



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 . . .	1741

President: Mr. Indalecio LIEVANO (Colombia).

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

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should like to inform the Assembly that a draft resolution has been submitted and will be circulated shortly in document A/33/L.37.

2. Mr. HASSAN (Pakistan): The General Assembly decided last December to resume its thirty-third session so as to give detailed consideration to all aspects of the question of Namibia. That was a wise decision because in the period intervening between the suspension of the regular session and now the situation in Namibia has continued to deteriorate.

3. Last December, when the question of Namibia was debated by the General Assembly, there was considerable optimism that the people of Namibia, after a long and arduous struggle, were finally on the threshold of genuine independence. These hopes were based on the efforts that the Secretary-General, Mr. Waldheim, was carrying out in pursuance of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which provided for the withdrawal of South Africa's illegal administration of 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).

4. It is indeed most regrettable that the hopes placed by the international community in a negotiated and peaceful settlement in Namibia have been belied by South Africa's intransigence and defiance of the will of the international community. Instead of acquiescing in the long-cherished desire of the struggling people of Namibia to

attain genuine independence and freedom, South Africa has once again shown that it cannot be trusted and would resort to all sorts of manoeuvres and stratagems to keep its illegal hold over Namibia.

5. My delegation wishes to congratulate the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, Ambassador Lusaka, on his lucid and comprehensive statement concerning the current situation in Namibia [*97th meeting*]. This statement, coupled with the eloquent speech given by Mr. Nujoma [*ibid.*], President of the South West Africa People's Organization [*SWAPO*], leaves no doubt that the situation in Namibia, far from approaching normalcy and tranquillity, has worsened further. It should be clear to any impartial observer of the situation in Namibia that South Africa had no intention of agreeing to the United Nations plan for a negotiated settlement of the question of Namibia.¹ Even while pretending to engage in consultations, South Africa was stepping up its repression and brutality against Namibian patriots. Moreover, it appointed an Administrator-General for Namibia when the important question of United Nations supervision and control of general elections in the Territory was under negotiation. True to its colours, the Pretoria régime then instructed the Administrator-General to carry out the so-called internal elections to install its puppets in power in Namibia. These elections are in total contravention of resolution 439 (1978) of the Security Council, which has declared them null and void. The aforementioned action leaves no doubt that South Africa has once again succeeded in thwarting and undermining the international efforts undertaken so far which have been aimed at achieving self-determination and independence for the indigenous people of Namibia in accordance with various Security Council and General Assembly resolutions. My delegation agrees with the assessment given here by Mr. Nujoma that the South African actions in the five-month period since the thirty-third session was suspended smack of "a Rhodesian type of unilateral declaration of independence" [*97th meeting, para. 78*]. South Africa thus has continued with its present defiance of the United Nations. It not only continues its policies of exploitation, repression and racial discrimination in Namibia but also has used that Territory to launch attacks against the neighbouring States of Zambia and Angola, thus seriously jeopardizing peace and security in the region.

6. The question of Namibia has been on the agenda of the United Nations for a long time, and its basic elements are well known. At a time when almost the whole of the continent of Africa has freed itself from colonialism, it is

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

indeed anachronistic that a vast region of southern Africa remains under colonial rule or in the hands of a minority. Not only are the indigenous majority denied their elementary political and economic rights but the present régimes in South Africa, Namibia and Rhodesia practise in one form or another the most abominable systems of racial discrimination. South Africa's presence in Namibia after the General Assembly formally terminated its Mandate over Namibia in 1966 [resolution 2145 (XXI)] is illegal and constitutes a defiance of international law and an act of aggression. It is clear to my delegation that South Africa will not heed the call to reason. The United Nations, which assumed direct responsibility for the liberation of the people of Namibia in 1967, cannot evade its responsibilities and obligations any longer. There is a limit to attempts, no matter how well meaning, aimed at persuading South Africa to relinquish its hold over Namibia through negotiations and in a peaceful and orderly fashion. The events of the past few months have proved that the minority régime in Pretoria is oblivious to the objective realities of the situation and will continue to defy the will of the international community. Under such circumstances it is incumbent upon the United Nations to take punitive measures described under Chapter VII of the Charter to bring about the evacuation of the Territory by South Africa. Only the imposition of comprehensive and mandatory economic sanctions will make it clear to South Africa that the international community is united in its resolve to free Namibia. My delegation is of the considered view that any further delay in taking such action would only prolong the agony of the people of Namibia, on whom a fresh reign of terror has been unleashed with widespread arrests, violence and intimidation. If the prestige and authority of the United Nations, which has taken over direct responsibility for Namibia, is to be upheld, such a course of action becomes imperative.

7. My country is indeed proud to have been in the forefront of those who have given both moral and material support to the heroic liberation struggle of the people of Namibia under the leadership of SWAPO, its sole and authentic representative. Pakistan has contributed to this goal through our participation in the United Nations Council for Namibia since its inception, as well as by our active advocacy of Namibian aspirations in other international forums. Pakistan could not base its stand on any other consideration. Our own country owes its very existence to the aspirations of the Moslems of the south Asian region to establish an independent State where they could order their lives in accordance with the precepts of Islam. Pakistan is a living realization of that dream. Likewise, a free Namibia would be the culmination of the aspirations of the people of southern Africa to establish an independent State free from exploitation of man by his fellow man, and where the equality of all people, regardless of race, colour or creed, will be ensured. As a member of the Council for Namibia, I wish to take this opportunity to record the deep appreciation of my delegation for the work performed by Ambassador Lusaka of Zambia, under whose dynamic leadership the Council has intensified its efforts and programmes in all directions to assist the United Nations in its goal of leading the Namibians to genuine independence. In this context the recent consultation missions sent by the Council to a number of countries in Asia and Europe have generated a great awareness of the

grave consequences of the deteriorating situation in Namibia. These missions enabled many countries to assess the current situation in Namibia in its correct perspective and have won wider support and solidarity for the just and genuine struggle of the people of Namibia under the leadership of SWAPO, their sole and authentic representative.

8. My country also had the honour recently to receive a visit by a mission of consultation sent by the Council for Namibia. During a meeting, President Muhammad Zia-ul-Haq of Pakistan pledged Pakistan's full support for the brave people of Namibia under the leadership of SWAPO and reiterated that Pakistan would extend all possible material and moral assistance to the efforts to hasten the process of Namibia's march to independence.

9. Pakistan would like to reaffirm its conviction that no plan or measure will succeed in ensuring genuine independence to Namibia unless it protects the territorial integrity of Namibia. Walvis Bay is an integral part of Namibia and should not be the subject of any negotiations. South Africa must withdraw from Namibia and must not be allowed to destroy the national unity and territorial integrity of Namibia by spurious claims to Walvis Bay in pursuance of its territorial ambitions and expansionism. The General Assembly must reiterate its commitment to ensure the territorial integrity of Namibia against any attempts to dismember the Territory through the illegal negotiations on Walvis Bay by South Africa. It should reaffirm that Walvis Bay is not a question of territorial claims; it is an inviolable and non-negotiable part of Namibia.

10. My delegation would like to record its tribute to the Secretary-General, Mr. Waldheim, for his unremitting efforts on behalf of the people of Namibia. We were gratified to learn from the Secretary-General's message on the occasion of the inauguration of the International Year of Solidarity with the People of Namibia² that, despite the set-backs, he is continuing his efforts for the implementation of the United Nations plan and to keep up the momentum for the attainment of a peaceful settlement in accordance with the resolutions of the Security Council. The Secretary-General deserves our unreserved co-operation and our admiration for his unrelenting efforts. We agree with him that we must spare no effort to bring about a settlement as rapidly as possible and that we must continue to stand firm against all unilateral political attempts that are not in conformity with the resolutions of the Security Council. Any relaxation of our efforts would have tragic consequences for all concerned.

11. The question of Namibia should continue to receive the most serious consideration and engage the attention of the United Nations. South Africa's past record in Namibia should leave no illusions that it is prepared to accede to the overwhelming desire of the Namibian people to be free. On the contrary, its actions indicate that it will continue its illegal hold over Namibia and exploit its riches and resources indefinitely. However, if the international community makes it clear to South Africa that it will not countenance such a course, only then can a change in South

² See document A/AC.131/PV.300, p. 8.

Africa's policies be expected. In any case, the valiant people of Namibia, who have earned universal admiration for their willingness to make any sacrifice in pursuit of their cherished goal of independence, will not be kept in subjugation much longer. If need be, they will wrest their freedom through their own efforts. The international community should stand behind them in a united fashion and extend all possible assistance for the achievement of their just and inalienable rights.

12. I wish to conclude by quoting from a message issued by President Muhammad Zia-ul-Haq of Pakistan on the occasion of the inauguration of the International Year of Solidarity with the People of Namibia on 4 May 1979:

“Pakistan, a founding member of the United Nations Council for Namibia, is proud of its close association with the Namibian people's just struggle for self-determination and independence. We support the United Nations Plan on grounds of principle because the Security Council has recognized that the right of self-determination by the people of Namibia, as elsewhere, can be exercised only through impartial elections under United Nations auspices, and not through sham constitutional and political arrangements. Pakistan has upheld this principle for more than three decades at the United Nations.

“... ”

“Finally, I should like to stress that the decisive factor in the liberation struggle of the valiant people of Namibia is their perseverance in the face of adversity and the dedication of the national liberation movement SWAPO. I am confident that their heroic efforts will soon be crowned with success, and we look forward to strengthening the close relations of friendship between the peoples of Pakistan and independent Namibia.”³

13. Mr. HUSSEN (Somalia): The General Assembly's decision to resume the thirty-third session in order to review the question of Namibia is evidence of the determination of Member States that the United Nations should discharge its legal, political and moral responsibilities for the Territory of Namibia.

14. Mr. President, I am sure that under your wise guidance, of which we already have ample evidence, the resumed session will make a valuable contribution to the attainment of the goal of establishing a genuinely independent Namibia.

15. My delegation is grateful to Mr. Lusaka of Zambia for the comprehensive and objective statement he delivered at the opening of the resumed session in his capacity as President of the United Nations Council for Namibia.

16. We also wish to extend to Mr. Sam Nujoma, the President of SWAPO, a warm welcome to the General Assembly, and we congratulate him on the balance and insight of his statement. My delegation agrees with

Mr. Nujoma's assessment of the Namibian situation when he said at the beginning of his statement:

“To say, at this stage, that the situation in Namibia is critical and deteriorating is an understatement. Actually, throughout Namibia there is currently an ominous spectre of war, more bloody than ever before and bearing ghastly consequences not only for our people and country but also for the rest of southern Africa, [and] for Africa as a whole. . . .” [97th meeting, para. 50.]

Mr. Nujoma's dramatic words underscore the need for Member States, collectively and individually, to show their unequivocal moral support for SWAPO and to increase their material support for the liberation of Namibia. The long years of fruitless negotiation with South Africa have surely illustrated the willingness of the Namibian people and their authentic leaders to explore every avenue of peaceful change and their ability to carry on the liberation struggle by all means, including armed struggle, against the illegal occupation of their Territory by South Africa.

17. The past year has, of course, been a particularly frustrating one with regard to the Namibian question. Hopes were raised high by the apparent agreement among all parties concerned on the proposals for Namibian independence negotiated initially by the five Western Powers.⁴

18. An outstanding feature of the protracted and delicate negotiations was the high level of statesmanship shown by SWAPO's leaders, who made as many concessions as it was possible for them to make without compromising the fundamental interests of the Namibian people.

19. It was therefore with deep disappointment and dismay that my Government saw the prospects for a negotiated settlement recede as the Pretoria régime reverted to its customary strategy of deceitful manoeuvres and arrogant defiance of the United Nations.

20. It is obvious now that South Africa has no intention of co-operating to bring about genuine independence for Namibia. Its bluff was called when the Security Council adopted resolutions 431 (1978) and 435 (1978), giving overwhelming support to the Western proposals and to the Secretary-General's plan for their implementation. The Pretoria régime showed its true colours when it insisted on imposing a so-called internal settlement on the people of Namibia through fraudulent elections for an illegal puppet régime. That attempt to perpetuate its colonial and racist exploitation of the Territory has, of course, been denounced by the Security Council and must be condemned by the international community in the strongest terms. As Security Council resolution 439 (1978) states, South Africa's decision to proceed unilaterally with elections in Namibia constitutes a clear defiance of the United Nations and of the authority of the Council itself.

21. The illegal political process in Namibia, which included the creation, first of a so-called Constituent Assembly, and then of a National Assembly, has been

³ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-fourth Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1979*, document S/13326, annexes.

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

accompanied by machinations on the part of South Africa on the international scene. The Pretoria régime has been attempting to stall for time and to divert attention from its bad-faith by giving evasive responses to the Secretary-General in the course of his efforts to salvage the proposals endorsed by the Security Council in resolution 435 (1978).

22. I should like in this connexion to express my delegation's appreciation of the patience and hard work of Secretary-General, Kurt Waldheim, and of the unremitting efforts and skilfulness with which he has carried out the mandate of the Security Council. The fact that he and his colleagues did not succeed is due solely to the intransigence of the Pretoria régime. The Pretoria régime must now be considered to have closed the door to the holding of United Nations-supervised elections leading to the genuine independence of Namibia. The patently unacceptable conditions it belatedly put forward, such as the monitoring of SWAPO forces in neighbouring independent African States, were not envisaged in the original proposals and must be seen as deliberate efforts to sabotage any further prospects for a negotiated settlement. If any illusions about South Africa's good faith remained, they should have been dispelled by the recent wave of political repression directed against SWAPO members in Namibia and by the savage armed attacks directed against Namibian refugees in Angola.

23. My delegation believes the answer to the question of what can be done about the Namibian situation today can be found in paragraph 6 of Security Council resolution 439 (1978). That paragraph warns South Africa that its failure to co-operate with the Security Council and the Secretary-General in the implementation of resolutions 385 (1976), 431 (1978) and 435 (1978) would compel the Council

“...to meet forthwith to initiate appropriate actions under the Charter of the United Nations, including Chapter VII thereof, so as to ensure South Africa's compliance with the aforementioned resolutions”.

24. The Security Council has often issued ultimatums to South Africa on Namibian issues in the past, and successive Pretoria régimes have known that those warnings would not be translated into significant action. The warning contained in its resolution 439 (1978) is the clearest and weightiest the Council has so far given South Africa. If the Council once again fails to take positive action, such as the imposition of comprehensive sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter, not only will it inflict upon itself the final blow to its credibility and authority, but the very prestige and authority of the United Nations will be also called into question.

25. The fundamental purpose of the United Nations is to forestall threats to international peace and security and to deal with breaches of the peace. Even when the Namibian situation had not attained its present dangerous proportions, the majority of Member States recognized that it posed a grave threat to international peace and security. Those States which found it convenient to take a contrary view can hardly continue to maintain their position in view of the violence and bloodshed rife in South Africa, where the problems, including the problem of Namibia, are also closely interrelated.

26. Even if the United Nations did not have a special responsibility for Namibia, it could not be indifferent to South Africa's oppressive and racist occupation of the Territory and to South Africa's rape of Namibia's resources, which clearly constitute aggression against the land and its people. The United Nations cannot ignore South Africa's use of Namibia as a spring-board for aggression against neighbouring African States, or its direction of its military arsenal, including such inhuman weapons as napalm, against Namibian refugees. Neither can the world Organization remain passive while South Africa wages war against SWAPO, whose liberation struggle has been declared legitimate by the international community.

27. The Namibian situation is clearly related to that of Zimbabwe, which was considered dangerous enough to call for Security Council sanctions. As we know very well South Africa, which is at the heart of all the tension and conflict in the whole of southern Africa, has violated those sanctions to such an extent that Ian Smith not only has been able to remain in power for 13 years, but has imposed an illegal internal settlement on the people of Zimbabwe and continues to direct vicious military operations against Zimbabweans inside and outside their country, against the authentic leaders of the Zimbabwean people, the Patriotic Front, and against the front-line States of Zambia and Mozambique.

28. Flagrant aggression, wanton bloodshed, gross violation of human rights and a dangerous presence of elements of cold-war rivalry are as evident in southern Africa and as threatening to international peace as they are, for example, in the Middle East where another despotic régime has been pursuing oppressive and repressive policies against the indigenous people of that region.

29. Given the gravity of the southern African situation in general and of the Namibian problem in particular, it is hoped that the five Western countries, especially the veto-holders on the Security Council, will recognize the need for drastic action. The time has certainly come for them to show how far they are committed to the achievement of a peaceful and equitable solution to the Namibian problem.

30. There have been many mental reservations and much scepticism about the motives and sincerity of the five Western countries in their initiative of entering into negotiations with South Africa. Those who held this state of mind maintain South Africa would hardly be in a position to defy the authority of the United Nations if it knew that the Western Powers were genuinely and fully committed to bringing about self-determination and independence for Namibia under the United Nations authority.

31. My delegation believes the efforts of the five Western Powers deserve recognition. However, if one or more of the veto-holders should once again frustrate the demand of the international community for action commensurate with the needs of the situation, they would stand unmasked before the world; their complicity with the racist régimes would no longer be in doubt; and they would be held responsible for prolonging the agony of the Namibian people.

32. The direct responsibility of the United Nations for bringing about self-determination and independence for Namibia can only be discharged by the Security Council. I am sure the overwhelming majority of Member States will join in calling on the Security Council to convene urgently and to take appropriate measures to put an end to South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia. The facts of the situation leave no alternative but the adoption and strict implementation of enforcement measures under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations. That is the only approach likely to have any effect on South Africa and to ensure its compliance with United Nations resolutions on Namibia.

33. Mr. FILALI (Morocco) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, it is a particular pleasure for me to tell you how happy the delegation of the Kingdom of Morocco is to see you presiding over the proceedings of the resumed thirty-third session of the General Assembly which is being devoted exclusively to the question of Namibia. We remain convinced that under your enlightened leadership our Assembly will live up to the hopes of the international community, and of the Namibian people in particular and that we will be able to bring about a just solution to this painful problem.

34. We note with bitterness and frustration that what has been done so far by our Organization, often at the cost of compromises which were difficult to bring about, has not been properly understood or appreciated by Pretoria.

35. In defiance of the will of the international community, South Africa continues its illegal occupation of Namibia, in disregard of the resolutions and decisions of the General Assembly and the Security Council and of the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice.⁵

36. We had thought, not too long ago, that Pretoria would come to see reason under the influence of the concerted efforts of the international community. It will be recalled, in fact, that the situation in Namibia had become so serious that it was liable to have disastrous consequences, not only for Namibia but also for the front-line States. The situation seemed to be degenerating in the direction of a regional war liable to give rise to international complications. Believing that this situation presented a potential danger to international peace and security in the region, the Security Council decided to take up the question of Namibia, which was to be considered no longer solely as a problem of decolonization but as a problem of international security. After numerous vicissitudes, in the course of which tension alternated with hope, the Council achieved understanding on the basis of the proposals of the five Western Powers for a settlement of the Namibian problem. As members are aware, in a spirit of compromise SWAPO subscribed to those proposals and South Africa also, it appeared, subscribed to them.

37. This peace plan was solemnly approved by the Security Council in resolution 431 (1978) in which, among other things, it called on the Secretary-General of the United Nations to work out practical arrangements for applying the proposed peaceful settlement of the Namibian situation. The recommendations of the Secretary-General, contained in his report in document S/12827, were then endorsed by the Council in its resolution 435 (1978). However, once the Secretary-General's report was approved, South Africa made an abrupt turn-about and came up with equivocal interpretations of that report, and resorted to delaying tactics. Events have shown subsequently that Pretoria was not sincerely committed to the peace plan, because it went ahead with its previous plans. Thus, in December 1978, it organized elections contrary to the spirit and letter of the peace settlement of the United Nations, arguing that those elections should be considered as an internal process for the appointment of leaders. The holding of those elections and the interpretation placed on them confirm our fears. There can be no doubt that the true leaders of Namibia should emerge from free elections, organized under United Nations control, in accordance with Security Council resolution 431 (1978).

38. The creation of the spurious Constituent Assembly constitutes in our view a dangerous first step towards an internal settlement. After this unilateral action—which, incidentally, was declared null and void by the Security Council in its resolution 439 (1978)—South Africa then strove to pursue a policy of obstruction with the unavowed intent of dragging out the process of negotiation. Thus Pretoria, which had agreed at the beginning to co-operate in the rapid application of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), called into question one after the other the most important aspects of the peace plan. In the light of those delaying tactics and recent statements by South African leaders with regard to the imminent transfer of legislative and executive powers to the Windhoek Assembly, we wonder whether Pretoria is not in fact carrying out in Namibia, hand in hand with the Salisbury Government, an action similar to that which led to the internal settlement and subsequently to the installing of a pseudo-Government in Zimbabwe. However that may be, if this plan were carried out the United Nations would be confronted with a fait accompli. This new situation, the extreme gravity of which is obvious to everyone, would radically change the nature of the Namibian problem. Indeed, South Africa which, since the foundation of the United Nations, has defied resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, would be committing the greatest possible act of defiance of our Organization if, after having accepted the United Nations peace plan, it were to prevail upon the Assembly which it has pieced together to declare unilateral independence for Namibia. The international community could not then interpret this subterfuge as anything but a means enabling the Government of South Africa to perpetuate its economic and military grip on Namibian territory. In the circumstances, the foreseeable consequences which would flow from this action could only give rise to the risk of destabilization and ever more serious intervention in this part of Africa. And if this eventuality were, unfortunately, to occur what role could the United Nations play once again in order to achieve the objective which it has always set itself, namely, that of leading the people of Namibia to independence?

⁵ *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.*

39. But what is certain is that world opinion—and African opinion in particular—would not understand a passive attitude on the part of our Organization. The United Nations, in our view, should first of all accord moral support and material, diplomatic and military assistance without reservation to the Namibian people, led by its national liberation movement, SWAPO.

40. Furthermore, our Assembly should reaffirm its previous resolutions, as well as those of the Security Council, and see that the economic sanctions adopted against Pretoria are put fully into effect.

41. Lastly, we believe that those who still possess a certain amount of influence and substantial interests in South Africa should use all appropriate means to make South Africa realize that its dreams can no longer come true and that the only solution which can respond to the profound sentiments of the Namibian people and of the international community is the bringing about of an independent, united and free Namibia.

42. South Africa must face the undeniable fact that any solution to the Namibian problem has to be brought about by negotiation with SWAPO, the legitimate representative of the Namibian people and the symbol of its resistance. If there is any advice we can give to South Africa it would be to say that in the recent past other colonial Powers have had resort to and abused the same subterfuges and manoeuvres, but in the final analysis they have had to face the facts and negotiate with the liberation movements which were fighting against them by armed force.

43. In actual fact, what can one blame SWAPO for? It cannot be accused of either intransigence or irresponsibility. Indeed, SWAPO has always demonstrated political maturity. In a spirit of realism and compromise it supported the United Nations peace plan. That support means above all acceptance by SWAPO of the principle of free elections, supervised by the United Nations. In the circumstances, what further guarantees could South Africa demand of SWAPO or the United Nations?

44. In any case, I should like to take this opportunity to reiterate the support of Morocco for SWAPO in its struggle for the liberation of Namibia. We are fervent champions of African solidarity and we wish to express today, as always our unreserved support for the legitimate claims of the Namibian people.

45. We wish also to affirm our solidarity with the peoples of the front-line countries which have constantly been the victims of aggression committed by Pretoria, which has thereby violated their territorial integrity and hindered their economic development.

46. I should also like to pay a tribute to the Secretary-General of the United Nations and his Special Representative for the patience they have shown in the performance of their tasks. We are keenly aware of the complex nature of their tasks and we wish to extend our support to them.

47. Finally I wish to express our gratitude and encouragement to the United Nations Council for Namibia under the

enlightened leadership of Mr. Lusaka for the excellent work it has been doing on behalf of us all for the cause of Namibia. The existence of that Council reminds us of the moral, political and legal responsibility of the General Assembly and the Security Council vis-à-vis Namibia.

48. It is the duty of our Organization and particularly of the Security Council, the organ responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security, to demand the speedy and full implementation of the United Nations peace plan. In so doing, it will have honoured a commitment which it has always assumed selflessly and faithfully, that of conducting Namibia to independence and liberty.

49. Mr. CARIAS (Honduras) (*interpretation from Spanish*): This is the second time that, as head of the delegation of Honduras, I have had to speak on the situation of Namibia in the General Assembly. The year that separates my two statements has been characterized by disappointing results; it has also served to strengthen the feeling of solidarity of Honduras in favour of an internationally acceptable settlement that will permit the prompt achievement of genuine independence for the people of Namibia.

50. The delegation of Honduras had felt that the ninth special session, which had been devoted to Namibia in May 1978, would be the culmination of the long years of efforts made in the international sphere as well as of the selfless struggle of the Namibian people. We had hoped that the massive and unreserved support which Member States accorded the Declaration on Namibia and Programme of Action in Support of Self-Determination and National Independence for Namibia [*resolution S-9/2*] would, after a reasonable period of time, lead to the attainment of independence for the Territory, with the preservation of its territorial integrity and the end of an unjust and oppressive economic and social system.

51. The plan of the Western Powers, as it is called, was endorsed in Security Council resolution 431 (1978) and, although difficult problems were foreseen in its implementation, several States offered their resolute and generous co-operation in forming civilian and military contingents which would guarantee the conduct of a democratic electoral process and the transition to a representative government in Namibia.

52. However, in December the response of South Africa was final and negative and under its control elections became a mockery. Since then it has made efforts to legitimize the "internal settlement" in opposition to the wish of the Namibian majority and this is a constant feature of its foreign policy regarding the Territory.

53. The delegation of Honduras considers that the United Nations plan that was so eminently suited to bringing peace in Namibia, since it would translate into fact the consensus of the entire international community, has been cruelly frustrated by the Government of South Africa.

54. The Pretoria authorities cannot allege any reasons to explain their behaviour since they were associated in the preparation of the transition plan by means of preparatory

high-level visits to their capital by representatives of the five Western Powers and through subsequent broad-ranging consultations and negotiations in New York.

55. Nor in this case can we accept their reference to a resumption of armed resistance activity in Namibia—almost always a reaction against acts of terror committed against the Namibians—as a pretext for refusing to negotiate with SWAPO or as a justification for a general hardening of their position vis-à-vis the United Nations. Nor can the preparation of civil war between the factions under an “internal settlement” be considered a viable solution or be felt to hold out any promise for the future of the Territory.

56. We can objectively affirm that, among other foreseeable consequences, the white Namibian minority cannot expect indefinitely to dominate the other Namibians. The march of history is in favour of the self-determination of peoples and will not halt. The odious system of *apartheid* has earned universal repudiation and will have to disappear from the earth.

57. To live off injustice and oppression cannot be an attractive prospect for the white settlers of Namibia or for their mentors in Pretoria.

58. International public opinion that could have a wider audience in the white *laagers* should therefore be mobilized to the utmost to highlight the magnitude of the deceit and illusion of false security which they are trying to create.

59. The persistence of the Namibian crisis is a threat to international peace and security which might extend not only to other African countries but also to the rest of the international community, with very serious consequences.

60. The delegation of Honduras has most attentively followed the work of the United Nations Council for Namibia under the presidency of Mr. Paul Lusaka of Zambia and we wish to avail ourselves of this opportunity to pay a tribute to the dedicated efforts of its members.

61. The Council for Namibia has duly considered various initiatives and actions which the United Nations could take to deal with the difficult situation created by the persistent refusal of South Africa to comply with resolutions adopted by the relevant United Nations organs and by its determination to continue illegally to maintain a markedly military presence in the Territory.

62. Among those actions, which our delegation could certainly support, are the following: first, the United Nations must reassert itself as the legal authority in the Territory, in which it must have the forthright and resolute co-operation of Member States; secondly, it must condemn South Africa's intransigence in frustrating the implementation of the relevant resolutions of the Security Council, carrying out constant and indiscriminate attacks on the Namibians and neighbouring countries and demonstrating its total lack of compliance with the principles established in the Charter; thirdly, it must reaffirm support for the exercise by the Namibian people of their inalienable right to self-determination and true independence and the preservation of their territorial integrity; fourthly, it must not recognize the results of the election carried out unilaterally

by South Africa in Namibia last December and that country's intention to perpetuate by means of dependent authorities its military occupation and economic and social exploitation of the country and its inhabitants; fifthly, it must give priority to the search for a just settlement of the Namibian question, with the full participation of SWAPO in all relevant negotiations and action, and to the securing as a matter of urgency of the prompt liberation by South Africa of those leaders and militants still being detained.

63. Finally, in view of the gravity of the situation and the special responsibilities of the United Nations concerning the people of Namibia, the Security Council must consider with urgency the application of measures in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter.

64. Mr. FLORIN (German Democratic Republic) (*interpretation from Russian*): Five months ago this General Assembly of the United Nations adopted a resolution on the situation in Namibia which drew attention both to the increasingly dangerous situation in Namibia and to what should be done to ensure the exercise by the Namibian people of its right to self-determination and independence [*resolution 33/182*].

65. The continuing illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa has been condemned as an act of aggression against the Namibian people. All attempts to impose upon Namibia a so-called “internal settlement” and to create a puppet régime subservient to South Africa have been repudiated. The aspirations of South Africa to the possession of nuclear weapons, the cruel suppression of the people of Namibia and their national liberation movement, SWAPO, and the acts of aggression by the racist régime against independent African States have been described as a serious threat to international peace and security, which, as everyone knows, is entirely in accordance with the facts.

66. On this basis, the General Assembly solemnly declared that the refusal of South Africa to comply with the resolutions of the Security Council, in particular resolution 385 (1976), had made it necessary to apply effective sanctions in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter. The resolution stresses that SWAPO is the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people and calls upon all States Members of the United Nations to give all necessary support and assistance to SWAPO in its struggle to achieve independence and national unity in a free Namibia.

67. The German Democratic Republic has done everything possible to encourage the implementation of the General Assembly resolutions and has supported unreservedly and selflessly the just struggle of the people of Namibia under the leadership of SWAPO. In the course of a visit to Angola, Zambia and Mozambique, the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany and Chairman of the Council of State of the German Democratic Republic, Erich Honecker, pointed out repeatedly that in their difficult struggle the peoples of Africa could always count on the German Democratic Republic. In a conversation with the President of SWAPO, Sam Nujoma, Erich Honecker assured him:

“...that the German Democratic Republic would continue uncompromisingly to support the complete

independence of Namibia and respect for its territorial integrity, and would continue and intensify its solidarity with and support for SWAPO.”

68. One manifestation, among others, of this assistance is the fact that the German Democratic Republic, in the course of the International Anti-Apartheid Year, as a mark of solidarity, supplied the countries of southern Africa with vital necessities to the value of 40 million marks. All our efforts have been dictated and continue to be dictated by the sincere desire to help the people of Namibia to cast off once and for all the heavy yoke of colonial oppression and finally to achieve independence.

69. This objective can be achieved only by means of broadly-based co-operation with the legitimate representative of the Namibian people, as recognized by the United Nations, SWAPO. Aware of its great responsibility for the future of the people and the country, SWAPO has stated its readiness to take part in elections under United Nations supervision, has played a constructive part in the implementation of United Nations decisions and has agreed to far-reaching concessions. SWAPO has adopted this course although, on the basis of bitter experience, it was compelled from the beginning to view with the utmost misgivings the hypocritical assertions of the racists that they would accept United Nations plans to hold democratic elections in Namibia. The following facts show how well founded those doubts and misgivings were. Instead of withdrawing their troops from Namibia, the racists actually increased their military strength there. Instead of freeing detainees, their number was actually increased. Further murders were committed, terror was stepped up and aggression against peaceful neighbouring States was intensified. The most recent example in the long chain of aggressive actions, this time once again against Angola, occurred as recently as within the last week. Instead of recognizing the territorial integrity of Namibia, which includes Walvis Bay, the racists have transformed Walvis Bay into a spring-board which menaces independent Namibia. Instead of putting an end to the illegal occupation, they are trying, with the assistance of the so-called national assembly of venal puppets, the so-called Democratic Turnhalle Alliance, to perpetuate their régime of oppression. Instead of abolishing the discriminatory laws of *apartheid*, they are applying them ever more harshly against the population. In many parts of the country there is virtual martial law.

70. Every day that has passed in efforts—as they say—to “resolve this problem by means of negotiations”, efforts which have proved futile, has brought additional proof that the racist régime is still trampling human rights underfoot, doing everything it can to prevent the people of Namibia from attaining independence and trying to suppress their liberation struggle with acts of bloodshed. The months and months of unsuccessful negotiations have only made it possible for the racists to win time to get around the relevant decisions of the United Nations and to prevent a truly peaceful solution, to implant their neo-colonialist puppet régime and to step up terror against the people. Sometimes one gets the impression that in the course of talks it has been forgotten that South Africa is the occupying Power, while SWAPO is the representative of the oppressed people fighting for their freedom. Pretoria has

been virtually encouraged to carry out in Namibia the so-called internal settlement, which is similar to the one that was carried out in Southern Rhodesia. The Government of South Africa scarcely conceals its joy at the desire of certain circles in the United States and the United Kingdom to repeal the sanctions against the racist régime of Southern Rhodesia and to recognize the neo-colonialist puppet Government.

71. The aggressive actions of South Africa, carried out from the Territory of Namibia against sovereign neighbouring States, as well as the aggressive actions of Southern Rhodesia, have seriously aggravated the situation in the area. Having proclaimed the concept of creating groupings of States, South Africa has thus laid claim to hegemony, which it is trying to attain by creating puppet régimes in Namibia and Southern Rhodesia. Furthermore, the statements made by the racists have left no doubt that their aim is to include free African States in that bloc by means of the historically notorious policy of forced union, or “fusion”. All this amounts to an exacerbation of tension in southern Africa, which has long been a constant threat to international peace and security.

72. Imperialist circles never tire of repeating that the efforts of certain States members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization [NATO] made with a view to bringing about a so-called peaceful settlement are, so they believe, nothing but attempts by neutral States that have no part in the conflict to “rescue” Namibia. In actual fact, what we see is something quite different.

73. United Nations studies submitted by the Commission on Transnational Corporations, which is currently in session, have shown that the number of firms with “capital investments and interests” in South Africa increased from 1,623 in 1974 to 2,883 last year. In the period 1977-1978 alone, one study states, the number of United States monopolies operating where *apartheid* prevails increased by 10 per cent.

74. From the report submitted in March of this year to the United Nations Special Committee against *Apartheid*⁶ it emerges that 382 banks of imperialist States have in the period 1972 to the end of 1978 lent the racist régime of South Africa sums of money amounting to \$5.5 billion. First and foremost are the banks of the Federal Republic of Germany, the United Kingdom, the United States, France and Switzerland. The press organs of the Springer concern, in the Federal Republic of Germany, have not concealed their sympathy with the white racists in Windhoek, which have taken a leaf out of the book of Hitlerite fascism. Nuclear co-operation between monopolies of NATO States and South Africa is in full swing, as has been so cogently demonstrated by the seminar of the United Nations Special Committee against *Apartheid* with regard to nuclear co-operation with South Africa. What is happening is not a so-called “peaceful settlement”, nor a “model of salvation”. What is happening is the salvation of monopolist profits, imperialist spheres of influence and the privilege of white colonialists. And herein lies

⁶ Corporate Data Exchange, Inc., “Bank Loans to South Africa, 1972-1978” in Notes and Documents of the United Nations Centre against *Apartheid*, No. 5/79 (May 1979).

the true reason for the feverish haste with which certain circles, distorting Security Council resolution 385 (1976), have been preparing plans for a neo-colonialist settlement and have staged various manoeuvres to obstruct a true solution to the Namibian problem. Attempts are being made to assert that the primary question is whether the problem of Namibia should be resolved peacefully or by the language of warfare, and although such an interpretation of the situation is significant in itself, it does not go to the essence of the problem. The important thing is the objective sought. If the goal is an independent and free Namibia, then South Africa should leave that country. If the occupying Power is unwilling to leave, then it must be compelled to leave, and every possible means available to the liberation movement and the international community must be used. That is only logical. Thus any party that does not want to apply United Nations means of enforcement in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter is unwilling to bring about an independent Namibia and is aiming at other objectives.

Mr. Urquía (El Salvador), Vice-President, took the Chair.

75. Those circles that support South Africa want to undermine SWAPO's role and are trying to raise the international prestige of the puppet groupings in Namibia illegally created by Pretoria, and those circles, like the South African racist régime, bear responsibility for the fact that elections have been held in extremely ominous circumstances.

76. The delegation of the German Democratic Republic remains convinced that Security Council resolution 385 (1976) is a general basis for a solution to the Namibian problem. That means the withdrawal of South Africa from Namibia, the freeing of political detainees and guaranteeing **the right of the people of Namibia to self-determination** and the territorial integrity of their country. We support SWAPO, the sole legitimate representative of the Namibian people. In its difficult and selfless struggle, SWAPO is not alone. All the progressive forces of the world are linked with it by close ties of solidarity. There has been a perceptible increase in its international authority and its battleworthiness. Naturally, at the present time, in view of racist and imperialist manoeuvres, SWAPO has been forced to step up the armed struggle that has been imposed upon it.

77. The liberation struggle in Namibia and Zimbabwe has entered a decisive phase. The racist régimes cannot any longer maintain the harshest forms of implementation of their present power. The main issue today is whether these peoples will manage to achieve genuine independence or whether they will have imposed upon them neo-colonialist pseudo-solutions. There can be no doubt that the United Nations must assume considerable responsibility in this process. Primarily, it must adopt urgent measures to avert a further exacerbation of the dangerous situation in the south of Africa and also promote the cause of the independence and liberation of the people of Namibia. That course has been indicated by resolutions of the Security Council and of the General Assembly—and that course should be taken. But this is only possible if pressure upon South Africa is increased. The Charter of the United Nations provides for appropriate measures. The delegation of the German

Democratic Republic wishes to urge with the utmost insistence that the sanctions provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter be applied against South Africa, something which has already been called for in General Assembly resolution 33/182 of 21 December 1978.

78. Mr. BOYA (Benin) (*interpretation from French*): The resumption of the thirty-third session of the General Assembly to discuss the question of Namibia is taking place at a time when the struggle of the brave Namibian people, under the firm and resolute leadership of SWAPO is entering its most critical phase and when the enemies of Africa are redoubling their ruses and subterfuges and trying to implement all sorts of plans designed to obstruct the real independence of the peoples of southern Africa. In the debates taking place now we must analyse this situation in all its complexity so as to enable the international community, which is responsible for leading the Namibian people to full independence, to adopt the necessary measures to safeguard the legitimate interests of the Namibian people, and enable it to enjoy its inalienable rights to self-determination and independence.

79. My delegation doubts not that Mr. Liévano of Colombia will guide our debates with the objectivity and dynamism necessary to arrive at satisfactory results.

80. The Benin revolution has been aware from the outset that it constitutes a link in the great chain of the African revolution and therefore everything that concerns the freedom and independence of African peoples directly concerns the Benin revolution. The special attention which our democratic and popular revolution gives to the serious events taking place in southern Africa, and particularly Namibia, can therefore surprise no one.

81. Our delegation has unequivocally made known its position on the question of Namibia in the debates both in the General Assembly and in the Security Council. We expressed our profound scepticism regarding the diplomatic initiative of the five Western Powers, which were then members of the Security Council, an initiative whose first purpose was to mark time, to distract Africa from the real problems of the time and to demobilize SWAPO politically and liquidate it militarily in the field.

82. When at the time the delegation of Benin denounced this Machiavellian strategy, we were bombarded with epithets and given all sorts of labels, such as intransigent and radical, but today everybody, including those who seemed to have been afflicted with political shortsightedness, now clearly see the game being played by the Western Powers and their protégés, the Pretoria racists. Everything points to the fact that the Machiavellian plan was cunningly concocted by the imperialist Powers and their protégés, and is now about to be realized. Defying international public opinion, and while negotiations to find a "peaceful" solution to the problem of Namibia were under way, South Africa unilaterally organized sham elections in Namibia in December last, and is now preparing to confer legislative and executive powers on the so-called Constituent Assembly.

83. Thus there is a real threat that the Namibian people will have imposed on it an internal settlement on the

Rhodesian model, with the installation of a puppet government given over heart and soul to the Botha régime and to the defence of the interests of international imperialism.

84. The minority and Fascist régime of South Africa will then have fulfilled its dream of creating a safety belt around South Africa, including the puppet régimes installed in Rhodesia and in Namibia and “certain African States of the region which have economic ties with it” to quote Squire Botha’s own words.

85. Last month the international community learned, with indignation, that the Salisbury racists and their straw men had just proceeded to a sham election, and expressed the hope that no organ emerging from these so-called elections would be recognized. We are impelled to express our concern over the pressure being exercised by certain reactionary imperialist circles in the United States and the United Kingdom for official recognition of that illegal régime.

86. Indeed, the British Conservative Government, since it came to power, has unceasingly taken regrettable initiatives to prepare the way for this forthcoming recognition of the puppet Muzorewa Government. Otherwise, what is the meaning of the appointment of a diplomatic representative to Salisbury? What is the meaning of all these official contacts which come one after the other between Mrs. Thatcher’s government and that of the illegal Salisbury régime? Why does the United Kingdom, the administering Power, hesitate before an illegal political process carried out by an illegal régime? Need one make much of an effort to demonstrate the illegality of these elections and of this majority government. Likewise, in the United States, despite action and negotiations by the African group of States in New York and in Washington, reactionary circles never stop increasing their pressure to lift the sanctions decreed by the Security Council, of which the United States and the United Kingdom are permanent members.

87. The illegal process of the spurious independence in Southern Rhodesia of necessity encourages South Africa in its design to go ahead and proceed to a unilateral declaration of independence by the puppets of the Democratic Turnhalle Alliance in Namibia.

88. Furthermore, everything combines to make us fear this tragic outcome. In flagrant violation of all the General Assembly and Security Council resolutions, Pretoria is continuing its illegal occupation of Namibia and increasing its military forces there, which now number approximately 75,000 troops, and, from these bases in the Territory, it is committing acts of aggression against neighbouring independent African States aimed at making them renounce their support for national liberation movements.

89. Moreover, Pretoria has massed a strong army all along its border with Angola, and this is a constant threat to the stability, peace and territorial integrity of that country.

90. The situation created in Namibia by the Pretoria racists has thus become explosive and poses a threat to international peace and security. The independent African States, particularly the front-line States and the liberation

movements of southern Africa—the Patriotic Front, SWAPO and the African National Congress of South Africa—will never agree to yield to the dictates of the racist régimes of Pretoria and Salisbury. And if a really satisfactory solution taking into account the legitimate interests of the Namibian people is not found soon, this explosive situation might degenerate into a general conflagration, for which Africans would not bear the responsibility. The time has therefore come for the international community to act. For more than two years the imperialist Powers have loudly touted the so-called negotiations with South Africa, SWAPO and “all interested parties”, on the basis of what it has been agreed to call the “Western plan for a peaceful settlement”. While that plan—with all its imperfections—had been accepted by SWAPO at the cost of very heavy sacrifices and by the front-line African States, the slippery Vorster régime, at times accepting the plan and at others rejecting it, has benefited from these two years of “negotiations”, with the complicity of the imperialist Powers, which gave it all the necessary financial, military and diplomatic assistance to strengthen its position in the field. It proceeded to commit more frequent and deadly acts of aggression against Angola, Zambia and Botswana with the purpose of destroying the fighters of SWAPO and of creating difficulties for the countries which give them assistance, so as to make them accept the fait accompli.

91. If South Africa has thus been able until now to flout the international community with such arrogance, refusing to implement the various relevant Security Council and General Assembly resolutions, which are intended solely to seek a peaceful solution to this problem, it is because it feels strong enough to do so because of the support and encouragement it has been receiving from its masters, the Western imperialist Powers. Need we repeat that South Africa would be nothing without the massive economic and military assistance of the imperialists. It could never have survived, any more than the rebel Salisbury régime, if the sanctions imposed against it had been respected and scrupulously applied by all countries, particularly those which maintain major economic relations and collaborate militarily with it. Now the Western Powers can no longer continue to delay; they must put an end to their duplicity and understand that their long-term interests reside in friendship and co-operation with the African peoples and not in blind support for the inveterate Pretoria and Salisbury racists, who will sooner or later be cast out in the waste-basket of history.

92. It is high time for the five Western Powers to realize that they can no longer continue to work towards the total failure of their own diplomatic initiative if they do not wish to allow the situation in Namibia to worsen from day to day.

93. If the Western Powers are really prompted by a genuine will to co-operate with Africa on the basis of the principle of reciprocal advantages, they must support action by the international community for effective application of the provisions and measures contained in the many relevant resolutions already adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council.

94. As for the international community, it must reaffirm its solidarity with and increase its assistance to the

Namibian people and SWAPO, the sole authentic representative of that people recognized by the Organization of African Unity and the United Nations, in their just struggle to obtain genuine self-determination, freedom and independence.

95. It is time for the United Nations to reaffirm its responsibility on the subject and urgently take measures that will bring the racist minority régime of Pretoria to comply with the decisions of our Organization.

96. To support the action of the international community in this critical period for the Namibian people is to call for and support the application against South Africa of the measures provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter, in particular comprehensive economic sanctions, which is the only way to prevent a catastrophe in Namibia and the internationalization of a local colonial conflict, to stop the racist minority Pretoria régime from being able to mock the international community and to enable our Organization to play its role of guarantor of international peace and security.

97. The delegation of the People's Republic of Benin is convinced that, with the effective support of the international community and the armed struggle of SWAPO, the victory of the Namibian people and of the majority in South Africa is inevitable. We wish here to pay a special tribute to the firm determination of SWAPO and its tireless efforts to overcome the numerous obstacles in the path of independence and freedom.

98. The People's Republic of Benin, which is victoriously carrying out the democratic and popular revolution, is in total solidarity with the struggle of the Namibian people, a struggle which we shall continue to support by every means and at the cost of any sacrifice.

99. Ready for the revolution; ready for production; the struggle continues.

100. Miss LOPEZ (Venezuela) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The persistence of the racist Pretoria régime in attempting arbitrarily to guide the destiny of the people of Namibia and to consolidate its illegal occupation of and presence in the Territory of Namibia has compelled us to meet again in our common desire to find a solution to one of the most complex and shameful problems which the history of international relations has ever known.

101. We cannot but repeat here our position, which we have explained at length in various forums. Because the position of Venezuela with regard to the case of Namibia is well known and unequivocal, we shall confine ourselves to a study of the recent events which have occurred in Namibia as a result of the intolerable actions taken by South Africa in that Territory and which are bringing the entire region of southern Africa to the brink of an international conflict of enormous proportions.

102. We are facing an extremely difficult situation, since, for the Government of *apartheid*, the decisions of the United Nations, in particular those of the Security Council, are but objects of scorn and mockery—a position of defiance that is not foreign to the complicity of a group of

countries which has enabled South Africa permanently to maintain its illegal occupation and deprive the indigenous population of its right to self-determination, the enjoyment of the most basic human rights and even of the natural resources legitimately belonging to them.

103. Recent events that have occurred as a result of the illegal elections held in December and unilaterally devised by the racist régime so as to establish the improperly named Constituent Assembly cause us grave concern. Even before that gross manoeuvre, Venezuela, as a member of the Security Council, had voted in favour of resolution 439 (1978), which was adopted last December, condemning the decision of the Government of South Africa to hold such elections, which were considered by the Security Council to be null and void. We cannot accept any electoral process in Namibia held without United Nations supervision and control.

104. Regrettably, the South African actions were carried out, thus casting overboard all the efforts for a settlement outlined in the plan previously presented by the five Western members of the Security Council, a plan that in turn had as its foundation the principles stipulated in resolution 385 (1976), which was recalled by that important United Nations organ in resolution 435 (1978), also supported by Venezuela.

105. New events have brought to light the desire of Pretoria to disregard the United Nations plans for the independence of Namibia. The attempts by the South African Government to give the so-called Constituent Assembly of Windhoek legislative and executive powers cannot but astound and exacerbate the wrath of the international community.

106. It would seem in the present circumstances that South Africa is bent on destroying every effort to arrive at a negotiated settlement, by unilateral actions without consultation, so that there is no choice but to carry on with the brave struggle waged for many years by the majority movement in Namibia, namely, SWAPO. Support for this movement must be spurred by more decisive action on the part of the United Nations which would lead to a strict application of the sanctions envisaged in Chapter VII of the Charter. Such action was anticipated in resolution 33/182 B, which was adopted last autumn by this Assembly and which was, it goes without saying, supported by Venezuela.

107. Venezuela, as a member of the United Nations Council for Namibia, which is the legitimate authority responsible for the administration of that Territory, joins all peoples and Governments in the world which demand the immediate liberation of the Namibian patriots imprisoned by the despotic *apartheid* régime.

108. On the occasion of this resumed session of the Assembly, we must shoulder our collective responsibilities in view of the tragedy taking place in Namibia and not allow the opportunity to pass without adopting crucial decisions which will enable the people of Namibia to achieve genuine independence, free from any alien domination, and the free exercise of the rights that are legitimately

theirs, in accordance with the premises of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV):

109. Finally, we are profoundly concerned at the tendency of some Governments to compromise with racist régimes. This tendency could condemn us to confrontation with the African continent and to a leap into the unknown; into the unwanted.

110. The manner in which some countries systematically disregard the role of the United Nations indicates to us that they intend to try to solve the problems outside our Organization, thus competing with the plans which they themselves have proposed within the United Nations.

111. The failure of the Western plan, which had been approved by the Security Council and supported by Venezuela, a result of sincerity and goodwill, must not now become proof of the slight regard some countries have for the United Nations and for the commitments entered into therein, for that would cause a public impugning of our Organization and attacks on it by the Western press and would benefit some countries with easily measurable economic interests, which are the ones that really matter to the friends and supporters of South Africa and its abominable *apartheid* policy in southern Africa.

112. I should like to announce at this time that Venezuela has joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/33/L.37, which has just been distributed.

113. Mr. FOUM (United Republic of Tanzania): The General Assembly has convened once more to consider the question of Namibia. It is a session in which the United Nations will once again have to reaffirm its responsibilities for Namibia and its determination to fulfil its sacred trust, so that the people of Namibia may achieve freedom and independence. This responsibility and obligation of the international community is all the more compelling today, given the circumstances that prevail in and around the international Territory, for the Assembly is meeting at a time when the negotiations to bring about a settlement, in accordance with Security Council resolution 385 (1976), have reached an impasse because of the intransigence of the racist minority régime in Pretoria. Clearly, therefore, this Assembly meeting could not have been held at a more opportune time. We welcome the session with the hope that in reassessing our efforts we shall equally review our past hopes and expectations, which have now been clearly frustrated, and rededicate our resources to a more practical way of achieving genuine independence for the Namibian people.

114. My delegation considers that this session is taking place at a time when the United Nations faces one of its greatest challenges, for the will of the international community, expressed through our United Nations collective effort, is called upon to withstand the challenge posed by the racist régime of South Africa—a challenge which threatens the credibility of our Organization as a viable instrument for promoting international peace and security. It is the sincere hope of the Tanzanian delegation that this Assembly will respond to this challenge with commensurate action.

115. The last two years have witnessed concerted efforts aimed at achieving a negotiated settlement of the Namibian question. In supporting the initiative of the five Western Powers in this direction, SWAPO, supported by the Organization for African Unity, was conscious of its responsibilities to do its utmost and explore all possible avenues in order to attain the liberation of Namibia with the minimum of bloodshed, suffering and sacrifice. Throughout this exercise, neither SWAPO nor those of us that supported them had any illusions about South Africa's motives, deceit and double-dealings. Yet the road to negotiation was pursued with earnestness and dedication in the hope that, despite South Africa's known intransigence, those Western Governments with massive economic and other ties with that régime would use their considerable leverage with Pretoria in order to compel the authorities there to comply with the decisions of the United Nations, and more particularly Security Council resolution 385 (1976).

116. On embarking on this road, we solemnly committed ourselves to the ideal of negotiation and thus to a less violent resolution of the problem. We realized, as it is indeed clear, that in the pursuit of these ideals concessions would be inevitable. We were prepared to pay that price because we were convinced that a peaceful solution that would ensure genuine freedom and independence was worth the effort. No one can deny that in this whole exercise SWAPO demonstrated tremendous flexibility and leaned to a point beyond which it is now practically impossible to go. To SWAPO, therefore, it was more than a concession. It was an expression of faith and trust in the United Nations and a noble effort to bring to an end the suffering that the people of Namibia have endured for so long. SWAPO did, in fact, continue with the negotiations, even when confronted with murderous attacks by South Africa against Namibian civilians and SWAPO militants as well as the repeated barbarous acts of aggression committed against the front-line States of Zambia and Angola. I need not recount the actions that demonstrate the seriousness displayed by SWAPO in the negotiating process as these are self-evident. But South Africa has remained defiant—defiant of the will of the international community, and no less defiant to the very Western Powers that have initiated the proposal culminating in the adoption of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). And yet, ironically, it is these very Powers that continue to proffer to the South African régime extensive support, thus providing Pretoria with the means of perpetuating its intransigence and effrontery.

117. What is even more disturbing about the recent developments in Namibia is the over-all behaviour and deceitful attitude of the South African régime towards the negotiating process for, while claiming and professing a willingness to negotiate, the illegal occupiers of the international Territory have proceeded with the consolidation of their repressive rule in Namibia. They have used the negotiations as a cover-up to create "new facts" and "new realities" in the Territory.

118. Shortly after the special session last year, the racist régime undertook to appoint an "Administrator-General". Then, subsequent to the adoption of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which, *inter alia*, provided for the establishment of the United Nations Transition Assistance

Group that will prepare for and hold elections under United Nations supervision, South Africa proceeded with its unilateral elections, as a result of which a so-called "Constituent Assembly" or "National Assembly" has been established. It is clear that the racist régime is continuing to bestow extensive legislative and executive powers upon this new arm of coercion contrived on the basis of those illegal and bogus elections. This will continue to be used as a smoke-screen for its continued callous and brutal repression. In fact, the events we see now unfolding in Namibia bear a striking resemblance to the machinations of the Smith minority régime in Salisbury. It is a clear road to the establishment of a similar "internal settlement", which is nothing but a process of bantustanizing Namibia. It is thus the duty of this Assembly to arrest the situation before we see another unilateral declaration of independence in Namibia by the surrogates of South Africa.

119. Attempts to translate the Secretary-General's plan into action through the United Nations Transition Assistance Group have repeatedly been frustrated by the usual vacillations and deceptive tactics of Pretoria through its ambivalent and contradictory press campaigns, coupled with increased repression in Namibia and aggression outside. The South African racist régime has unleashed a new wave of aggression against neighbouring front-line States. It is not unknown why these attacks have escalated as the process of consultations by both SWAPO and the front-line States to secure the implementation of the relevant Security Council resolutions has intensified. It is within the murderous designs of the racist and *apartheid* régime that such callous acts, resulting in the destruction of property and the massacre of innocent civilians and children, come at the crucial stage of the initiative of the Secretary-General to pave the way for the Transition Assistance Group's assumption of its duties in Namibia. It is a premeditated design to forestall the negotiating process and an attempt to frustrate the efforts of the international community. The United Republic of Tanzania has consistently condemned such displays of arrogance and total contempt of the will of the international community by the régime in South Africa.

120. Symptomatic of South Africa's clear obstruction and, indeed, virtual closure of the path to negotiation is the rate of repression, brutal killings and arbitrary imprisonment of SWAPO cadres and sympathizers inside Namibia. The recent imposition of martial law and the declaration of a state of emergency over two thirds of Namibian territory are calculated more to intensify the racist régime's acts of terrorism and banditry against the Namibian people under the guise of maintaining "law and order". The terror imposed upon the Namibian people and the fraudulent and obstructionist machinations to sabotage the United Nations plan for a negotiated settlement in Namibia have been characteristic of South Africa's Draconian style of negotiation. This sustained state of terror, the continued destruction of property and the establishment of more concentration camps in Namibia cannot be deemed to be conducive to a peaceful process towards independence. Equally, the imposition of the "Assembly" is a calculated perversion of the process towards genuine independence and must be treated for what it is—merely yet another tool in South Africa's arsenal to perpetuate the illegal occupation and colonization of Namibia.

121. Let me reiterate that this resumed session is faced with a challenge and must thus consider commensurate action. It should consider how South Africa can maintain such a notorious position of displaying utter arrogance and contempt for the international community and get away with it. Virtually all Members of this Organization have expressed the political will to ensure the attainment by the people of Namibia of their freedom and independence. It is now time that this political will be translated into concrete action to ensure that the South African régime complies with the just demands of the people of Namibia, and that it conforms to the demands of the international community for a truly independent Namibia.

122. Those Western countries with extensive political and economic links with South Africa, more especially the five Western Powers at whose initiative the negotiations of the last two years have taken place, have in this respect a particular responsibility. In many ways these countries provide an economic lifeline for the Pretoria régime. Thus their attitude and actions toward this calculated defiance of South Africa will have a direct bearing on the nature of the evolution of events, not only with respect to Namibia, but indeed the whole of southern Africa. We call upon them to join with the rest of the international community so that the United Nations objectives in Namibia should be realized. We call upon them to desist from frustrating meaningful enforcement action by the Security Council aimed at using the full weight of the Charter to secure compliance by South Africa with the Council's own decisions, for it would be both absurd and tragic for this Organization to continue allowing South Africa to use the process of negotiation as a platform to demonstrate its defiance and affront to the international community while consolidating its illegal occupation of Namibian territory.

123. Mr. MAINA (Kenya): It is not by accident the General Assembly is holding this resumed session at this time of the year. Indeed, the Assembly could as easily have disposed of this item during the earlier resumed session in January. In our view, the timing was meant to give a chance to South Africa to implement the agreement it reached with the five Powers on the procedure for bringing to an end its unlawful occupation of Namibia.

124. The plan, apparently accepted by South Africa more than a year ago on the premise that the United Nations and SWAPO would not accept it, became a stumbling-block to South Africa's intentions for continued illegal occupation of Namibia. Therefore, South Africa created contemptible excuses to back out of the plan and to accuse the Secretary-General and SWAPO falsely of breaches of faith and agreement. To anyone interested in these developments, it is quite obvious that South Africa has openly taken measures in breach of the agreement and good faith. South Africa intensified tension by unleashing an attack on the Kasanga refugee camp in Angola when the plan was being promulgated. South Africa proceeded to organize internal elections and governmental authorities in Namibia contrary to the spirit and intention of the plan. South Africa continued to organize internal puppet groups to oppose the United Nations and to pretend to grant those puppets independence and obviously to support them against the United Nations.

125. As a prelude to this session, a day before the session opened, South Africa addressed a letter to the Secretary-General which can be regarded as the final act of withdrawal from the plan of the five countries and a declaration of the new policy and plan of creating client, satellite States in southern Africa which would depend entirely on South Africa for their existence and survival. This is our reading of the *laager* mentality statement of the Prime Minister of South Africa quoted in the final part of that letter which reads:

“If South Africa is to be punished and victimized for its honourable and firm commitment to its assurances and undertakings toward the inhabitants of a neighbouring State, it is prepared to accept the consequences of its viewpoint rather than follow the path of dishonour and be branded by the nations of southern Africa as an unreliable neighbour prepared to place its own transitory salvation above the interests of the other nations of the region.”⁷

126. In our view the plan of the five countries is dead and buried, and the United Nations is no further than it was three years ago when the five undertook their voluntary private initiative on behalf of the United Nations. The United Nations has given well-deserved credit to the five countries by endorsing their plan and by giving the Secretary-General all the support he needed to implement that plan. The response of the South African régime, in our view, has been negative and final. Therefore, the United Nations should resume the initiative and take appropriate measures to evict South Africa from Namibia.

127. When the United Nations addresses itself to the question of what should be done to end the illegal occupation of Namibia, or to bring about an end to the crime of *apartheid*, it becomes seized with violent divisions of a kind which threaten the Organization itself. We partly saw this when the Assembly adopted the report of the Credentials Committee leading to the exclusion of the delegation of that régime from this session [A/33/350/Add.1]. Indeed some of the speeches made in explanation of the vote of those Member States which cast negative votes were so threatening in tone that a comment or two would help to set the record straight.

128. We have no doubt at all that the decisions taken by the General Assembly in 1974 and this year to exclude a delegation whose credentials are rejected are correct and firmly based on the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. We should point out also that the provisions of the Charter regarding the expulsion of a Member which has persistently violated the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, as South Africa has done, are very specific and clearly spelled out in Article 6 of the Charter. In our view, the admission and exclusion of Members are procedural matters of the United Nations, and the use of the veto in the Security Council on these matters is an abuse of the spirit of the Charter.

⁷ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-fourth Year, Supplement for January, February and March 1979*, document S/13148.

129. The records of the United Nations relating to the observance of the mandatory sanctions against Southern Rhodesia, and the voluntary ones against South Africa, are replete with many instances of breaches, some clandestine, some blatant. The correlation between the votes against the report of the Credentials Committee and the record of violation of the sanctions makes quite an interesting study. Few if any of those who accuse others of acting illegally can stand up and say they have not violated the provisions of the Charter and the specific legal obligations deriving from it. Indeed we believe these strictures are being put out now as a tentative base on which to build opposition to any action the United Nations proposes to bring to an end the illegal occupation of Namibia by the *apartheid* régime of South Africa. We view in the same light the provocative appearance of South Africa in the General Assembly when its delegation did not appear in September last year or at any time since 1975. Why send a delegation now, if not to set the stage for more planned outrages? We shall wait and see.

130. In our view the United Nations has come to the critical point of decision and action. There is no alternative left other than to take firm measures to bring to an end the illegal occupation of Namibia by the *apartheid* régime of South Africa. We consider the time has come for the Security Council to adopt enforcement measures to this end; otherwise it will be impossible to escape the charge of complicity in the continued illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa. My delegation will support any measures proposed to this end.

131. Mr. DA LUZ (Cape Verde) (*interpretation from French*): Permit me first to congratulate the General Assembly on the firmness with which it reacted to one further act of provocation on the part of South Africa which, deliberately and in an act of indescribable insolence, on 23 May last occupied one of the seats in our Assembly. The voting on the report of the Credentials Committee [99th meeting] is conclusive proof that the international community is keeping a close watch on all the manoeuvres of the South African régime, which is seeking desperately to use all possible means to replace the true representatives of the Namibian people.

132. My delegation is gratified at the President's firmness in solving the problem, something which strengthens your reputation for wisdom and effectiveness which you demonstrated in the course of the first part of the thirty-third session of the General Assembly.

133. I should like to take this opportunity to pay a tribute to our Secretary-General, Mr. Kurt Waldheim, for his devotion and his tireless efforts in the cause of the total liberation of Namibia.

134. Permit me to congratulate the United Nations Council for Namibia which, in its role as administrator of this Territory, has spared no effort over the 11 years it has been in existence to achieve work which has won our respect and consideration.

135. We should also like to express our admiration for and solidarity with the front-line States which, although they have been victims of the most brutal acts of aggression and

have suffered incalculable economic hardship, have been unstinting in their unconditional support for the freedom fighters who, in their just, armed liberation struggle, have found in them a reliable rearguard.

136. There is no way of exaggerating the importance of this session which is taking place at precisely the time when the international community has once again been faced with an intolerable act of defiance by the South African racists who, with their customary lack of respect for our Organization, have been attempting to perpetuate their domination over the Namibian people. The recent electoral farce so vigorously condemned by us all declared null and void by this Assembly and by the Security Council, is about to achieve its objectives. The South African régime is determined to impose upon us a Rhodesian-style solution, that is to say, a unilateral declaration of independence.

137. Although we know that this act is born of the despair of South Africa—the prisoner of the contradictions of its own régime which internally is fighting the threat of recession and is incapable of resolving the dispute between the business community, connected with the great international monopolies, and the farmers, in a dispute over slave labour—nevertheless this is a criminal manoeuvre which should be most vigorously repudiated by us all.

138. It is encouraging to note that the international community has been following with justifiable concern the most recent events in this region of our continent and has attached to them the importance warranted by their gravity. However, along with this feeling of encouragement, we also feel indignation and we are inevitably driven to ask ourselves—as indeed we ask all representatives here—how much longer we are going to tolerate the arrogant defiance of Mr. Botha and his companions, and how much longer we are going to permit these international criminals to continue to prevent our Organization from performing its historic task of restoring to the Namibian people freedom and sovereignty over their Territory.

139. SWAPO, which symbolizes the deepest aspirations to independence of Namibia and which, through its heroic liberation struggle, has already created the necessary internal conditions for the sovereignty of the people which it legitimately represents, continues to evince political maturity and calm by collaborating constantly in the search for solutions, and this is something which has won the respect and esteem of us all.

140. But we should declare unambiguously that we cannot ask any more of SWAPO, whose tolerance and spirit of conciliation are only too well known, though they have certainly reached the outermost limits of concession.

141. For its part, South Africa, with total disdain for the positions of our Organization and particularly, *inter alia*, Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 439 (1978), persists in occupying its illegal bases in Namibia as a spring-board for aggression against neighbouring countries, persists in pursuing, arresting and killing Namibian patriots members of SWAPO, and persists in failing to give up its intentions to annex Walvis Bay.

142. Furthermore, in recent statements we have noted with great concern that the illegal administration of South Africa in Namibia intends to accord sovereign Powers to the pseudo-Assembly of Windhoek, thus attempting to perpetuate colonialist domination and exploitation in Namibia by setting up a puppet régime composed of tribal elements and supporters of racism and *apartheid*.

143. This racist policy of repression being carried out by the South African authorities, far from facilitating either the work of the United Nations Council for Namibia in its role as legal administrator, or indeed diplomatic initiatives designed to narrow the differences between the parties to the conflict—that is to say, South Africa, which is illegally occupying the Territory of Namibia, and SWAPO, the sole and legitimate representative of the Namibian people—constitutes rather a long-term threat to peace in the region. However, this attitude, which is not in the least surprising to us, is something we are not going to waste much time in regretting. It is entirely consistent with the very essence of *apartheid* and is part of the internal logic of that régime.

144. However, there still remains the problem of substance. How are we going to break this deadlock? How are we going to prevent South Africa from perpetuating its criminal acts against the people of Namibia, and how are we going to react against the defiance with which we are constantly faced? Whether we like it or not, the international community owes these replies to the people of Namibia and, in accordance with the compromises reached either in the General Assembly or in the Security Council, it is now urgent that, in the course of this very session, firm and consistent measures be adopted in order to cut this international cancer from our conscience; otherwise, we run the risk of sitting in the dock along with the other accused.

145. We shall not go on and on analysing situations and facts which are only too familiar to us all. I should merely like to propose measures which my delegation believes to be indispensable if the people of Namibia are to exercise as soon as possible their inalienable rights to self-determination and total independence under the leadership of SWAPO.

146. The first measure we believe to be fundamental is for the United Nations to reaffirm unequivocally its responsibility in this area and to commit itself by all the means available to it to thwart any attempt at a unilateral declaration of independence. Having said this, we propose that freedom be returned to all political detainees and that all refugees who so wish should be able to return home, that the racist occupation troops should abandon the Territory of Namibia and that authentic elections under the aegis of the United Nations be held as soon as possible.

147. Furthermore, if South Africa persists in its delaying tactics in order to cover with ridicule all the attempts at a negotiated solution of the problem of Namibia, the Security Council should meet as soon as possible to adopt against South Africa appropriate measures which should include those provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter.

148. Furthermore, all those Members able to do so should make available to SWAPO all necessary means, including military means, so that it can unswervingly wage its

liberation struggle for its country in any way it deems necessary, in particular by armed struggle.

149. In conclusion, permit me to reaffirm to the Namibian people, who are fighting for their independence, and to their vanguard, SWAPO, that the Republic of Cape Verde will continue always to accord them all possible militant solidarity and it will support all forms of struggle which they may deem necessary to resort to for the reconquest of their historic rights and for the building of a prosperous country, a happy country, free from all forms of colonialism and neo-colonialism.

150. Mr. MESTIRI (Tunisia) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, at this time when we are considering the question of Namibia, in keeping with the provisions of resolution 33/182 A adopted by the Assembly on 21 December last, the situation in the Territory is continuing to develop dangerously, and may lead to developments with the most serious consequences, especially following the recent initiatives of the South African Government in defiance of the valid aspirations of the Namibian people and the repeated condemnations of the international community.

151. South Africa's decision to implement its own "internal settlement" plan dangerously aggravates the situation. This initiative, inspired directly by the Rhodesian model, has as its sole aim preparing the way for a unilateral declaration of independence. It is, moreover, a further demonstration of the stubborn refusal of the South African Government to abide by the resolutions of the United Nations, especially Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978).

152. In so doing, the South African Government is once more revealing its true intention of continuing its policy of illegal occupation of the Territory of Namibia and the exploitation of its resources.

153. By imposing a bogus government in Namibia in the form of the Democratic Turnhalle Alliance, against the will of the Namibian people, South Africa is confirming the views of those who have always doubted its sincere intention of accepting the implementation of a settlement plan negotiated with the United Nations.

154. Everyone is aware that South Africa, despite the many appeals by the international community, has always found a way to place obstacles in the path of any attempt at a peaceful solution based on the recognition of the legitimate rights of the Namibian people to self-determination, freedom and independence.

155. South Africa's intransigence, its numerous delaying tactics and its ever more brutal repression against the Namibian people are aimed at the perpetuation of the racist régime of *apartheid* and the establishment at the beck and call of the Government of South Africa of a "regional group of States" forming what Prime Minister Botha calls a "geo-economic community of interests", a sort of white bastion behind the façade of internal settlements and so-called governments with black participation but professing a racism which is hardly concealed.

156. It is with great sadness that we see today, after more than two years of negotiations and patience, that no progress has been achieved towards resolving the problem of Pretoria's rejection of the independence of Namibia in keeping with the advisory opinion of 21 June 1971 by the International Court of Justice and the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council advocating the organization of free elections under the control and supervision of the United Nations.

157. Throughout these negotiations, which we are now convinced have been used by South Africa to attempt to undermine the struggle of the Namibian people, we hoped, in spite of all, that the South African Government would finally take a step in the direction of conciliation and wisdom.

158. But Pretoria's rejection of the Secretary-General's report dated 26 February 1979⁸ and the intransigence of the South African leaders during the talks conducted in New York on 19 and 20 March confirmed our fears as to the sincerity of South Africa and its will to implement the "negotiated settlement plan" approved by the Security Council in its resolution 435 (1978).

159. These talks, which were designed to reconcile the positions of the parties involved, have shown once more the deceit of the attitude of the South African Government in its refusal to put an end to its illegal occupation of Namibia and make it possible for the Namibian people freely to exercise its right to self-determination and independence.

160. At this critical stage in the Namibian situation, and at a time when the latest events in the Territory inspire heightened pessimism, urgent and effective action is needed. We must in fact do all in our power to induce the South African régime to abide by the law and by the resolutions of the United Nations.

161. The five Western Powers which have assumed great responsibility in preparing and adopting the settlement plan should demonstrate firmer political will and exert stronger pressure on the South African Government to induce it to accept the United Nations decisions. We are convinced that they are able to do so.

162. In the view of the Tunisian delegation, any attempt by the South African Government to establish a so-called "national assembly" or any other type of so-called "interim government" should be forcefully opposed and condemned because such an operation would violate international justice and legality and would add one more threat to an already explosive situation.

163. The implementation of such illegal measures would be a clear-cut violation of Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978).

164. Any settlement on the basis of the principle of co-sovereignty in Namibia is contrary to the decisions of our Organization and is aimed only at the perpetuation of the colonial régime in South Africa.

⁸ *Ibid.*, document S/13120.

165. In this respect all States and all Governments should now express their total refusal to recognize a government stemming from the so-called "Constituent Assembly", an assembly established following elections organized unilaterally by South Africa and already declared null and void by the Security Council in its resolution 439 (1978) and the General Assembly in its resolution 33/182 B.

166. Tunisia feels that any solution must necessarily be negotiated with SWAPO, the legitimate representative of the Namibian people, and with the participation of the United Nations, which has direct responsibility towards Namibia until it achieves genuine independence.

167. In any event, we cannot support any plan which does not involve the unconditional withdrawal of the unlawful South African administration from Namibian territory and the transfer of power to the Namibian people under the auspices of the United Nations and in conformity with Security Council resolution 385 (1976).

168. Recent manoeuvres by the South African Government and the ever more evident use of force to perpetuate the exploitation of the people and heritage of Namibia, its persistent defiance of the United Nations and, in particular, the authority of the Security Council, and its policy of aggression against neighbouring States are undoubtedly a grave threat to peace and security not only in Africa but throughout the world.

169. That is why the Security Council, whose authority has frequently been defied by the Pretoria leaders, should as soon as possible adopt forceful and effective measures under Chapter VII of the Charter to ensure implementation by South Africa of the provisions of the relevant United Nations resolutions.

170. In this connexion, we should like to take this opportunity to pay a tribute to the Secretary-General for his active role and attitude during the long and difficult negotiations among the parties concerned in order to lead Namibia to genuine independence.

171. We wish also to pay a tribute to the Council for Namibia, the only legal authority of Namibia, and to its President for their untiring efforts to help the Namibian people regain its freedom and dignity in a united Namibia.

172. Similarly, a special tribute must be paid to Mr. Ahtisaari for the part he has played and the far-sighted way he has carried out his mission.

173. While in Pretoria there is a pretence of peace talks, we are witnessing a sustained campaign by South Africa to destroy the national unity and territorial integrity of Namibia. While practising these delaying tactics the Pretoria Government has unleashed a new campaign of real terror in order to impose a bogus "government" on the Namibian people.

174. Since 27 April the South African police, by virtue of Proclamation AG 26, have embarked on a wave of mass arrests of SWAPO militants.

175. The arbitrary arrest and detention of anyone considered by the South African Government to be a "political threat to the régime" is one more demonstration of the repressive policy practised by Pretoria. The brutality of the South African régime aimed at establishing an atmosphere of intimidation only aggravates an already alarming situation.

176. In this decisive phase of the struggle of the Namibian people against oppression and colonialism the international community can no longer confine itself to a reaffirmation of the principles involved in the peaceful settlement of the conflict. It must now find ways and means of implementing the negotiated settlement approved by the Security Council, which remains valid since it is in keeping with the basic principles of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples [resolution 1514 (XV)] and of other United Nations resolutions.

177. In this context, two possibilities exist: either the five Western countries manage to exert their influence and induce South Africa to respect international legality, or the Security Council will have to decide on the application of the sanctions provided for in Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter.

178. We are confident that the Security Council will be able to discharge its responsibilities and that its permanent members who have played an active role in negotiating the settlement plan will not fail in what is the duty of all the members of the international community.

179. In conclusion, it would be regrettable, even dangerous, if the trust which the Namibian people have placed in the United Nations were betrayed. The failure of the negotiated settlement plan would be fraught with consequences not only for Namibia but also for all Africa and would seriously diminish the confidence of oppressed peoples in the peace initiatives of certain countries in particular and of the international community in general.

180. In any event, as in the past Tunisia will continue to give its full support for the freedom and independence of Namibia and to reaffirm its complete solidarity with SWAPO, the authentic representative of the Namibian people.

181. Mr. ALGÅRD (Norway): It is a matter of utmost concern to the Norwegian Government that the efforts to achieve a negotiated and peaceful settlement in Namibia have reached a critical impasse. The complex diplomatic undertaking by the five Western countries over the past two years has dramatically narrowed what seemed like insurmountable differences of opinion between SWAPO and South Africa as regards the road to independence for Namibia. As a result, the Secretary-General, in accordance with the mandate given him by the Security Council, has proposed in various reports how the implementation of the settlement plan should be proceeded with in order to provide for free and fair elections under United Nations supervision and control.

182. It is our understanding that the implementation plans presented by the Secretary-General have been accepted by

one of the negotiating parties, SWAPO, and that they enjoy the support of the five Western countries and the front-line States.

183. South Africa, on the other hand, continues to raise questions which in fact amount to obstructing the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia, and continues to proceed towards the implementation of an internal settlement in Namibia, in contravention of the letter and spirit of the Western negotiating efforts and the United Nations plan. The latest example is the establishment of a national assembly inside Namibia.

184. Another move by the South African authorities which gives reason for considerable concern and further complicates the possibility of a negotiated settlement is the recent wave of arrests and detentions of SWAPO officials and supporters. We demand their immediate and unconditional release.

185. Furthermore, it is also a matter of the utmost concern that South Africa continues its armed aggression against neighbouring countries. This practice cannot be condoned by the international community.

186. The policies of the South African Government in Namibia, and indeed in southern Africa as a whole, seriously threaten the peace and stability of the region and raise the prospect of future regional wars. These would entail increased suffering for the peoples and countries of the region and a potential internationalization of the problems facing that part of Africa.

187. The South African Government seems to believe that a policy of international confrontation will not prove damaging to South Africa's interests. It would be a very serious mistake for South African leaders to believe that confrontation policies would eventually produce a community of interest among South Africa and Western countries.

188. South Africa must be made to understand and accept that no solution can gain international recognition and ensure peaceful development in Namibia unless the following two principles are strictly observed: first, free and fair elections must be held under international supervision and control; and secondly, conditions must be created which allow for the equal and full participation of all political forces in the Territory.

189. At present we see no realistic way of achieving such a settlement except through continued and intensified negotiating efforts. If necessary, such efforts must be accompanied by demonstrated willingness to apply the forms of peaceful pressure available to the international community.

190. The Norwegian Government therefore urges that renewed and concerted international efforts be undertaken without further delay with a view to breaking the present deadlock in order to find a peaceful solution, in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which will allow for the emplacement of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group in Namibia at an early date.

191. Should South Africa continue to respond negatively to the international demand for a negotiated settlement, as proposed by the five Western countries and endorsed by the Security Council, such defiance will constitute a threat to international peace and security. Such a development must result in the adoption of international measures under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter. The United Nations has a special responsibility for Namibia and will have no choice but to implement a policy of international disengagement against South Africa until South Africa ends its illegal occupation of Namibia and allows free and fair elections under United Nations supervision and control.

The meeting rose at 6.25 p.m.