people and from which it launches acts of aggression against Angola and Zambia.

337. The militarization of Namibia is accompanied by an unprecedented increase in the exploitation of natural resources of the Territory. South Africa, together with transnational corporations with headquarters and capitals in Western Europe and North America, is involved in an economic conspiracy to plunder systematically and drain the riches of Namibia, in complete disregard of the Namibian people.

338. Moreover, confronted with the increasing awareness of and protests by Namibian patriots, the abhorrent and illegal South African administration is enacting ever more repressive legislation. Waves of arrests of peaceful men, women and children, followed by indescribable torture, mutilation and death are a daily scene in today's Namibia.

339. We in Mozambique have refused to accept the idea that the use of force and negotiations are incompatible or contradictory within the process of national liberation. We do not like war, but we do believe that when contradictions and antagonism are inseparable, as in this concrete case, then only war can bring peace and justice. That is why we find ourselves completely on the side of the SWAPO freedom fighters in their armed struggle for self-determination and national independence.

340. According to the proposal of the five Western States, which was endorsed by the United Nations along with the programme for its implementation, the independence of Namibia should have taken place last year. However, South Africa has been allowed to act in flagrant defiance of the international community by preventing the accession of Namibia to genuine independence.

341. In order to facilitate the implementation of the proposal of the five Western States on Namibia, endorsed by the General Assembly and the Security Council, the front-line States and SWAPO accepted the concept of the demilitarized zone and the broad outline proposed by the Secretary-General regarding its implementation. South Africa, which is illegally occupying the Territory, refused to react immediately to the proposals made at the Geneva consultation meetings. After a long period of waiting and anxiety, the South African Minister of Foreign Affairs, R. F. Botha, came out on 5

December with a response which did not surprise anybody. Arrogance, ambiguity and pre-conditions are the answers which the international community has received from South Africa. South Africa accepts the concept of a demilitarized zone only if and when agreement is reached on six well-known points.

342. The rationale behind all those pre-conditions is very clear and does not require any comment from my delegation. Those pre-conditions represent another insult to the efforts made in this matter by the international community, the Secretary-General, SWAPO and African countries.

343. It is now the international community's duty to denounce and condemn the delaying manoeuvres of South Africa which are intended to create obstacles to the process of the liberation of the people of Namibia. The United Nations must take concrete measures against South Africa to ensure that the plan adopted by the Security Council will be implemented. We must intensify our support to and solidarity with SWAPO, which fights for a free, united and indivisible Namibia, including Walvis Bay.

344. In the face of this situation, my delegation considers that any decision taken with a view to solving the problem of Namibia will be valid only if it respects the will of the fighters, who are the legitimate representatives of the people of that Territory.

345. The United Nations machinery has contributed to bringing about profound changes in the perceptions and values of the international community. It is now necessary to supplement those positive changes by decisive actions against the most abominable political disease of contemporary civilization, that is, the colonialist, racist *apartheid* régime of South Africa.

346. *Apartheid* is hunger and misery; *apartheid* is disease and ignorance; *apartheid* is the deprivation of culture, and unemployment. In other words, *apartheid* is the complete denial of the human being.

347. Opposed by the South African people, denounced and rejected by the international community, the *apartheid* régime tries to introduce cosmetic changes which do not modify in substance the structure of domination and discrimination. It is in this context that we witness the pseudo-liberalization of the régime in certain social domains. It is also in the same context that the policy of bantustanization was introduced. Through bantustans the South African régime tries to create buffer states in order to protect the racist citadel. Through bantustans it can have at its disposal a permanent reserve of cheap labour which ensures the continuity of the system of exploitation. Through bantustans the people who constitute the South African nation are divided.

348. The failure of attempts at peaceful negotiation of the question of Namibia is clearly related to South Africa's over-all hegemonistic aims in southern Africa. Through its acts of aggression South Africa has attempted to destabilize neighbouring countries and weaken and destroy SWAPO. Any support for the minority régimes of South Africa and Southern Rhodesia will only encourage them in their acts of aggression against Botswana, Zambia, Mozambique and Angola. South

Africa intends to establish a neo-colonial and racist sphere of influence in southern Africa. Thus it is important that the United Nations review the situation in southern Africa in the light of South Africa's concerted attempts at imposing its domination in the region.

349. My delegation is very much convinced that the struggle of the people of Zimbabwe and of South Africa itself is inseparable from the struggle being waged in Namibia under the leadership of SWAPO. It has the same objective—total liberation from oppression—so it deserves the total support of our Organization.

350. Until the day on which Namibia becomes an independent nation, free from South African colonial oppression, our theme must be "*A luta continua*".

351. Mr. PFIRTER (Argentina) (*interpretation from Spanish*): There is no need to remind representatives that both the General Assembly and the Security Council, as well as other organs of the United Nations system, have repeatedly dealt with the question of Namibia. That is clear proof of the importance and gravity of the problem, and is fully justified because of the continued illegal occupation of Namibia, the anachronistic and discriminatory features of the administration of that Territory by South Africa and the persistent, yet frustrated call of the Namibian people for the right to exercise their inalienable right to self-determination and independence in a united Namibia.

352. The Argentine position on this subject has been repeatedly set forth and today we wish to reaffirm its basic points. For the Argentine Government: first, since the adoption of resolution 2145 (XXI), Namibia and its inhabitants have been the direct responsibility of the United Nations; secondly, South Africa's occupation and administration of Namibia is illegal and, therefore, it should withdraw totally from that Territory; thirdly, the Namibian people has the inalienable right to self-determination, freedom and national independence, in accordance with the United Nations Charter, General Assembly resolutions 1514 (XV) and 2145 (XXI) and other resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council on this subject. The international community should lend its co-operation to the people of Namibia in its struggle for the exercise of this right; fourthly, as is laid down in paragraph 7 of Security Council resolution 385 (1976), for the people of Namibia to be able freely to determine its future, it is imperative that free elections, under the supervision and control of the United Nations, be held for the whole of Namibia as one political entity; fifthly, the United Nations Council for Namibia, established by General Assembly resolution 2248 (S-V), is the legal Administering Authority of Namibia until it attains independence; sixthly, the territorial integrity of Namibia, the unity and national identity of its people and its right fully and freely to dispose of the natural resources of the Territory should be respected; seventhly, any negotiated settlement designed to solve the problem of Namibia should be brought about within the framework of United Nations resolutions and enjoy the participation of all the parties, including SWAPO, which is recognized by the majority of States as the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people; eighthly, the situation prevailing in Namibia as a consequence of the continued illegal occupation of the Territory and the measures adopted to prolong that illegal occupation are jeopardizing international peace and se-

curity in the region of southern Africa. In view of this, it would be appropriate for the Security Council to continue to deal with the problem and adopt appropriate measures to ensure compliance with United Nations decisions on this subject.

353. If the illegal occupation of Namibia has been difficult to explain in the past in terms of the law and morality, it is still less easy to explain today when the recent independence of the former Portuguese colonies in Africa and the prospects of the forthcoming independence of Southern Rhodesia prove the existence of an irreversible political process within which there is no room for colonialism or racial discrimination. This fact is, in our view, fundamental.

354. Indeed, it seems obvious to us that at this rather late stage it is no longer a matter of South Africa recognizing the obvious ethical and legal shortcomings of its position, but rather a matter of Pretoria's admitting that there is no longer any room for juridical and political schemes such as its own, which are incompatible with the course of history, and that it should consequently make the necessary change of course.

355. Time, which once appeared to be on the side of Pretoria, now seems to be on the side of those forces which oppose the political and social system that is defended by South Africa. Therefore, if not out of conviction, at least from a sense of timeliness, South Africa should substantially modify its approach.

356. That having been said, it should be recognized in good faith that, perhaps for the motives we have just mentioned, the development of the question of Namibia has seen some progress. For the time being, South Africa has agreed to negotiate on the decolonization of Namibia, thus making possible a process which will perhaps bring about the satisfactory and definitive solution of this problem. It is true that certain unilateral delaying measures adopted by Pretoria are not compatible with the spirit of co-operation necessary to achieve a satisfactory settlement.

357. For example, even though Pretoria claims to be seriously engaged in the negotiations initiated on the basis of the proposal of the five Western Powers and Security Council resolution 435 (1978), it continues its armed aggression against neighbouring countries. At the same time South Africa says it accepts the idea of the demilitarized zone initially proposed by the late President Agostinho Neto, but its acceptance of this idea is accompanied by a series of conditions which could lead to a total distortion of this concept.

358. The fact is that, despite the numerous obstacles, the negotiating process is under way.

359. Argentina, which has persistently urged the parties to make maximum efforts to seek a peaceful and generally agreed solution to the problem of Namibia, today wishes to repeat this appeal. Our hopes in this respect have been encouraged by the success which has apparently attended the negotiations on Southern Rhodesia, a question which is intimately connected with the rest of the conflicts in southern Africa.

360. We anticipate that the forthcoming decolonization of Southern Rhodesia will necessarily have a posi-

tive influence on the future of the question of Namibia. At least it shows that negotiation constitutes a suitable method of reaching a satisfactory solution of remaining colonial questions.

361. On the other hand, it confirms the irreversibility of the process of decolonization and also the fact that this political phenomenon is not necessarily incompatible with the safeguarding of certain rights and with respect for the results of the efforts that have been made.

362. It remains only to express the wish that this historical lesson will be properly assimilated and used by the South African leaders, whose intransigence may eventually become the worst enemy of the very interests that South Africa would like to protect.

363. In conclusion, we wish to express gratitude to the Secretary-General and the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia for their tireless and significant efforts aimed at achieving a peaceful and acceptable solution to this serious problem.

364. Mr. VARELA QUIRÓS (Costa Rica) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Since the General Assembly adopted resolution 2145 (XXI), the question of Namibia has been constantly before the United Nations.

365. My delegation has given thorough and careful study to the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia [A/34/24], which is the legal Administering Authority for Namibia, in accordance with resolution 2248 (S-V) of the General Assembly. That report gives us cause for serious concern because, despite all the efforts made by our Organization, and despite the effective endeavours of the Council, there is no sign of early freedom for the Territory and the people of Namibia.

366. My delegation congratulates the members of the Council, in particular its Chairman, Mr. Lusaka, of Zambia, on their work on behalf of the independence of Namibia.

367. South Africa persists in its illegal occupation of Namibia. It continues to have recourse to machinations of all kinds in order to delay settlement of the dispute and continues to ignore the resolutions of both the Security Council and the General Assembly. Thus, South Africa resists the general will of the international community and endangers world peace and security.

368. This flouting of basic human rights, the discrimination imposed by South Africa to the detriment of the people of Namibia, the application of time-wasting tactics in order to delay the attainment of independence by the Territory, the fragmentation of the Territory into bantustans and the illegal annexation of parts of the Territory of Namibia are clear and unambiguous signs of South Africa's disregard of this Organization and of the Pretoria régime's scant respect for our decisions.

369. My delegation rejects any attempt to arrive at an internal settlement which would ignore the rights of the people of Namibia, and considers that such subterfuges can lead only to a worsening of the present crisis and to measures designed to delay the attainment of the final goal, which is the complete and absolute decolonization of Namibia. We condemn the constant violations by



South Africa of the territory of neighbouring States, particularly Angola and Zambia, and deplore the death and destruction caused by such acts of aggression.

370. If South Africa continues to disregard the advisory opinion handed down by the International Court of Justice and persists in arrogantly ignoring the decisions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, the only solution will be to impose the implementation of those decisions upon South Africa. Therefore we shall support any measures which the United Nations is ready to adopt and put into effect against the racist régime in South Africa, in particular the enforcement measures provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter. If in the history of our Organization any country has deserved the imposition of such sanctions, it is South Africa.

371. The situation in Namibia calls for rapid and radical solutions, otherwise the shameless exploitation of the natural resources of that country by South Africa and the racist measures applied against the population of that Territory will lead to a situation such that, when liberation finally comes, the resources will be virtually exhausted and the population made destitute. This is not a proper fate for a country which has so valiantly fought for its independence, nor a situation to be tolerated by our Organization for a Territory that is legitimately under its administration.

372. Mr. SASSI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*interpretation from Arabic*): It is well known to all that, not long ago, the General Assembly adopted a great many resolutions concerning the policy of *apartheid* practised by the South African racist régime. The international community agreed that the *apartheid* policy practised by South Africa is unacceptable and it affirmed also that the system of *apartheid* is regarded as the most odious system of Government in the world today.

373. Now, here we are again, discussing an even worse practice carried out by that same régime against the people of Namibia and its national liberation movement. The situation in Namibia is deteriorating all the time, mainly because of the obstinacy of the racist minority régime of Pretoria, its dilatory manoeuvres and all its terrorist campaigns throughout the whole of Namibia. Moreover, that régime has turned the Territory into an arsenal to be used as a base for attacks on neighbouring States, particularly Angola which last month was the victim of a barbarous and treacherous attack by the racist forces of Pretoria. That attack led to loss of life among disarmed civilians and to the destruction of vital buildings and services in that country. In resolution 454 (1979), the Security Council condemned South Africa's barbarous aggression against Angola, regarding it as a flagrant violation of the sovereignty and the territorial integrity of a Member State of the United Nations.

374. Of course, the aim underlying all these acts of aggression is to ensure that the proposed settlement plan—which was endorsed in Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978) and which is being put into effect in the region—should fail.

375. Thirteen years have elapsed since the adoption of the General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) which put an end to South Africa's Mandate over the Territory of

Namibia and placed the Territory under the direct responsibility of the United Nations. Since that time, South Africa's presence in Namibia is considered to be illegal, against all the rules of international law and also in flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter and of about 30 resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly.

376. South Africa's continued disregard for the resolutions of the United Nations, and its continued presence in Namibia are a cause of concern to us all, because its refusal to withdraw from Namibia and its continued exploitation and exhaustion of the natural and human resources of the Territory constitute a challenge to General Assembly resolution 1803 (XVII), which affirmed the right of peoples to exercise sovereignty over the natural wealth and resources in their territory in the interest of their national development and of their well-being.

377. They are also a challenge to Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia, since that Council has stipulated that

“No person or entity, whether a body corporate or unincorporated, may search for, prospect for, explore for, take, extract, mine, process, refine, use, sell, export, or distribute any natural resource, whether animal or mineral, situated or found to be situated within the territorial limits of Namibia without the consent and permission of the United Nations Council for Namibia. . . .”<sup>19</sup>

378. The General Assembly has adopted several resolutions reaffirming the rights of the Namibian people to independence and freedom. The latest was General Assembly resolution 33/206 of 31 May 1979, which reaffirmed that direct responsibility for Namibia lay with the United Nations, expressed once again the will of this Organization to carry through its task and appealed to Member States to support the United Nations Council for Namibia as the legal Administering Authority for Namibia until that Territory attained independence. That resolution strongly condemned the racist régime of South Africa for arrogant and provocative acts in imposing upon the people of Namibia a so-called internal settlement and for establishing a fraudulent and illegal national assembly which was designed mainly to obtain international recognition for South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia and its racist exploitation of the Territory. That resolution called upon the Security Council to convene to take enforcement measures against South Africa, as provided in Chapter VII of the Charter, and to oblige South Africa to comply with the decisions and resolutions of the United Nations on Namibia.

379. This Assembly and the Security Council, together with the International Court of Justice and the entire international community, have repeatedly condemned the Pretoria clique for its crimes and acts of repression against the people of Namibia. The international community, led by the General Assembly, has since 1966 called for the unconditional and immediate withdrawal from Namibia of the Pretoria racists. The South African régime, as was made clear in the documents prepared by the United Nations, has stood firm in its obstinacy since the end of its Mandate over

<sup>19</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-ninth Session, Supplement No. 24A*, para. 84.

Namibia and challenged the decisions of the United Nations when proposals were submitted by the five Western Powers in an attempt to find a peaceful settlement to the question of Namibia. These proposals stipulated a cease-fire in the Territory and also provided for the phased withdrawal of all South African troops with the exception of 1,500 soldiers who were to be confined to the bases of Grootfontein and Oshivelo until the final withdrawal. There were also provisions concerning the return of Namibians who were outside the Territory, including the representatives of SWAPO, so that they could freely take part in political activities. We all remember that this plan came before the ninth special session of the General Assembly; but it was bound to fail, as my delegation, among others, said, for the following reasons: first, the aim of the plan was to try to influence the status of SWAPO in order to weaken it both inside and outside the Territory, to portray it as the "tough guy" who was making things difficult, and thus to influence the attitude of the United Nations and of international public opinion, which supported SWAPO; secondly, substance of the plan, in any case, was ambiguous and was open to several interpretations, because, although it was claimed that the plan was designed to implement Security Council resolution 385 (1976), in fact it left the illegal administration of South Africa over the Territory unaltered and allowed Pretoria to leave troops there to supplement its police forces; thirdly, the plan made no mention of Walvis Bay, which is regarded as an integral part of Namibia. The absence of specific reference to Walvis Bay allowed the South African régime to maintain its forces in that area, thus posing a significant threat to the rest of the Territory.

380. For these reasons, and for many others, my delegation condemned this plan from the outset, regarding it as a new act in a drama which goes back to the collapse of Portuguese colonialism in Africa and to the attainment of independence by Angola and Mozambique. But the epilogue and the closing scenes are known, and they will go on as long as the producers of this scenario are able to find an audience ready to listen to them and to allow themselves to be fobbed off with their fallacious plans.

381. The problem of Namibia will persist as long as the minority racist régime remains in power. It is not a matter of convening conference after conference. The problem lies, first and last, in the elimination of the hateful racist régime in South Africa and the granting to the Namibian people of its right to self-determination and independence. The conferences in question are aimed, in the first place, at wasting time and prolonging the life of the racist régime of South Africa in Namibia, and, last but by no means least, at continuing the exploitation of the human potential of this valiant people.

382. We all know that during the last 11 years the racist entity in South Africa has done nothing to indicate its willingness to co-operate with the United Nations Council for Namibia or with the United Nations in general on the question of Namibia. Quite to the contrary, it has shown itself to be more stubborn and more repressive, has stepped up its savage acts and has armed Namibia to the detriment of its people. Today that régime is detested by everyone for its policy and its practices in Namibia, as well as for its colonial régime based on *apartheid*. In practice, South Africa has been excluded from this Assembly. But, thanks to the right

of veto exercised by certain of its Western allies in the Security Council, it is still a Member of this Organization. South Africa and the agents of its supporters among the forces of the West have carried out acts of aggression against Namibia and its neighbouring countries, and those acts of aggression have become a threat to international peace and security. The Security Council, instead of supporting the General Assembly in order to protect the victims of racist aggression, has been used by the Western countries, permanent members of the Security Council to block all progress by continual recourse to the right of veto, making that United Nations organ ineffective.

383. The international community has a special and very serious responsibility in connexion with the reinforcement by the South African entity of its armed forces in Namibia, the mobilization and training of Namibians to form part of tribal armies and the illegitimate use of Namibian territory from which to carry out acts of aggression against independent African countries. That entity is also carrying on the transfer of Namibians by force from the northern frontier region of Namibia, for military purposes. That is why my delegation condemns the continued military co-operation between racist South Africa and certain Western and other countries, particularly in the nuclear field. We consider that all co-operation by the Western countries with the racist régime in South Africa in the military field and in the manufacture of nuclear weapons by South Africa constitutes a grave violation of Security Council resolution 418 (1977) on the arms embargo against South Africa, as well as a threat to international peace and security. Moreover, the racist entity in South Africa is continuing its campaign aimed at exterminating the Namibian people. During the years 1978 and 1979 the South African police imprisoned a large number of the leaders and members of SWAPO in order to stifle any opposition on the part of that national liberation movement. The members of SWAPO are subjected daily to the most barbaric forms of torture by the racist police of South Africa. My delegation fully supports the appeal made by the representative of SWAPO during his statement before the General Assembly on 6 December, when he said:

"We appeal to this Assembly and the Security Council to empower the Secretary-General to facilitate through his good offices an inquiry into the conditions of those Namibians being held in gaols, detention centres and concentration camps in Namibia and South Africa and to secure their immediate unconditional release."<sup>20</sup> [See 91st meeting, para. 45.]

384. The racist entity in South Africa has openly challenged the United Nations by not complying with the decisions of the General Assembly and of the Security Council, which, in its resolution 435 (1978), established the bases for a just settlement of the Namibian question, reiterating that its objective was

"the withdrawal of South Africa's illegal administration from Namibia and the transfer of power to the people of Namibia with the assistance of the United Nations in accordance with Security Council resolution 385 (1976)",

and decided

<sup>20</sup> Quoted in English by the speaker.

“to establish under its authority a United Nations Transition Assistance Group...for a period of up to 12 months in order to assist [the] Special Representative [of the Secretary-General] to carry out the mandate conferred upon him by the Security Council in paragraph 1 of its resolution 431 (1978), namely, to ensure the early independence of Namibia through free elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations”.

385. SWAPO agreed to co-operate in the implementation of the measures proposed by the Secretary-General and expressed its willingness to sign and abide by the provisions of the cease-fire. But when the racist régime was asked to co-operate immediately with the Secretary-General to give effect to that resolution, it said it was going to hold internal elections in Namibia and set up what it called a constituent assembly at Windhoek, giving it the legislative and executive power to declare independence unilaterally. That decision by the régime of South Africa is categorical proof of its refusal to implement Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978). These two resolutions provide for free and impartial elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations, which could guarantee genuine independence for Namibia. This flagrant defiance of the Security Council resolutions should be dealt with by the Council by means of enforcement measures to compel the racist entity to implement the Council's resolutions on Namibia.

386. The racist entity has once again rejected the compromise solution proposed by the United Nations, which provided for a 60-mile demilitarized zone along the Namibia-Zambia and the Namibia-Angola borders, under the supervision of United Nations forces.

387. Once again, the people of Namibia, under the leadership of their legitimate representative, SWAPO, have shown their willingness to reach a peaceful settlement in their just cause, but their good intentions have always been met with a hardening of position by the racist entity of South Africa, which has invented false excuses and put every possible obstacle in the way of a peaceful settlement of the question. That entity has demonstrated its bad faith in this respect, as evidenced in the notes exchanged between that racist régime and the Secretary-General this November. The latest of those notes was that addressed by the racist entity of South Africa to the Secretary-General, and circulated in document S/13680 of 5 December 1979, in which the racist entity of South Africa accepts the principle of establishing a demilitarized zone, but subject to many conditions. Those conditions clearly show how naive and foolish are the leaders of that racist entity.

388. Indeed, the conditions imposed by the racist entity of South Africa are just another attempt to prevent the success of the proposal for a settlement. The date of acceptance of the proposal by the racists of South Africa was just one day earlier than that of the General Assembly's meeting on the question of Namibia, which raises doubts as to the intentions of the régime. Indeed, their purpose is clear; it is to minimize the effectiveness of this debate and prevent the taking of any strong decisions condemning the régime.

389. My delegation feels that the time-wasting manoeuvres and the empty and pointless promises of the

racist entity of South Africa must lead the General Assembly to take the following action.

390. First, it should declare very clearly that the racist entity of South Africa must abide by the resolutions of the United Nations in every detail and without pre-established conditions, in particular by Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978). If that entity should fail to abide by those resolutions, it will have to bear the responsibility for the United Nations failure in its quest for a peaceful and just settlement of the cause of the people of Namibia in accordance with the Security Council resolutions, especially those I have just mentioned. The Western countries which submitted that proposal would have to join with all the other States Members of the United Nations in adopting severe measures to put an end to the obduracy and the defiance of the racist régime of South Africa towards the resolutions and the Charter of the United Nations.

391. Secondly, the Assembly should ask the Security Council to meet in order to adopt effective measures to deal with that régime and to apply the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter in order to expel the South African racist régime from the Territory of Namibia and enable the people of Namibia under the leadership of SWAPO, freely to decide on their own future and independence.

392. Thirdly, the Assembly should strongly condemn the racist entity of South Africa for its acts of terrorism and intimidation against the Namibian people and for the imprisonment of the leaders of SWAPO, the aim of which is to destroy SWAPO within the Territory, thus enabling the racist régime to stifle the voice of the Namibian people which calls for law, justice, freedom and independence. Furthermore, the racist régime should be asked to unconditionally release the imprisoned leaders, and a commission of inquiry should be set up by the United Nations to look into the conditions of imprisonment of Namibian prisoners.

393. Fourthly, the Assembly should give material and moral support to SWAPO so that it may continue to lead the people of Namibia in their struggle for independence and freedom. In that regard, all the resolutions of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the OAU held at Monrovia, and those adopted by the Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Havana, affirm total support for the people of Namibia, under the leadership of SWAPO, in their struggle against the racist entity of South Africa until victory is gained and independence is won. In those resolutions the countries members of the OAU and the non-aligned countries affirmed their willingness to co-operate with the United Nations in order to achieve a just and equitable solution to the Namibian problem, and also to support the Council for Namibia in its efforts to carry out the task entrusted to it under General Assembly resolution 2248 (S-V).

394. In conclusion, I should like to reaffirm that the people of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya will continue its policy of support for the brotherly people of Namibia in every possible way until freedom and independence have been gained by the struggle that is being carried on under SWAPO, the sole legitimate representative of that people. I should like to express my country's thanks to the Secretary-General, Mr. Kurt Waldheim, for his considerable efforts, and to the Council for

Namibia for its efforts to carry out the functions entrusted to it by the General Assembly. The delegation of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya also congratulates the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples on its valuable reports on Namibia and Zimbabwe.

395. The delegation of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya also wishes to announce that it has become a sponsor of draft resolutions A/34/L.45 to A/34/L.50/Rev.1.

396. Mr. AL-GHAFFARI (Yemen) (*interpretation from Arabic*): First, on behalf of the Yemen Arab Republic, I should like to reiterate our thanks and gratitude to the President and members of the United Nations Council for Namibia for their efforts, on which clear reports and documents have been submitted to bring about the independence of the people of Namibia so that they, too, may in future participate in the work of the General Assembly.

397. Year after year, the Main Committees and other international bodies have discussed the question of Namibia, which has engaged the attention of the whole international community. This gives new dimensions to the question and an unprecedented impulse to the struggle, particularly since SWAPO and the African National Congress have been winning fine victories, demonstrating their determination to free themselves from the clutches of colonialism, which is the noblest task of mankind, particularly in southern Africa.

398. The racist régime of South Africa, which continues to occupy the Territory of Namibia, is defying all the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council and the will of the international community. This constitutes an act of aggression against the people of Namibia and all the neighbouring independent States of southern Africa.

399. The question that arises is how the racist régime of South Africa can continue its occupation of Namibia and its exploitation of the natural resources of that Territory although the time of colonialism and occupation, which existed for a certain period of time, has gone for ever.

400. The answer lies in the very nature of the racist régime of South Africa, because, due to the Territory's wealth and the abundance of its primary commodities, and also the assistance of certain Western countries the monopolistic interests of which are similar to those of South Africa itself, that régime has succeeded in challenging the Organization and defying all its resolutions, which are based on the letter and spirit of the Charter.

401. Thus, we believe that the South African régime has succeeded in obtaining the nuclear weapon and has carried out certain nuclear tests, in violation of the resolutions of the United Nations and the OAU, for Africa is regarded as a denuclearized zone.

402. We listened with a great deal of interest to the statement made in the General Assembly yesterday [91st meeting] by the representative of SWAPO, in which he referred to the bitter truths concerning the Namibian people under the occupation of South Africa. We have also followed the development of the situation

in southern Africa, and we hold that the unilateral attempt to hold elections in South Africa is a violation of resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) of the Security Council. All this shows that these elections were null and void, were aimed merely at perpetuating the minority racist régime and were only serving the interests and the aims of that minority.

403. The racist régime has clearly shown that it has no intention of co-operating with the United Nations, which is the legal Administering Authority of the Territory until its independence, in negotiating a settlement of the situation in Namibia in accordance with resolution 435 (1978). On the contrary, that régime has imposed its agents on the Namibian people by means of the so-called internal settlement.

404. Thus, racist régime in South Africa is continuing its colonialist policy and programmes in defiance of world public opinion, and is continuing to defy the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council.

405. The fraudulent elections carried out by that régime and its continuing aggression against the neighbouring countries, Angola and Zambia, and also against the members of SWAPO, make it necessary that the international community adopt measures imposing sanctions with which Member States must comply. In my country we are convinced that in order to secure a radical solution it is necessary: first, to intensify all the efforts to bring about total decolonization; then, to provide moral and material assistance to SWAPO, the sole legitimate representative of the Namibian people; finally, to isolate the racist régime and put into effect the sanctions provided for by the Security Council, so that the Pretoria authorities can meet the requirements and claims of the people of Namibia for their freedom and independence.

406. My delegation also makes the following points. First, all the countries in the Organization should respect the embargo and stop all military, nuclear and economic co-operation. Secondly, the liberation movements, SWAPO and the African National Congress, are the only ones that should receive support and assistance from the international family. Thirdly, we see in the support given to the activities of the liberation movements in southern Africa, under the leadership of SWAPO in Namibia and the Patriotic Front in Zimbabwe, and the other African national liberation movements, a victory for the principles and objectives of the United Nations Charter. That is why Member States must respect the Charter. Fourthly, the Yemen Arab Republic supports the adoption of effective measures aimed at preventing South Africa from continuing its present policies. At the same time, my Government again calls on the Western Powers to put into effect the resolutions of the United Nations relating to the applications of economic and other sanctions, and we are ready to give all necessary assistance to the people of Namibia to enable it to obtain its independence, regain sovereignty over its territory and drive out foreign colonialism. Fifthly, my Government considers that the elections organized by the racist régime in Namibia are null and void, because they were unilateral elections in which the people's political organizations did not participate at all levels. We believe that democratic elections in Namibia should be carried out under the auspices of the United Nations, so as to permit the

Namibian people to express their will freely and Namibia to join the United Nations family as an independent and sovereign country.

407. Mr. MATTIN (Afghanistan): At the outset, I should like on behalf of my delegation to express our admiration to the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia for his introductory statement [91st meeting] on the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia, contained in document A/34/24, covering the activities of the Council during the year under consideration.

408. For 12 years now, the General Assembly has been considering the report of the Council for Namibia whose characteristic features remain almost the same: the continued illegal occupation of the international Territory, systematic policies of brutal repression, torture, inhuman practices, arrests, detentions and other acts of violence against leaders and members of SWAPO and against Namibians, as well as the continuation of armed attacks by the racist régime of South Africa against the independent African front-line States.

409. During the year under review, the racist régime, with the support and backing of imperialist countries and some other States attached to it, has resorted to a number of manoeuvres aimed at preserving the *status quo* and prolonging the occupation and exploitation of the human and natural resources of the international Territory, as well as continuing the brutal policies of the illegal administration, which have led to the detention, torture and death of many heroic Namibians. The creation of a so-called National Assembly in Namibia, the initiation of the so-called internal settlement in Namibia, the deceitful actions of the racist régime by means of unilateral measures and sinister schemes within Namibia during the holding of talks for a negotiated settlement in Namibia: those are but a few examples of the manoeuvres engineered with the cooperation of imperialism to which the racist régime resorted to attain its objectives.

410. Last year's attempt by the racist régime to annex Walvis Bay and separate it from the rest of the international Territory, with the aim of dismembering the Territory and destroying the territorial integrity and unity of Namibia, was another of the South African régime's shameful practices designed to prolong its own life.

411. We have previously had an opportunity to join in the international condemnation of these manoeuvres by the racist régime and its supporters.

412. The convening of the ninth special session of the United Nations General Assembly, in April 1978, to consider the question of Namibia was nothing more than a manifestation of the great importance the international community attaches to the question and the great attention it is giving the question. Experience and events have proved that the racist régime, relying upon the support and backing of imperialism and some other countries attached to it, has paid no attention to the decision and recommendations of that special session.

413. Today, despite all the resolutions, the obnoxious system of colonial oppression and exploitation is being intensified on a massive scale by the racist occupation

régime. Armed forces are being increased and deployed all over the international Territory. A more ominous development is the reported nuclear explosion by South Africa, an arrogant display of nuclear weapons, and the establishment of new military bases in the Territory is alarming. The increasing commission of acts of terror and oppression is now a matter of daily life. Transnational corporations and Western companies continue to exploit the wealth of the Territory and, therefore, the imperialist and other States which have constituted the life-blood of the racist régime continue to benefit from the situation. At the diplomatic level, unilateral acts by the Pretoria racist régime have further frustrated the efforts and hopes for a negotiated settlement.

414. It is our conviction that so long as the racist régime enjoys the military, economic and political support of imperialist and international reaction, and so long as the sanctions already imposed against the racist régimes are not respected and observed by imperialism and its allies, no search for a way to ensure the undeniable rights of the heroic Namibian people to self-determination and national independence in a united Namibia, through a peaceful process, will be effective. In such a situation, it would be the intensification of armed struggle, under the leadership of SWAPO, the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people, effectively supported by all peace-loving and justice-loving forces of the world, which would pave the way to bringing true national independence to Namibia. As was stated by Sam Nujoma, the heroic leader of SWAPO, before the ninth special session of the General Assembly on the question of Namibia:

“so long as racist South Africa continues to entrench and perpetuate its colonial military occupation, and so long as the plundering and exploitation of our natural and human resources continue, for so long will SWAPO persist in the intensification of the armed struggle”.<sup>21</sup>

415. We continue to maintain the view that the basis for any consideration of the question must be the 1966 decision of the General Assembly, endorsed by the Security Council and reaffirmed by the International Court of Justice, terminating South Africa's Mandate over Namibia and placing Namibia under the direct responsibility of the United Nations, in order to ensure the speedy realization of the aspirations of the Namibian people to freedom and independence, as well as establishing the United Nations Council for Namibia, as the legal Administering Authority of Namibia until its independence.

416. A clear condition for a settlement of the Namibian question has been set in various United Nations resolutions, particularly Security Council resolution 385 (1976), under which the Council demanded the release of all Namibian political prisoners, the abolition of all racially discriminatory laws and practices, the unconditional return of all Namibian exiles, the immediate end of the illegal administration, and the holding of free elections in Namibia under United Nations supervision and control.

417. We should like to call for the immediate release of all political prisoners held in Namibia or in South Africa. In that connexion, the proposal by SWAPO that

<sup>21</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Ninth Special Session, Plenary Meetings, 1st meeting, para. 132.*

the General Assembly and the Security Council empower the Secretary-General to facilitate an inquiry into the conditions of Namibians held in prisons, detention centres and concentration camps in the international Territory and in South Africa, and to secure their immediate, unconditional release [91st meeting, para. 46], deserves careful consideration by the General Assembly.

418. While we consider that the declaration and programme of action drawn up by the Council for Namibia give a correct assessment of the situation in that country and that the programme of action is indeed an effective one, my delegation holds the firm opinion that the time is now ripe for applying effective measures for enforcement action, as provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter, to put an end to aggression. It is gratifying to note that there seems to be a growing recognition by the international community of the necessity for taking action in this regard.

419. In conclusion, the people and the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, being strongly opposed as a matter of principle to colonialism, neo-colonialism, imperialism, exploitation and all forms of racial discrimination, expresses its unshakable support for and solidarity with the Namibian people, led by SWAPO, in their just struggle for self-determination and national independence.

420. Mr. ALIHONOU (Congo) (*interpretation from French*): Of the questions included from one session to another on the agenda of the General Assembly, that of Namibia is certainly one of the most clear, and it is also one of those that reveals the arrogance and the iniquity of the racist South African régime, which is supported and defended in every way, it is true, by some Western Powers.

421. As we have said, the question is one of childish simplicity and clarity. Under the provisions of General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966, the United Nations put an end to South Africa's Mandate over Namibia and placed that Territory under the direct responsibility of the United Nations in order to enable the people of Namibia to realize their legitimate aspirations to freedom and independence. Unfortunately, in flagrant and shameless violation of the terms of the Mandate, the racist régime of South Africa is still illegally remaining in Namibia and thus defying the international community.

422. Our position on this question has been repeatedly expressed before the Assembly. It will not change, far from it, as long as the South African régime distinguishes itself by acts of aggression against neighbouring States, the massacre of innocent civilian populations and barbaric repression of the people of Namibia struggling for liberation.

423. It is a real tragedy that the people of Namibia are living through, a tragedy in which the death of peaceful populations accompanies cynicism and barbarity in the interests of certain Western Powers. But it is a tragedy in which the people of Namibia refuses to die and is fighting back.

424. The actors in this drama are well known. First of all, there is South Africa, a country that only travel

agencies in Western capitals advertise, a country that has built its power upon the enslavement of non-whites, who are refused minimal rights.

425. It is a régime of horror and barbarity that is characterized by daily arrests and the execution of people after rigged trials. It is a régime that South Africa is trying to impose on Namibia, a régime that recalls the worst horrors of the Nazi régime of about 40 years ago.

426. South Africa is using the same methods. It attacks neighbouring countries and commits regular acts of aggression against them under the pretext that they are harbouring Namibian refugees. We believe that the cause of the problem is the desire of the South African racists to annex the Territory of Namibia in order to exploit its immense riches.

427. A sinister plan of occupation was set up. Sham elections were organized, and puppets were found to present to the world a Namibia that was called independent but was in fact in bondage to South Africa.

428. South Africa is encouraged and supported, albeit from a distance, by certain Western Powers that play an inglorious role in this drama. Those countries are for the most part members of the much respected Security Council, in which they acquire renown with neutral or negative votes, while making statements about the excesses and horrors of the South African régime. Those countries, which pose as great champions of human rights, close their own eyes to the massacres and the inhuman treatments in Namibia. Human rights are no longer in vogue when the exploitation of gold and uranium can benefit their economies. The aircraft of those countries that lay claim to Christianity regularly take off from Namibia, their holds filled with precious metals. Those Western countries are responsible for the sufferings and the martyrdom of the Namibian people. They take refuge in the United Nations, where they can leisurely, and with the words that best suit them, expatiate upon the need to arrive at a solution of the problem of Namibia.

429. In fact, our Organization is in deadlock after taking every possible initiative and exploring every possibility and every opportunity of putting an end to the tragedy.

430. The struggle of the people of Namibia, courageously led by SWAPO, its sole authentic representative, deserves our total support. SWAPO is fighting in extremely difficult circumstances and in the face of blind police persecution.

431. The South African troops have sophisticated equipment and weapons, which allow them to hunt down the people and stifle their cry for freedom. How, in these circumstances, can we talk about an internal settlement of the problem? These are simply manoeuvres to perpetuate the exploitation of the people and the riches of Namibia. A valid settlement of the question of Namibia must be reached through the application of the Security Council and General Assembly resolutions, and through the total isolation of South Africa.

432. Our delegation believes that we must achieve the immediate cessation of the occupation of the Territory

of Namibia by South Africa, the evacuation of the occupation and police troops, a guarantee of the unity and territorial integrity of Namibia, including Walvis Bay, and the right to self-determination and independence for the people of Namibia.

433. But those demands can be satisfied only through the principal key to the question, namely, the effective cessation of the criminal assistance some Western countries are giving to the racist régime of South Africa.

434. In closing, we should like to salute the courage and stoicism of the front-line countries, whose peoples pay with their blood for supporting the just struggle of SWAPO.

435. The people of Angola, Zambia, Botswana and Mozambique, and all those peoples suffering martyrdom with the Namibian people, deserve all our respect and consideration.

*The meeting rose at 8.50 p.m.*