



CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 113: Financing of the United Nations peace-keeping forces in the Middle East ( <i>continued</i> ):	
(a) United Nations Emergency Force and United Nations Disengagement Observer Force: report of the Secretary-General Report of the Fifth Committee (part III) . . . . .	1243
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 . . .	1246

*President:* Mr. Indalecio LIEVANO (Colombia).

**AGENDA ITEM 113**

**Financing of the United Nations peace-keeping forces in the Middle East (*continued*):\***

**(a) United Nations Emergency Force and United Nations Disengagement Observer Force: report of the Secretary-General**

**REPORT OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE (PART III)  
(A/33/346/ADD.2)**

1. Mr. HAMZAH (Syrian Arab Republic), Rapporteur of the Fifth Committee (*interpretation from Arabic*): I have the honour to present to the General Assembly part III of the report of the Fifth Committee [A/33/346/Add.2], on agenda item 113 (a).<sup>1</sup> The Fifth Committee adopted draft resolutions A and B in paragraph 10 of the report by vote. Paragraph 1 of section I, and section II of draft resolution A, were adopted by separate votes. I should like to add that the delegation of Romania, which voted in favour, has been accidentally omitted from the voting record.

2. The Fifth Committee recommends to the General Assembly the adoption of draft resolutions A and B and hopes that the Assembly will act accordingly.

*Pursuant to rule 66 of the rules of procedure, it was decided not to discuss the report of the Fifth Committee.*

3. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I shall now call on those representatives that wish to explain their vote before the vote.

\* Resumed from the 68th meeting.

<sup>1</sup> For part I of the report of the Fifth Committee on agenda item 113, see the 44th meeting, paras. 23-24 and 60-97; for part II, the 68th meeting, paras. 10-21.

4. Mr. CERGA (Albania): The Albanian delegation wishes to explain its position in connexion with the draft resolutions contained in the report submitted by the Fifth Committee on the question of financing UNEF and UNDOF in the Middle East.

5. The United Nations has been discussing for many years now the question of the financing of those Forces. The delegation of the People's Socialist Republic of Albania has stated at every opportunity that it is against the establishment of such forces, that it is against stationing them in the Middle East, and that it is against their financing by the United Nations.

6. The People's Socialist Republic of Albania has never participated in the financing of those forces and other forces set up by the United Nations. Although the document presented to the Assembly deals only with the financial aspect of those forces, we do not believe that we are dealing with a routine question of a purely technical character. Our stand concerning the question of the financing of those forces is not based in any way on financial considerations. On the contrary, our stand is based on reasons of principle. It is precisely the political aspect of the question of the setting up and financing of United Nations forces in general which has been and remains at the foundation of our well-known and unchangeable stand on this question.

7. Events and facts have clearly shown that United Nations forces stationed in the Middle East and other forces which have been sent on behalf of our Organization to various areas of the world at different times have never served the interest of establishing or preserving peace and stability or of restraining the aggressors and defending the victims of aggression.

8. Such forces have been established and sent to various zones, depending on the period in which they were established, through the manipulations of imperialist Powers and super-Powers. United Nations forces have been used by various imperialist Powers to cover up their aggression and intervention in the area where such forces have been stationed. The use of the United Nations flag for aggressive purposes and operations is a violation of principles of our Organization.

9. With regard to the United Nations forces which are dispatched allegedly to preserve the peace in the Middle East, it must be pointed out that as a matter of fact such forces do not serve the cause of peace and stability in the area. Those forces are there because of the machinations of, and the bargaining between, the two imperialist super-Powers and as such are used by them in order to attain their expansionistic and hegemonic aims in the Middle East.

Those forces, like the ones stationed this year in Lebanon, have not in the least deterred the Israeli Zionist aggressors from going on with their aggression against the Arab peoples and countries; on the contrary, the Israeli aggressors are thus offered the possibility of consolidating the results of that aggression.

10. The presence of such forces does not ameliorate in the least the explosive situation in the Middle East and does not make any contribution to lowering the tension or to the settlement of the problems which that area faces.

11. In our opinion such forces serve only to enable the enemies of the Arab peoples to intensify their activities and their intervention in the Middle East.

12. In view of all this, the delegation of the People's Socialist Republic of Albania voted against the two draft resolutions in the Fifth Committee, and it wishes to reaffirm its position by voting against them in the document which the Fifth Committee is recommending to the General Assembly for adoption.

13. Mr. NGUYEN NGOC HOAN (Viet Nam) (*interpretation from French*): For reasons which my delegation has frequently reiterated during this session of the General Assembly, both in the Fifth Committee and in plenary meetings, the Government of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam refuses to bear any responsibility with regard to the financing of United Nations peace-keeping forces in the Middle East and therefore is not participating in the financing of those forces.

14. For that reason, my delegation will not participate in the vote on the two draft resolutions recommended by the Fifth Committee in document A/33/346/Add.2 concerning the financing of UNEF and UNDOF.

15. Mr. MUTHANA (Democratic Yemen) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The delegation of my country has already expressed its views on this item. We should like to emphasize our position once again. My country wishes to terminate its participation in the financing of the United Nations Forces in the Middle East, UNEF and UNDOF, which is dealt with in document A/33/346/Add.2, because these have become standing forces as a result of the continued Israeli occupation of Arab territories and Israel's continued denial of the legitimate national rights of the Palestinian people, including their right to establish their independent State.

16. The time has come for the United Nations to spare no effort to deter the Israeli aggressor and compel it to adhere to international law and to implement all relevant United Nations resolutions.

17. For all these reasons we shall abstain in the vote on the draft resolutions relating to this matter.

18. Mr. SAFRONCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): The delegation of the USSR would like to confirm its position of principle with regard to the financing of those additional functions of UNEF deriving from the Egyptian-Israeli Agreement of

4 September 1975.<sup>2</sup> The Soviet Union had nothing to do with that Agreement, which was concluded on a separate basis and, in substance, in circumvention of the Geneva Peace Conference on the Middle East and the Security Council. Therefore, the Soviet Union cannot bear any responsibility for the consequences of that Agreement, including the financing of additional expenditures for United Nations troops deriving therefrom.

19. The Soviet Union does not intend, for that reason, to take part in defraying that part of the expenses which derives from the second Egypt-Israeli Agreement. The Soviet Union will therefore continue in future to refrain from paying that part of its contribution to UNEF which is intended to cover the expenses involved in the carrying out by those forces of the additional functions I have mentioned.

20. The Soviet Union considers that the deployment of United Nations troops in the Middle East is a purely temporary matter and cannot effect a comprehensive and just settlement in that region.

21. The Soviet delegation also wishes to make a number of comments on the estimates for UNEF and UNDOF.

22. The method and system for the compilation of the budget estimates for the armed forces of the United Nations in the Middle East continue to be highly unsatisfactory. The compilation of the figures on and the accounting for actual disbursements are also highly unsatisfactory. When requesting appropriations for UNEF, the Secretariat does not give a sufficiently detailed break-down of actual and anticipated expenditures. Furthermore, it submits the documents requesting allocations too late for them to be properly considered.

23. The Secretariat's requests for travel expenses and *per diem* for staff, the chartering of aircraft, the purchase of transport equipment, the repair and operation of vehicles, and so on, are completely unsupported.

24. We have every reason to assume that, since the Secretariat does not exercise even elementary control over these financial and management operations of the United Nations armed forces in the Middle East, the funds allocated for these purposes are being spent very inefficiently.

25. Adequate justification for requests for funds under other sections of the budget is also lacking.

26. Moreover, the proposed budget estimates for UNEF and UNDOF are established on the basis of last year's increased standard reimbursement rates of \$680 per man/month plus \$200 for experts. The delegation of the Soviet Union voted against that increase as being totally unjustified.

27. To sum up, the Soviet delegation wishes to state that, for the reasons just given, and also because the Secretary-

<sup>2</sup> See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirtieth Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1975*, documents S/11818 and Add.1-4; and *ibid.*, *Supplement for October, November and December 1975*, document S/11818/Add.5.

General, despite his assertion in paragraph 11 of document A/33/373 and Corr.1, has not carried out the instructions of the Security Council and the General Assembly and has not taken all necessary measures to ensure that the activities of United Nations troops should be conducted with the greatest possible degree of efficiency and economy, it cannot support the appropriations requested for this regular phase of the activities of UNEF and UNDOF.

28. Mr. AL-TIKRITI (Iraq) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The delegation of Iraq would like to stress its opposition to all draft resolutions dealing with UNEF in the Middle East and in particular to the draft resolutions now before us, for reasons which we have already given on various occasions.

29. I should like to reiterate those reasons: first, this is tantamount to giving tacit recognition to acts of aggression on territories belonging to others; secondly, the aggressor and the victim are placed on an equal footing; and this encourages the Zionist entity to persist in its acts of aggression on the territories of others; and thirdly, my delegation wishes to reaffirm here its past and present position that the aggressor must assume the consequences of its aggression. Therefore, my country is opposed to the draft resolutions before us.

30. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The Assembly will now take a decision on the two draft resolutions, A and B, appearing under the title "Financing of the United Nations Emergency Force and of the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force", which have been recommended by the Fifth Committee in paragraph 10 of part III of its report [A/33/346/Add.2].

31. We shall vote first on draft resolution A. Separate votes have been requested on paragraph 1 of section I and on section II. If there is no objection, we shall so proceed.

*It was so decided.*

32. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I shall now put to the vote paragraph 1 of section I of draft resolution A. A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:* Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Belgium, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Central African Empire, Chad, Chile, Comoros, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Samoa, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

*Against:* Afghanistan, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Iraq, Mongolia, Syrian Arab Republic, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

*Abstaining:* Cuba, Democratic Yemen

*Paragraph 1 of section I of draft resolution A was adopted by 94 votes to 11, with 2 abstentions.<sup>3</sup>*

33. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I now put to the vote section II of draft resolution A. A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:* Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Belgium, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Central African Empire, Chad, Chile, Comoros, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Samoa, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

*Against:* Afghanistan, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Iraq, Mongolia, Syrian Arab Republic, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

*Abstaining:* Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Guinea

*Section II of draft resolution A was adopted by 93 votes to 11, with 3 abstentions.<sup>4</sup>*

34. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I now put to the vote draft resolution A as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:* Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Belgium, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Central African Empire, Chad, Chile, Comoros, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea,

<sup>3</sup> The delegations of Malawi and Nigeria subsequently informed the Secretariat that they wished to have their votes recorded as having been in favour of the paragraph.

<sup>4</sup> The delegations of Malawi and Nigeria subsequently informed the Secretariat that they wished to have their votes recorded as having been in favour of the section.

Guyana, Haiti, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Samoa, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

*Against:* Albania, Iraq, Syrian Arab Republic

*Abstaining:* Afghanistan, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

*Draft resolution A as a whole was adopted by 94 votes to 3, with 11 abstentions (resolution 33/13 C<sup>5</sup>).<sup>6</sup>*

35. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I now put to the vote draft resolution B, contained in paragraph 10 of document A/33/346/Add.2. A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:* Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Belgium, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Central African Empire, Chad, Chile, Comoros, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Samoa, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

*Against:* Albania, Iraq, Syrian Arab Republic

*Abstaining:* Afghanistan, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

*Draft resolution B was adopted by 94 votes to 3, with 11 abstentions (resolution 33/13 D).<sup>7</sup>*

<sup>5</sup> For resolution 33/13 A see the 44th meeting, para. 93; for resolution 33/13 B, the 68th meeting, para. 21.

<sup>6</sup> The delegations of Malawi and Nigeria subsequently informed the Secretariat that they wished to have their votes recorded as having been in favour of the draft resolution.

<sup>7</sup> *Idem.*

## 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

36. Mrs. TØSDAL (Norway): Never before has the situation in Namibia been more critical than today. The decision of the South African Government to proceed unilaterally with the holding of internal elections in Namibia in contravention and defiance of Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978) is unacceptable and must be condemned. I declare on behalf of the Norwegian Government that Norway regards these so-called elections and their results as null and void.

37. Of the utmost concern to the Norwegian Government is the fact that the internal elections in Namibia have been accompanied by increased measures of repression against those who have spoken up against South Africa's arrogant abuse of power in Namibia. The Norwegian Government condemns the latest detentions of leading officials and supporters of the South West Africa People's Organization [SWAPO], and demands their immediate release. Furthermore, we cannot condone the recent expulsion from Namibia of church leaders who have exercised their right to criticize South African policies.

38. The Norwegian Government believes that further delays are unacceptable and that the time has come for the international community to demand that South Africa co-operate unconditionally with the Secretary-General and the United Nations in the implementation of Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978).

39. The South African Government must be warned not to resort to further subterfuges and refuse to face up to its international obligation to end the illegal occupation of Namibia peacefully. The internal elections, and the representatives to emerge therefrom, must not be used as an excuse to relinquish formal authority in Namibia while maintaining actual control. South Africa will always bear full responsibility for all developments in the Territory until the South African illegal occupation has been terminated in accordance with relevant United Nations resolutions.

40. Should South Africa fail to respond positively to the international demand for a negotiated settlement as proposed by the five Western members of the Security Council<sup>8</sup> and as endorsed by the Security Council in resolution 435 (1978), the future of all southern Africa will be affected in a most serious manner.

41. It must be recognized that South Africa's defiant policies at home and abroad constitute a threat to international peace and security. Reports of a military build-up in Namibia further underline this fact. Continued failure by South Africa to reverse its Namibia policies in the

<sup>8</sup> See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-third Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1978*, document S/12636.

next few weeks, or in any case before the end of the year, must result in the adoption of effective international measures under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter. The Norwegian Government is ready to implement any decisions the Security Council may take in this respect.

42. In this connexion a variety of measures must be given immediate and serious consideration and should be prepared for with a view to speedy implementation. Such measures could, in the view of the Norwegian delegation, include the following: the cessation of further investments and financial loans; the implementation of an oil embargo; the cessation of nuclear co-operation; and the extension of the existing arms embargo.

43. Such measures should, furthermore, be accompanied by unilateral measures by States aimed at consolidating a policy of disengagement vis-à-vis South Africa. Such a policy of international disengagement would have to be implemented systematically and progressively until South Africa ends its illegal occupation of Namibia and allows free and fair elections under United Nations supervision and control.

44. A policy of disengagement must include concrete and specific measures not only in relation to South Africa's involvement in Namibia but also in relation to the South African Government's *apartheid* policies. A new régime imposed on Namibia by South Africa, by whatever means, must face the same measures applied by the international community as South Africa itself.

45. Such a policy of disengagement should also be accompanied by concerted efforts on an international basis to assist those third-world countries most adversely affected by concrete measures against South Africa because of its actions in Namibia. The existence of politically and economically stable countries on the borders of South Africa will in itself remain a source of powerful pressure on South Africa to adopt internationally acceptable policies in southern Africa, including Namibia.

46. The stepped-up South African repression in Namibia underlines, furthermore, the increasing need for humanitarian assistance to all those forced to leave Namibia because of their political convictions and their opposition to the South African presence. In view of that situation the Norwegian Government has recently allocated about \$US 1.4 million in humanitarian assistance to SWAPO for 1978. We stand ready to increase this support even further next year.

47. Norway has also this year increased its support for various programmes of assistance for Namibia through United Nations channels. Most recently, the Norwegian Government decided to allocate close to \$US 1 million for the Nationhood Programme for Namibia. We trust that this Programme will be implemented as a matter of priority and that it will prove to be an important step in the preparation for genuine independence in Namibia.

48. This is a critical stage in the history of southern Africa, and we appeal once more to the South African Government to accept without further hesitation the offer of an internationally acceptable settlement in Namibia the terms of which are reasonable and already clear to all parties concerned. The full responsibility for either progress

or the lack thereof lies with South Africa. Any attempt to divert attention from this indisputable fact cannot be accepted by the international community.

49. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I now call on the representative of the United Kingdom, who wishes to make a statement on behalf of the five Western members of the Security Council.

50. Mr. RICHARD (United Kingdom): I have been asked to make this statement on behalf of the five delegations of Canada, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, the United Kingdom and the United States. Rather than give this Assembly a long account of all that has passed since the ninth special session of the Assembly on Namibia, held in April this year, I should like to address myself to the present situation which is the occasion for this debate.

51. The South African Government, despite our efforts and to our disappointment and regret, is now proceeding with unilateral elections in Namibia. Our five Governments have made our position very clear. In Pretoria, our Foreign Ministers stated that

“... they saw no way of reconciling such elections with the proposal which they put forward and which the Security Council has endorsed. Any such unilateral measure in regard to the electoral process will be regarded as null and void.”<sup>9</sup>

This position has since been reiterated twice in the Security Council, which remains seized of the question of Namibia.

52. We stand by our commitment to fully free and fair elections supervised and controlled by the United Nations. The December election clearly does not fulfil our basic criteria. We repeat again: this election cannot be considered free and fair; it is irrelevant to the progress of Namibia to an internationally acceptable independence. We will not accord any recognition to the outcome. In our view the election has no validity and its results have nothing to do with the elections under United Nations supervision and control that are called for in our proposal to be implemented under Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

53. Following the Pretoria meetings the Secretary-General invited the South African Government to resume discussions with him. These took place in the series of meetings held in New York in late November between the Secretary-General and the South African Secretary for Foreign Affairs and the South African Minister for Foreign Affairs. We are well aware, from our own experience, of the difficulties of such negotiations. We applaud the Secretary-General for his patient, discreet and impartial diplomacy and for his unswerving commitment to an internationally acceptable settlement in Namibia. These are in the highest traditions of our international community at the United Nations. The five countries actively and profoundly support the Secretary-General's efforts.

54. A key aspect of the discussions between the representatives of the Government of South Africa and the

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, Supplement for October, November and December 1978, document S/12902, annex I, para. 5.

Secretary-General was the South Africans' reiterated willingness to co-operate in the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) and their commitment

"... during the month of December, to conclude consultations with the parties concerned on the principles of resolution 435 (1978), and to communicate the results to the Secretary-General".<sup>10</sup>

55. Our five Governments wish to state publicly that we expect the results which South Africa will communicate in December to be South Africa's final decision regarding its willingness to implement resolution 435 (1978). The decision must be clear-cut and positive, ensuring the establishment of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group in Namibia in the very early part of 1979. We note that consultations between the Secretary-General and the Government of South Africa are to continue this month and that the goal of those consultations is to resolve outstanding points. We urge the swift completion of these consultations, which we hope will settle the remaining details concerning the practical implementation of resolution 435 (1978). We also note that South Africa has publicly reaffirmed that it will retain authority in Namibia pending the implementation of the United Nations plan.

56. We have been involved for the past 20 months in an exhaustive negotiation. But the time for decision is now. If the South African Government turns its back on the chance for an internationally accepted independence in Namibia, the consequences for southern Africa, throughout the region as a whole, will be immeasurable. Twenty months ago we charted a course of peace for this long-standing problem. Any other course is not in the interests of the people in the region. It is certainly not in the interests of the people of Namibia nor of the people of South Africa itself. It will not gain independence for the people of Namibia, and without internationally recognized independence, Namibia will not prosper and South Africa will find itself completely isolated.

57. The past in Namibia is bleak: the hope for the future is great, but uncertain. We will be steadfast in our efforts to help the Namibian people find a better future. We stand by our proposal. We are committed to seeing that it is carried out.

58. Mr. BIN-HUMAM (Democratic Yemen) (*interpretation from Arabic*): In this critical situation in Namibia, we must not forget that for more than 60 years the Namibian people have suffered from oppression and exploitation by a racist minority régime in South Africa. It is ironical that this Territory of Namibia, which used to be known as South West Africa, was placed after the First World War under the Mandate of South Africa as a kind of "sacred trust of civilisation". We all know that the racist minority régime is in itself a disgrace to civilization and to mankind.

59. Over the past 12 years, since the United Nations at the twenty-first session of the General Assembly in 1966 adopted its resolution terminating the South African Mandate over Namibia [*resolution 2145 (XXI)*], the

Assembly and the Security Council, in numerous resolutions, have emphasized the inalienable right of the Namibian people to the exercise of their self-determination and independence, and have also emphasized the legitimate nature of their struggle by whatever means to put an end to the illegal occupation of that Territory by South Africa. These resolutions also have called for the total withdrawal of the South African armed forces, so that free elections under United Nations auspices and control can be held. But the arrogance and defiance of the white racist minority in South Africa has meant that all the United Nations resolutions have been completely disregarded, so that South Africa has been able to continue with its plan to perpetuate its illegal occupation of Namibia. All of this has been accompanied by acts of repression and torture against the Namibian people.

60. The *apartheid* régime could not possibly have withstood the international community and the United Nations were it not for the permanent, unswerving and effective support given it by certain Western Powers which we have already identified, and without the support of two racist régimes, Salisbury and Tel Aviv. It is no surprise to anyone, of course, to hear this because the interests and positions of the racist régimes coincide with those of imperialism and neo-colonialism and further the ruthless exploitation of the wealth of these peoples. Those same countries, however, have constantly appealed to us for "patience and trust" in coping with this flagrant challenge from the racist minority régime in South Africa, as if the sufferings of the Namibian people and their patience over the past 60 odd years have not been enough to convince those same countries that it has long been time to adopt firm and effective measures to put an end to South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia and to the repression and oppression of a people who aspire to freedom and independence. We are being asked to go on exercising "patience and trust" until it is too late.

61. But in the meantime justice has been swept aside by military might.

62. Freedom is taken, not given. A people cannot recover its independence by entrusting the task to others. The Namibian people are keenly aware of this fact. The Namibian people have resisted occupation, have made great sacrifices and may even have to continue to do so under the leadership of their sole legitimate representative, SWAPO, in order to obtain their independence and liberty. Democratic Yemen has always proudly supported the militant struggle of the Namibian people, and it will spare no effort to help the people to free themselves from the vise-like grip of racism and from the imperialist exploitation of the resources of their country. My country expresses its solidarity with the front-line African States which, notwithstanding the policy of intimidation, direct terrorism and aggression conducted by Pretoria, continue to support national liberation movements and to implement the resolutions of the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity [OAU] on the subject. The international community has been disturbed to see Pretoria's troops stationed in the north of Namibia. This deployment of troops is clear evidence of South Africa's aggressive intentions against Angola, intentions which were precisely put into execution three years ago when Angola acquired its independence, and when 700 Namibian refugees were

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, document S/12950, para. 8.

killed at Kassinga in May 1971. It remains for the international community, and the United Nations Security Council in particular, to put an end to these criminal acts and to prepare tough measures to prevent criminal acts from taking place in the future. If certain Western Powers continue to place obstacles in the way of the adoption of international decisions to dissuade the racist minority, and if they continue to help that minority, then the peace-loving peoples of the world must take measures precisely to circumvent and overcome those obstacles.

63. The attitude of the South African authorities is a challenge to the United Nations and a threat to world peace and security. Democratic Yemen does not rule out the possibility of a peaceful solution, on condition, of course, that that solution is a just one and meets with the approval of the sole representative of the Namibian people, SWAPO. We have no doubt that the racist régime in South Africa and its Western allies will continue their delaying tactics so as to perpetuate their rule over Namibia and to enable the international monopolies to continue looting the wealth of the country. South Africa has disregarded Security Council resolutions 385 (1976), 431 (1978), 432 (1978), 435 (1978) and many others. In the same way it is now openly disregarding the most recent resolution, Security Council resolution 439 (1978) adopted this year, which calls upon South Africa to cancel the bogus elections it has arranged. It can do so the more easily as its Western allies have abstained in the vote on that resolution, thus giving the South African authorities the green light to go right ahead and do as it pleases.

64. It is important not to let slip the opportunity to prevent the South African régime from setting up a puppet régime. We must not merely oppose the illegal internal elections in Namibia. It is essential that the international community go further than that and initiate sanctions against the racist régime, including the sanctions described in Chapter VII of the Charter, and provide military and material aid to SWAPO and the front-line countries, until the advent of authentic independence for the Namibian people.

65. Mr. HOLLAI (Hungary): At the meeting of the Security Council on 29 September last, at which the Council adopted the Secretary-General's report on the question of Namibia, Sam Nujoma, the highly respected President of SWAPO, in summing up his appraisal of the proposal of the five Western Powers and South Africa's response thereto, said:

“... For all practical purposes, the diplomatic exercise which started about 18 months ago has failed, as we predicted.

“In rejecting the report of the Secretary-General, the Pretoria régime has turned its back on a negotiated settlement under the aegis of the United Nations and has thus opted for its long envisaged internal settlement, which, in effect, will be a unilateral declaration of independence.”<sup>11</sup>

66. Since then the correctness of this lucid conclusion has been proved by the events in Namibia. In spite of the latest resolution of the Security Council, resolution 439 (1978) of 13 November 1978, which, *inter alia*, calls upon South Africa “immediately to cancel the elections it has planned in Namibia in December 1978”, the voting is now under way in Windhoek under the shadow of South African rifles.

67. This is not the first time that South Africa has defied the authority of this world Organization. The previous measures taken by Pretoria have paved the way leading directly to the shameful elections in Windhoek.

68. Since 1968 South Africa has been manoeuvring to bring into being an administrative infrastructure of government in Namibia for the purpose of maintaining its racial oppression. By the organization of “homelands” Pretoria set the stage for the bantustanization of Namibia, while in 1975, by convening the so-called Turnhalle Conference, it set out to create the necessary legal framework for a unilateral declaration of independence. And, with the appointment of the so-called Administrator-General for Namibia in 1977 and the first steps towards the registration of voters, events in Namibia entered a stage that could be anticipated as immediately preceding a planned declaration of sham independence, a so-called internal settlement.

69. Then, while it was making hasty preparations for an internal settlement, South Africa started, before the eyes of the world, show-case negotiations with its Western partners, which were, naturally, designed to mislead world public opinion and the United Nations and to confuse and divide the ranks of the progressive forces. True to its fraudulent tactics, the Pretoria régime was playing for time, setting conditions and bargaining, until on 25 April, one day before the opening of the ninth special session of the General Assembly, which was to be held on the question of Namibia, it announced its acceptance of the Western proposal. As was brought out in the statement of South Africa's representative at the meeting of the Security Council of 27 July,<sup>12</sup> that acceptance meant, first, that the legislative and executive power in Namibia was to remain within the purview of the Administrator-General during the transition period; secondly, that control over the maintenance of law and order was to be retained by the police force of South Africa; and, thirdly, that the Special Representative of the Secretary-General was to obtain the prior consent of the Administrator-General in all matters.

70. It is characteristic that South Africa should have made no mention of the final and total withdrawal of its occupying troops from Namibia nor of dismantling its military establishment there. Thus South Africa accepted the Western proposal on conditions that would practically imply the subordination of the United Nations machinery to its home-grown administration in Namibia. Nowhere in its conditions of acceptance does it make any reference to SWAPO, which is recognized by the United Nations as the sole legitimate representative of the Namibian people.

71. In being emphatic about its reservations concerning the Western move, the Hungarian Government bore in mind

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, *Thirty-third Year*, 2087th meeting.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, 2082nd meeting.

these cardinal deficiencies of the proposal of the five Western countries and the loop-holes it had left for South Africa. Apart from that, we expressed our disagreement in view of the fact that SWAPO was under constant pressure from the Western parties during the negotiations on their proposal. These features of the talks and the Western involvement in them were described by Mr. Nujoma, the President of SWAPO, in the following terms:

“We have participated in the diplomatic exercise [the five Western Governments] initiated on Namibia . . . in the belief that, as the major trading partners and as countries with special relations with racist South Africa, they are best placed to exert pressure on that country to co-operate at last with the United Nations on the question of Namibia. But, instead, SWAPO rather than racist South Africa has been subjected to massive pressure and blackmail. This has not only been sinister and unfair, but it has provided the Pretoria régime with support and encouragement to continue to defy and rebuff the United Nations and to frustrate and suppress the political aspirations of the Namibian people.”<sup>13</sup>

72. This is where the diplomatic campaign to win the consent of South Africa and to find favour with it has ended. The latest meeting of the five Western representatives in Pretoria, which was a complete fiasco, once again demonstrated the futility of persuading the racist régime. At present, because of the defiance and diplomatic manoeuvring by South Africa and some of its partners, the Security Council is unable to act resolutely at this decisive moment. Some try to present this situation as the result of a genuine conflict of interests between Pretoria and its Western partners.

73. Is it a question of differences on substantive or on tactical matters? The essence of this phenomenon was brought out clearly by another great leader of progressive Africa, Samora Machel, the President of the People's Republic of Mozambique, who in a speech delivered in Maputo on 15 September 1978 emphasized the following:

“In southern Africa, imperialism faces once again a dilemma: there is contradiction between its tactical alliances and its strategic goal of protecting and enhancing its economic and political hegemony . . .

“Imperialism faced a contradiction by actually supporting Portuguese colonialism in the economic and military fields, while at the same time maintaining a permanent ambiguity at the diplomatic level so as to avoid being crushed by the inevitable fall of colonialism.” [See A/C.4/33/2, annex, p. 1.]

74. As we cast our minds back over more than 30 years of debate on the question of Namibia, which has such important benchmarks as the General Assembly decision of 27 October 1966 on the termination of the Mandate of South Africa, and the advisory opinion handed down by the International Court of Justice in 1971<sup>14</sup> concerning the

illegality of Pretoria's presence in Namibia—which, along with other resolutions of the world Organization, have created a firm basis for large-scale international action against the racist régime—it cannot escape our notice that Pretoria's partners have so far failed to show any particular degree of activity with a view to the implementation of those resolutions. What is more, the implementation of several resolutions has been frustrated by their vetoes and objections.

75. What, then, is the explanation for their diplomatic activity, which has been sustained for a year and a half now? Is it perhaps accounted for by a substantial change in philosophical assumptions or in political thinking, or are the reasons to be sought elsewhere? At any rate, the birth of independent and progressive Angola and Mozambique, the growth of their influence and the successes of SWAPO and the Patriotic Front in their struggle for the liberation of Namibia and Zimbabwe have had a decisive impact on the tactics of the Western Powers. In the new circumstances now prevailing, the growing crisis of the settlers' régime in Rhodesia, the widening isolation of Pretoria and its anachronistic policy no longer provide a reliable guarantee for the political and economic interests of the leading Western Powers in that part of the world. A new formula is needed to safeguard their interests. That is the explanation for their diplomatic activity in recent months.

76. However, a just settlement of the question of Namibia cannot be conceived except on the basis of the total and unconditional withdrawal of the occupying troops and police forces of South Africa, the abolition of the administrative system imposed by Pretoria, the formation of a SWAPO-led government and the guarantee of Namibia's territorial integrity—in other words, the preservation of Namibia's sovereignty over Walvis Bay. Any other solution would serve only to deceive the Namibian people, to prolong the domination of South Africa and to intensify the conflict.

77. What is needed now is the application of over-all sanctions against Pretoria and the severing of all contact maintained with it by air, sea and land. The legal framework for such action is provided by Article 41 of the United Nations Charter. Such a resolute measure by Member States would enjoy the support of the peoples of the world. Speaking at the special meeting of the General Assembly to observe International Anti-Apartheid Year, Michael Manley, the Prime Minister of Jamaica, said:

“What is needed now is the commitment of Governments to embark on a total mobilization of the world community. At this critical juncture the world does not lack for the popular will to act.” [30th meeting, para. 42.]

78. I can assure the Assembly that the Hungarian Government and people will do their utmost to ensure that the sanctions defined in Article 41 of the Charter of the United Nations will be applied against racist South Africa as soon as possible.

79. Mr. FLORIN (German Democratic Republic) (*interpretation from Russian*): Six months ago, in this hall, the meetings of the ninth special session of the General Assembly took place. It adopted a Programme of Action

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, 2087th meeting.

<sup>14</sup> *Legal Consequences for States of the Continued Presence of South Africa in Namibia (South West Africa) notwithstanding Security Council Resolution 276 (1970), Advisory Opinion, I.C.J. Reports 1971, p. 16.*



[*resolution S-9/2*] containing resolute measures to ensure the exercise of the right to self-determination and independence by the people of Namibia: the immediate cessation of the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa and the complete and unconditional withdrawal of all occupation troops; the recognition by South Africa of the territorial integrity and political unity of Namibia; the release by South Africa of all political prisoners; the recognition of the right of the people of Namibia to struggle using all possible means to attain its independence; and the holding of free elections in Namibia under the control and supervision of the United Nations.

80. At the special session the General Assembly once again confirmed that the exercise of the right of the people of Namibia to self-determination can be achieved only with the participation and under the leadership of SWAPO, their sole legitimate representative. However the ink on the final documents of the ninth special session was hardly dry when the mercenaries of the *apartheid* régime committed another act of aggression against the People's Republic of Angola by starting to kill women and children in Kassinga. World public opinion unanimously condemned that barbarous act, but the desire of the racists to commit acts of aggression, which is of such danger to the world, is boundless. Abusing the illegally occupied Territory of Namibia, South Africa is building up in the northern part of the country its troops equipped with weapons supplied by the countries members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization [*NATO*] and is preparing for further military attacks on Angola. Those acts once again demonstrate that the *apartheid* régime does not intend to put an end to its policy of terror and aggression.

81. The question arises, what enables the racist régime in South Africa to disregard world public opinion and continue to ignore the decisions of the United Nations? That question has already been answered by the many speakers who have taken part in the debates. The answer was given recently in the decisions of the Fourth Committee on agenda item 95 entitled "Activities of foreign economic and other interests which are impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples . . .". And the answer has also been given in the very full documentation of the United Nations Council for Namibia, the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and the Special Committee against *Apartheid* which have unambiguously proved and clearly condemned the intrigues that imperialism concocts with South Africa. The *apartheid* régime and its illegal occupation of Namibia continue to exist only thanks to the broad systematic support which they receive from certain NATO States and imperialist monopolies. The Foreign Ministers of the non-aligned countries condemn the continuing economic, military and nuclear co-operation of certain Western and other countries for their collusion with the South African racist régime. In their Declaration they state:

"They stressed that the support it is receiving from abroad has enabled it to build up its growing military power and machinery of subjugation, including plans to develop nuclear weapons." [*See A/33/206, annex I, para. 91.*]

82. That truth is something which the main partners of the régime cannot hide, even though under the pressure of indignant world public opinion they have been trying to conceal their co-operation and even to deny it outright. We are speaking here of certain NATO circles, which also bring influence to bear on the Security Council by attempting to block the adoption of effective measures against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter.

83. The foundations of such co-operation are well known. Profit and the strategic interests of monopolistic capital are the factors which determine the policies of a number of Governments. The statement of Prime Minister Botha of the *apartheid* State on 16 October this year,<sup>15</sup> in addressing the five NATO States, also provides certain explanations in this respect. Monopolistic capital clearly agrees with him when he states his opinion that the Pretoria régime is defending, as he put it, "the ideals of the free world, freedom and democracy". The Permanent Representative of India in the Security Council described Mr. Botha's statement as "truly extraordinary, even for a politically prehistoric monster who claims to be civilized".<sup>16</sup> Botha's statement reminds one of Hitler's pathological anti-communism which he invoked just before the Second World War in order to get his imperialist counter-agents to practise a policy of appeasement. Quite clearly, they intend to keep the South African régime as a bastion against the forces of national and social liberation on the African continent. But everyone has seen through their game. In the document to which I referred a moment ago, we read:

"The Ministers strongly condemned this collusion with the *apartheid* régime which has encouraged it to defy public opinion. This has increased its intransigence as well as strengthened its pretensions to being the defender of white, Christian and Western civilization and pose as gendarmes of the so-called free world in the region, by arrogating to itself the right to intervene in the affairs of all African countries." [*See A/33/206, annex I, para. 92.*]

84. In resolution 435 (1978), the Security Council adopted a decision on measures for supervision of the preparation and holding of the elections in Namibia. We share the justified doubts expressed by various members of the Security Council as to the effectiveness of those measures. It is difficult to understand that, on the one hand, by the retention of the South African administration and armed forces in Namibia new artificial obstacles to the independence of the country are being set up and that, on the other hand, a large contingent of United Nations troops and civilian personnel will have to be sent in order to avert the danger implicit in that. Surely the unconditional and immediate withdrawal from Namibia of all troops, police and administrative personnel of the racists would be the very best guarantee for the smooth conduct of the elections. That would also be in keeping with the substance of the numerous resolutions adopted on this question by the United Nations.

85. The members of the Security Council who expressed reservations about all this were quite right, as can be seen

<sup>15</sup> See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-third Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1978*, document S/12900, annex I.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, *Thirty-third Year*, 2095th meeting.

from subsequent developments. Under the slogan of "preventing bloodshed", the five NATO members of the Security Council have engaged in very many diplomatic approaches while the rulers in Pretoria and their stooges in Windhoek have maintained the régime of terror in Namibia and have organized fake elections which excluded SWAPO. The purpose of those so-called "elections", as was also the case in Southern Rhodesia, is the attainment of a so-called "internal settlement". It is desired to set up a puppet régime loyal to Pretoria and to make it possible for the policy of oppression and plunder to continue. I am sure nobody believes that the Western diplomats have failed to observe the "puppet show" that is being conducted by South Africa.

86. I should like, in that respect, to draw the attention of members to actions in Western countries which are being conducted for the purpose of providing financial support for the electoral farce that is being performed. As can be seen from the press service of the Lutheran World Federation, certain rightist circles of one German-speaking State, long ago linked to the German-speaking racist forces in Namibia, have organized so-called "donations for the support of the pre-electoral campaign." Banks and monopolies alone intend to contribute \$US 115,000 to that cause.

87. I should like to point out that South Africa, by annexing Walvis Bay, intends to create a fait accompli which would impede the free exercise of independence by Namibia and prevent the country from realizing its territorial integrity.

88. The electoral farce which is taking place this month and the so-called "internal settlement" in Namibia are categorically rejected by world public opinion, because they do not resolve the problem, but simply make the situation in that region worse. The results of the latest negotiations of the five NATO States in Pretoria can be regarded only in a manner in which the President of SWAPO described it in his telegram to the Secretary-General of 23 October:

"This communiqué is unacceptable and rejected by the overwhelming majority of the Namibian people. The whole exercise is a manoeuvre by the South African racist régime aimed at maintaining its colonial interest in Namibia and to impose on our people its evil intention of creating homelands and Bantustans through a neo-colonial settlement, against the popular political aspirations and demands of the Namibian people for self-determination and national liberation."<sup>17</sup>

89. The delegation of the German Democratic Republic emphatically supports the following demand made by SWAPO:

"The UNO should not allow itself to be used by the Pretoria racist régime to legitimize its evil intentions and illegal acts to impose a neo-colonial solution against the interests of the Namibian people."<sup>18</sup>

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, *Thirty-third Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1978*, document S/12913, annex.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*

90. The States Members of the United Nations must do everything possible to frustrate the devious designs of the South African racists and their imperialist henchmen. The Charter of the United Nations provides for certain measures for this purpose. On 13 November 1978 the Security Council issued another warning to the South Africa régime. The abstention of the five NATO Powers in the vote speaks for itself, of course. However, the indefinite postponement of the adoption of decisive measures cannot be permitted when it is essential resolutely to oppose the racist occupying force. This means that effective measures to bring real international pressure to bear on South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter must be adopted immediately. This means giving the broadest possible support to SWAPO in its struggle.

91. The discussion of the question of Namibia at the United Nations for a whole decade without any decision having been reached proves that everything is related to the international balance of forces. But today this balance of forces has radically changed, and not in favour of the racists and their stooges. The forces which oppose colonialism, *apartheid* and neo-colonialism and advocate national and social liberation have become stronger. This is true with regard to southern Africa as well. If any movement has occurred at all on the question it is thanks to the changed balance of forces and to the growing struggle of the African peoples and the national liberation movements, in particular SWAPO. The recent admission of Namibia to UNESCO proves this.

92. In this new phase of efforts to liberate Namibia the greatest vigilance is necessary. If the anti-imperialist, anti-racist forces maintain a united front, refuse to allow themselves to be tricked by the NATO States and South Africa but continue to insist on the adoption of all the measures available to the United Nations, a true and prompt solution to the problem of Namibia will be found.

93. The German Democratic Republic supports the just struggle of the people of Namibia, under the leadership of SWAPO, for self-determination, freedom and national independence. The opening of a SWAPO mission in the capital of the German Democratic Republic, Berlin, and official accreditation of the head of that mission have once again emphasized our solidarity.

94. The General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany and the Chairman of the Council of State of the German Democratic Republic, Erich Honecker, during a recent meeting with the President of SWAPO, Sam Nujoma, declared that the German Democratic Republic would continue to provide, as in the past, support and solidarity in the struggle for the liquidation of all the vestiges of colonialism and all forms of neo-colonialism and racism.

95. This is in keeping with the consistent policy of the States parties to the Warsaw Treaty, as confirmed at their recent meeting in Moscow. The Declaration adopted at that meeting states:

"The socialist States vigorously support the peoples of Zimbabwe and Namibia in their selfless struggle for the early attainment of national independence. They are in

sympathy with the just struggle of the people of South Africa for the abolition of *apartheid* and all forms of racial discrimination." [See A/33/392-S/12939, annex.]

96. In conclusion, the delegation of the German Democratic Republic wishes to express its firm conviction that the heroic struggle of the people of Namibia, under the leadership of SWAPO, will be crowned with success, a success which will open the way to the building of a sovereign, independent Namibia in circumstances of peace and progress.

97. Mr. JAMAL (Qatar) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The heroic struggle of the people of Zimbabwe, Namibia and South Africa against colonialism and racism and for total freedom and national independence, is indeed an outstanding event in contemporary history. Since 1967 the people of Namibia have been confronting the savagery of the racist colonialist, and are left with no choice but to pursue their armed struggle by every means available, so as to attain their legitimate aspirations to self-determination and national independence. More than 12 years have elapsed since the General Assembly adopted resolution 2145 (XXI), which ended South Africa's Mandate over Namibia, and since the United Nations decided to assume direct responsibility for leading that people to true independence. However, the question of Namibia has as yet not been solved; on the contrary, it has assumed a new dimension, which increases our concern and the threat to international peace and security. The many resolutions adopted by the Security Council and the General Assembly are proof of the refusal of the international community to accept the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa and its rejection of the policy of *apartheid* practised by the Pretoria régime in flagrant violation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the principles of our Organization.

98. The purpose of convening last April the ninth special session of the General Assembly, which was devoted to the question of Namibia, was to ascertain the circumstances which would guarantee genuine independence for Namibia, in accordance with its people's legitimate aspirations to freedom, self-determination, justice and national independence. However, we are once again meeting here to consider the question of Namibia—which is an urgent and important question—and to find a just and lasting solution, because of South Africa's intransigence and its refusal to meet the demands of the Namibian people and the international community and also to respect the relevant resolutions of the United Nations, thereby feverishly attempting to perpetuate its domination over the Namibian people and to consolidate its hold over southern Africa as a whole.

99. Qatar's position with regard to Namibia has always been very clear, and there is no need to repeat it here. We vigorously condemn the policy of *apartheid* and we deem it to be a crime against humanity. We support the struggle of the Namibian people to recover their freedom and national independence, and we consider SWAPO as the sole legitimate representative of that people. We believe that no just and lasting solution of the Namibian problem can be found without the participation of that organization. The world has witnessed the desperate attempts of the Pretoria régime. I am referring to the plans to create bantustans and homelands which the racist régime wished to establish in

order to make it easier for it to keep these regions divided. Proof of its intentions in this regard is not difficult to find; I am referring to the Turnhalle Constitutional Conference, which aimed to annex Walvis Bay—an integral part of Namibian territory—and the fact that the racist South African Government has refused to withdraw immediately from the whole Territory, flouting the many relevant United Nations resolutions adopted since 1966 and the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice. South Africa has resorted to escalating a campaign of assassination, imprisonment and indiscriminate mass torture against the innocent Namibian population.

100. I should like here to shed some light on the continued assistance certain Western countries give to South Africa in the economic, military and security spheres. That assistance complicated the situation in Namibia and contributed to escalating racist confrontation in the region. We are convinced that this co-operation has enabled the Pretoria régime to tighten its grip on Namibia and that it constitutes a threat to the neighbouring African countries, since South Africa has been committing barbaric acts of aggression against thousands of innocent people in Mozambique and Zambia. Such barbaric acts will be repeated so long as the United Nations fails to take firm and decisive measures to put an end to them. Certain Western countries are largely responsible for the obstinacy of the white racist régime in South Africa and for its refusal to comply with the United Nations resolutions demanding that it put an end to its hegemony in Namibia—obviously because of their monopolistic interests in the region. However, those interests did not prevent these same Western countries from offering their good offices in the search for a solution of the Namibian question—a solution which would perpetuate their presence there, ensure their domination under the cover of the colonial authority, guarantee the continued domination of their corporations of a major part of economic activities in Namibia and continue the plundering of the resources of the country.

101. We welcome the struggle being waged by the people of Namibia and we invite all nations to support them in every way possible so that they may realize their ultimate goal—freedom and independence.

102. As we have repeatedly emphasized on many previous occasions, my country strongly condemns the policy of *apartheid* and the various violations of human rights. It is indignant at the creation of bantustans by the Pretoria régime in Namibia, which is aimed at perpetuating the exploitation of this people and the plundering of its natural resources in the interests of the white racist minority. This plundering and this exploitation of the natural resources of the Namibian people are going on in spite of the relevant resolutions of the United Nations and its various bodies—in particular the resolutions of the United Nations Council for Namibia with regard to the protection of the country's natural resources and their preservation from plundering by the monopolistic enterprises of the South African authorities. Furthermore, South Africa is pursuing its policy of brutal aggression against Namibia and, in order "to divide and rule", is fomenting anarchy among Namibians and resorting to measures allowing it to perpetuate its racist, colonialist control over Namibia. I would even say that South Africa is setting up tribal armies and proceeding to

promote its agents by means of the Legislative Council. Those two examples give clear proof of the racist and colonialist manoeuvres aimed against the national interests of the Namibian people and constitute a violation of the principles of the United Nations and their objectives. Besides speaking of the illegal character of the aggression perpetrated by South Africa, I must add that it is pursuing its occupation of Namibia and its aggression against the people of Namibia, defying the United Nations in its capacity as the Administrative Authority entrusted with the administration of Namibia until its independence. Consequently, the international organization should take strict and effective measures to put an end to that human tragedy.

103. Independence for Namibia can be achieved only if the racist Government of South Africa recognizes the right to self-determination of the Namibian people and its territorial integrity, in accordance with the conditions set forth by the United Nations and reaffirmed in Security Council resolution 385 (1976) demanding the immediate withdrawal by South Africa of all its armed forces from Namibia, the removal of all military bases from the Territory and respect for Namibian territorial integrity, including Walvis Bay, which is an integral part of Namibia. Furthermore, the racist régime of South Africa must rescind all racist legislation in Namibia, especially the establishment of bantustans, and it must ensure the prompt and unconditional release of all Namibian political prisoners. This régime must also allow exiled persons to return to their homes. Those are the minimum prerequisites for any peaceful settlement in Namibia.

104. Lastly, I should like to state that Qatar reiterates its unswerving support for the struggle of the Namibian people, under the leadership of SWAPO, for the exercise of its right to self-determination and independence in a united Namibia, for the course of history cannot be altered. It is certain that the illegal racist minority régime will soon collapse and that all the African peoples and the other peoples who continue to suffer under the yoke of colonialism will finally free themselves from foreign and racist domination. We are convinced that the United Nations should undertake additional measures in order to put an end to racism and colonialism and free the African continent from that scourge.

105. Mr. ROBINSON (Guyana): In October 1966 the General Assembly took the historic decision of terminating South Africa's Mandate over Namibia. At the same time it assumed direct responsibility for the Territory. In May 1967, meeting in its fifth special session, the Assembly agreed upon modalities for the discharge of that responsibility, and for assisting the people of Namibia towards independence by 1968.

106. Today, more than 10 years after those important decisions, even as we meet here today to consider ways and means whereby this Organization might be able to expedite the discharge of what we declared were our own responsibilities in relation to Namibia, the racist régime in Pretoria is engaged in a scheme which stands as the clearest and latest manifestation of the utter contempt which that régime has always shown for the decisions of the United Nations. I refer to the fraudulent elections organized by

Botha and his clique in which the people of Namibia have been forced to participate; to the terror, the intimidation, the threats of loss of employment, of pensions and of medical treatment.

107. The question of Namibia has been on the agenda of the General Assembly since 1967. Since that time the Assembly has consistently called on South Africa to withdraw from the Territory of Namibia. The Assembly has consistently condemned the consolidation of *apartheid* in Namibia, the intensification of violence, the mass arrests, the beatings and the brutal repression taking place in the Territory. Meanwhile, Namibians, under the leadership of SWAPO have been defying the guns of the Fascist troops and police, laying down their lives for the freedom of their country. Yet when we seek to adopt resolutions which affirm the justice of the armed struggle being waged by Namibian patriots under the leadership of SWAPO, reservations are entered in this regard and South Africa's use of naked force to retain its illegal occupation over Namibia continues apace.

108. The fact that we are still debating the situation in Namibia naturally gives rise to serious concern. In effect it provides an opportunity for very sober reflection on the extent to which States have deserted the sacred principles of our Charter and of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV); or the capacity of some States to be moved by the suffering and the sacrifice of Namibians; or the moral crisis which our Organization is experiencing now in relation to this question. We have to acknowledge that we are now face to face with one of the basic weaknesses of our Organization. But our Organization cannot be any stronger than its membership allows it to be. If some States, those that are in a position to move South Africa to begin to comply with our resolutions, choose to desert the principles and purposes of the Charter in the interest of short-term profit, is it any wonder that we are in this position now in relation to Namibia?

109. The archives of this Organization contain a body of resolutions setting out the prescriptions and the framework for South Africa's withdrawal from Namibia and for the achievement of independence by the Territory. Resolution 385 (1976) was unanimously adopted by the Security Council. More recently, the Maputo Declaration in Support of the Peoples of Zimbabwe and Namibia and the Programme of Action for the Liberation of Zimbabwe and Namibia,<sup>19</sup> complemented by the decisions taken at this year's special session on Namibia, prescribed in clear and unambiguous terms the decisive measures which need to be adopted to thwart the ill-conceived Pretoria plan for installing a puppet régime in Namibia. Yet today, after 20 months of diplomatic activity undertaken by South Africa's trading partners, South Africa is still pursuing its chosen course.

110. In addressing this Assembly last year on the situation in Namibia, my delegation was careful to withhold judgement on the initiative undertaken by the five Western Powers. At that time we recognized that the negotiations were an ongoing process; we also recognized that these five

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, *Thirty-second Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1977*, document S/12344/Rev.1, annex V.

were States which had at their disposal, individually and collectively, appropriate means which could at least lead the racists in Pretoria to the realization that they could not for long survive in Namibia if those States were to act on the decision that the game was up.

*Mr. Fall (Senegal), Vice-President, took the Chair.*

111. But we have to admit that at no time whatsoever did the Pretoria régime deviate from its chosen course; at no time did the Pretoria régime make any concessions; at no time did the Pretoria régime give the faintest indication that it had any intention whatsoever of complying with the prescriptions of General Assembly and Security Council resolutions, which had as their solemn objective the accession of Namibia to genuine independence.

112. Last year, when speaking to the General Assembly, the Foreign Minister of my country said:

“If on the other hand those initiatives come to naught . . . those five Western States carry with them a clear, definable obligation. It is their unavoidable obligation to lend their positive support to the adoption by the appropriate organs of the United Nations of effective measures designed to achieve the objectives that those States have sought to realize through their joint private efforts. In this respect there can be no reluctance to impose mandatory sanctions against South Africa in accordance with the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter.”<sup>20</sup>

113. It is within this framework of blatant arrogance on the one hand and calculated ineptitude on the other that we must now consider what decisive measures the General Assembly can prescribe at this late hour. It seems to my delegation that one of the prime responsibilities of the General Assembly in this regard would be to ensure that the authority of the United Nations over the Territory of Namibia is not further undermined. My delegation was accorded the opportunity to participate in the most recently concluded debate on Namibia in the Security Council, and at that time we elaborated on the measures which we considered to be most appropriate in order that the South African régime be compelled to change its attitude and comply with the provisions of United Nations resolutions regarding Namibia.<sup>21</sup> Here in the General Assembly my delegation would simply wish to reaffirm its stated position—that the General Assembly must call upon the Security Council to convene urgently so as to invoke an all-encompassing régime of mandatory sanctions against South Africa. My delegation is convinced that South Africa will start to respond positively only when the South African régime witnesses a practical manifestation that support is waning in the West. And there are other areas in which we can complete the isolation of the racist Pretoria régime.

114. The adoption of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) signalled the cut-off point. We had agreed that

<sup>20</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-second Session, Plenary Meetings*, 36th meeting, para. 42.

<sup>21</sup> See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-third Year*, 2096th meeting.

time had run out for South Africa. Yet the Pretoria régime has been able to proceed callously with its sham elections, its arrests, detentions and murders in Namibia. If the Security Council has been found wanting, then the same ignominy must not befall the General Assembly, the supreme organ of this Organization. We must intensify our support for SWAPO, the authentic and legitimate representative of the Namibian people, especially now, when serious efforts are being undertaken to undermine their status. We must match the rhetoric of condemnation with a commitment to participate in all practical arrangements which have as their objective the relinquishment of South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia and the accession of the Territory to genuine independence.

115. And we must increase our assistance to those countries, Angola, Botswana and Zambia, which have made the ultimate sacrifice through solidarity with their brothers and sisters in Namibia. The people of Namibia have placed their confidence in this Organization's ability to relieve them of the harsh oppression which characterizes their daily existence. History will solemnly judge whether we have lived up to their expectations.

116. Mr. BALETA (Albania) (*interpretation from French*): This is the second time this year that the General Assembly has considered the problem of Namibia. During the ninth special session, the representatives of a large number of democratic States that love freedom and progress demonstrated repeatedly the gravity—indeed, the intolerable nature—of the situation persisting in Namibia because of colonial domination and the policy of racial discrimination and *apartheid* practised by the South African racists against the Namibian people. That policy has been denounced and condemned by the overwhelming majority of the States Members of our Organization and in the documents that have been adopted.

117. Some months have elapsed since the conclusion of the ninth special session, but no step has been taken towards the solution of the problem of Namibia. Quite to the contrary: the situation in that country has deteriorated even further, and the Fascist clique in Pretoria is committing a still larger number of crimes. That racist clique has intensified its repressive measures, as well as its conspiratorial manoeuvres against the rights of the Namibian people.

118. The events in recent months have confirmed that the South African racist clique has no intention whatsoever of voluntarily giving up its colonial domination or of voluntarily ceasing to exercise its policy of *apartheid* and racial discrimination in Namibia; it has no intention whatsoever of taking even the slightest account of the rights of the Namibian people, the will of the peoples of the world or the decisions of the United Nations. On the contrary, it continues, as always, to turn a deaf ear to the groundswell of indignation and anger throughout the world against it.

119. There can be no doubt but that the racists of South Africa would already have suffered a stunning defeat if they had not had the constant and multifarious support of imperialism and the other forces of international reaction. The Pretoria régime would not have dared to carry out its policy of racial discrimination and *apartheid* so stubbornly

and for so long had it not been able to take advantage of the confused situations and the tension and conflict created in southern Africa and the African continent as a whole by the imperialist super-Powers in order to divide the African peoples and weaken their struggle against the vestiges of colonialism and against neo-colonialism in Africa.

120. In their struggle against oppression and racial discrimination, the peoples of Namibia, Zimbabwe and Azania are grappling with fierce and barbarous enemies, such as the racist cliques of Pretoria and Salisbury. But they must also confront the dangerous intrigues of imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism, which are attempting to turn back the tide of African history and put a brake on the irreversible process of tremendous change now under way on that continent.

121. These sworn enemies of the African people, despite the defeats they have experienced, are not giving up their aggressive designs in Africa. The imperialist super-Powers in particular are showing in an increasingly overt way their ambitions and their aims of penetrating the African continent politically, economically and militarily in order to create and expand their respective spheres of influence and to establish their hegemony. In the framework of their rivalry and their hostile activities against all the African peoples, they are playing an extremely dangerous game fraught with consequences for the peoples of Namibia, Zimbabwe and Azania. The American imperialists and certain imperialist Powers are supporting and encouraging by all possible means the racist cliques in Pretoria and Salisbury in their oppression and exploitation of those peoples and in their denial to those peoples of the right to live in freedom and independence. It is very well known that the former colonial Powers have never stopped assisting the racist régimes in southern Africa so as to preserve there this last bastion of classic colonialism. It is also well known that for some years now the American imperialists have been the main protectors of the racist régimes of Pretoria and Southern Rhodesia, by giving them constant economic, political, military and diplomatic aid.

122. The Soviet socio-imperialists and other imperialists which are competing with one another for the title of champion of the defence of the rights of the peoples of Azania, Zimbabwe and Namibia, are in fact seeking only to benefit from the struggle that these peoples are waging, in order to accelerate the pace of their own expansion in Africa.

123. Some time ago the racist régime in Pretoria, just like the imperialist Powers that are behind it, became perfectly aware that it could no longer maintain its domination and privileges in Namibia solely by means of violence. Hence it found it necessary to combine the use of terror and oppressive force with recourse to deceitful tactics and plots to crush the struggle of the Namibian people, to awaken that people's will to resist and to fight. By this twofold tactic it is trying to mislead world public opinion as well.

124. That is why the racists in South Africa and, particularly, the imperialist Powers have launched a campaign for a so-called peaceful solution of the Namibian problem by means of negotiations and so-called free

elections organized in accordance with plans worked out by the South African racists and their protectors, under international supervision. The United States of America and other imperialist Powers have frequently claimed for themselves the merit of having elaborated these allegedly constructive ideas so as to contribute to a peaceful solution of the problem of Namibia by means of a compromise to be reached between the Namibian people and its torturers in South Africa.

125. According to them, this is the only way that a solution can be found to the problem. The propagandist machine of the imperialists has not ceased to puff up this plan that was developed by the five Western Powers as the best possible tool to reach a solution to the problem of Namibia which would be acceptable to the entire international community. During the ninth special session of the General Assembly, the imperialist Powers publicized this plan widely and they made a great fuss about promising that the solution of the problem of Namibia was merely a matter of time and that everything was about to be concluded in the best possible way in Namibia.

126. But events have occurred which have demonstrated that the sincere friends of Namibia were right when they denounced this plan describing it as a manoeuvre fabricated by the imperialists to delude the people, to promote collusion and thus to prevent the expansion of the armed struggle of the Namibian people. In the light of recent events, and particularly in the light of the electoral farce that the racists of South Africa have organized in Namibia, it becomes clearer than ever that the plan was merely a plot to gain time and to make it possible for the Pretoria régime to go ahead with its diabolical plans perpetrated against the people of Namibia. However, once again the Western Powers wish to make the people believe that their plan is the best possible means for a solution of the problem of Namibia, and are attempting at all costs to assure others that it will be productive and that the difficulties that have occurred so far are merely temporary and are not related to the plan. In fact, they are not a mere matter of coincidence. What is involved is the concrete implementation of plots against the Namibian people. The case of Namibia, the farce of the "internal settlement" in Southern Rhodesia, or the conspiratorial plans that have been hatched allegedly to find a solution to the Middle East are all the same. They faithfully reflect the well-known practices of the imperialist Powers, which, on the pretext of settling any particular problem, are attempting to sabotage and suppress the struggle of the peoples who are fighting to win their freedom and independence and to secure their national rights.

127. Pursuing their manoeuvres, the imperialist Powers are attempting to justify themselves by stating that they will not recognize the results of the elections organized by the racists of South Africa in Namibia. But the people of Namibia do not require such generosity. In their struggle they will declare the elections that have been set up by the racist aggressors and all of the plots of their imperialist enemies null and void.

128. The Namibian people, who have learned their lesson from their own experience and from that of the other African peoples, will know how to meet difficult situations.

They will not let themselves be taken in the trap laid by the South African racists and the imperialists. They will not allow the American and other imperialists to sacrifice their rights in order to perpetuate Pretoria's racial domination and to transform Namibia into a doubly dominated colony and a strongpoint for the aggressive policy conducted by the imperialist Powers in Africa.

129. They now see more clearly than ever the designs of those who are plotting against them in close co-operation with the Pretoria régime. Experience has taught the Namibian people that they must be careful about the friendship offered them by the Soviet social-imperialists, who merely wish to profit from the situation in southern Africa in order to score points in their rivalry with the other imperialists and to pursue their policy of hegemony. Nor should the Namibian people accept the advice given

them by the proponents of the theory of "three worlds" not to fight American imperialism and the reactionary régimes, but to join them and only to protect themselves against Soviet social-imperialism. We are convinced that no super-Power demagogy will succeed for long in concealing the rivalry for the domination of the world and the parcelling out of spheres of influence.

130. The Albanian people and Government vigorously condemn the policy of colonial domination and *apartheid* practised by the racists of South Africa in Namibia. They support the just struggle of the Namibian people, under the leadership of SWAPO, and are convinced that by continuing their armed struggle, the people of Namibia will finally achieve their national aspirations.

*The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.*