



CONTENTS

Agenda item 91:

Question of Namibia (*continued*):

(a) Report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples;

(b) Report of the United Nations Council for Namibia;

(c) Report of the Secretary-General . . . . . 687

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

AGENDA ITEM 91

Question of Namibia (*continued*):

(a) Report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples;

(b) Report of the United Nations Council for Namibia;

(c) Report of the Secretary-General

1. Mr. ROS (Argentina) (*interpretation from Spanish*): At this early stage in our debate on the question of Namibia, the Argentine delegation wishes to intervene to stress categorically its traditional and unchanging position on the problem and to refer briefly to the most recent events that have taken place in that Territory.

2. Eleven years have elapsed since, by the adoption of resolution 2145 (XXI), the General Assembly declared the South African Mandate over Namibia to be null and void and transferred the administration of that international Territory to the United Nations with a view to ensuring the implementation of resolution 1514 (XV). In the course of these years, the General Assembly, the Security Council and the International Court of Justice have repeatedly taken decisions on the matter, and a body of laws and rules has been formed that leaves no doubt about the way in which legally, politically and morally the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa deserves to be judged.

3. In these circumstances, it is unnecessary for me at present to dwell on the background and the features of the question. Suffice it to say that the overwhelming majority of the international community has joined repeatedly in criticizing the anachronistic situation that prevails in Namibia as an open challenge to the principles and purposes of this Organization and as one which, because of its gravity and the conflicts connected with it, jeopardizes international peace and security.

4. Furthermore, the Argentine position on the problem has been made very clear and decisive and once again today

I shall reaffirm that position. In complete agreement with the decisions I referred to earlier, we have unwaveringly maintained that Namibia and its inhabitants are the direct responsibility of the United Nations, and therefore that South Africa must comply with the decisions of the Organization. In other words, it must withdraw from Namibia and allow that nation, under the direct supervision of the United Nations, freely to exercise its inalienable right, recognized by the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

5. Furthermore, on this premise we have deplored and continue to deplore the adoption of measures designed to infringe the territorial integrity and national unity of Namibia. We have contended that a prerequisite for a solution of the problem is the active and free participation of all of the parties directly concerned in the matter in the working out of any such solution. In this context, I think we should specifically single out certain unfortunate political and/or administrative measures adopted recently by South Africa which, either because they unilaterally alter the shape of the Territory of Namibia or because they do not recognize the legitimate representative nature of organizations such as the South West Africa People's Organization [SWAPO], neglect or run counter to the basic and binding guidelines to which we have referred.

6. While this does not mean that we should ignore the fact that in the course of the year that has elapsed since the thirty-first session of the General Assembly, the South African Government has adopted or appeared to be ready to adopt measures which hint at a more flexible approach to the problem, there can be no doubt that such measures do not meet the conditions laid down by this Organization.

7. The type of provisions to which I refer are even more unacceptable when, as is the case with many of them, one can detect underlying them a deplorable attempt to extend to Namibia the despicable system of *apartheid*. Argentina has repeatedly and categorically repudiated that immoral and unnatural form of discrimination and wishes to express its firm condemnation of such attempts and to associate itself with those who call upon South Africa to renounce that inhuman practice.

8. The Government of my country intends to introduce certain amendments to the Argentine penal code in the near future so as to include rules, providing for severe penalties, including imprisonment, for any act of racial or religious discrimination, and we wish to state once again that *apartheid* not only constitutes an insult to the peoples of Africa but offends the conscience of mankind as a whole. It specifically conflicts with the principles of equality and justice on the basis of which the Argentine Republic was created and has developed.

9. Accordingly, my country has fully complied with the resolutions of the Organization with respect to Namibia. At the same time, and in accord with our faith in negotiation among the parties as the first and most desirable means of solving international disputes, Argentina has supported and continues to support whole-heartedly any efforts aimed at a peaceful and agreed solution to the grave problem confronting us. This does not exclude recognition that the long period since the adoption of resolution 2145 (XXI), the intransigence of the South African Government and the illegality of its continued presence in Namibia compel us to take due note of the opinion of those who call for different forms of action.

10. Yet, I repeat, we still believe that we must try to follow the path of peace which is the one enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations and the one which forms the very basis of the existence of our Organization.

11. It was precisely with this idea in mind that Argentina, during its term in the Security Council, sponsored three draft resolutions, unanimously adopted, which aimed at establishing conditions conducive to a peaceful and agreed solution of the problem through direct negotiations among the parties. I should add here that at that time we were once again given proof of the high degree of political awareness of the African representatives who supported our efforts, in sharp contrast to the stubborn intransigence of South Africa.

12. It is equally logical that we should give our whole-hearted support to the efforts being made by the five Western members of the Security Council to identify, through broad and continuing efforts, including negotiations with all the parties directly concerned, areas of common ground that might serve as a basis for an acceptable solution. We hope that South Africa will take advantage of this further opportunity offered of finding a peaceful solution to the problem, and that the efforts to which we have referred will allow the necessary conditions to be established for attaining in the near future the full implementation of the resolutions on this subject. I should add that the substantive aspects of those decisions are included in Security Council resolution 385 (1976).

13. Mention of Argentina's support of the Organization's activities regarding Namibia would be incomplete without a reference at the same time to the contribution made by my Government this year to the United Nations Fund for Namibia, which reaffirms our interest in helping, to the best of our ability, to alleviate the situation of the Namibian nation resulting from the illegal presence of South Africa in the Territory.

14. In that context, we wish also to express once again our support of the United Nations Institute for Namibia as well as our appreciation of the work of the United Nations Commissioner 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 United Nations Council for Namibia. We are happy to note that the last-named body continued its important work in the course of the past year, notably through repeated contacts with a number of intergovernmental organizations and with the specialized

agencies of the United Nations, as well as through the preparation of its annual report [A/32/24] and of proposals for submission to the Assembly. This work, together with the efforts of the Special Committee, constitute an important contribution to our debate and will deserve our close attention.

15. At the beginning of my statement I mentioned the effects which we believe the situation in Namibia might have on the maintenance of international peace and security. I would emphasize yet again that Namibia is not an isolated area of tension but, together with the question of Southern Rhodesia and the problem of *apartheid* in South Africa, forms part of a regional conflict which, because of the magnitude of the interests involved, threatens to make its repercussions felt beyond southern Africa.

16. In the light of this depressing picture, the situation in Namibia calls for prompt settlement. The General Assembly, I must emphasize, is coming to the end of its imaginative ability to suggest practical measures that should be adopted by either South Africa or the States Members of this Organization in order to solve the problem.

17. Therefore, it is now for the Security Council, the only organ which is constitutionally empowered to ensure the implementation of the decisions of this Organization, to adopt the specific measures necessary to achieve the implementation of the resolutions concerned, in particular Security Council resolution 385 (1976)—in other words, to ensure the end of the illegal occupation of Namibia and the free exercise by its people of its inalienable right to self-determination and independence.

18. In conclusion, I should like very briefly to refer to one aspect of the problem which is of special importance to the Argentine Government and people.

19. The Argentine Republic's identification with the struggle against colonialism and racial discrimination is crystal-clear and there is no need to reaffirm it here. Nor is it necessary for me to repeat our unwavering support of the African peoples in their struggle to achieve independence and to eliminate *apartheid*. Argentina has stood shoulder to shoulder with Africa from the very beginning, and our stand in this respect during the course of the 32 years during which we have been Members of the United Nations has been active and clear.

20. Our stand has not been fortuitous. In the first place, it was born of our identification as a people that seized the first opportunity to rebel against colonial domination, with all those who are or were recently the victims of pillage and oppression.

21. Secondly, we share with a large section of the African continent the important maritime highway of the Atlantic Ocean. That sea, which at one time might have appeared as an insuperable barrier between our two continents, is now, as a result of scientific and technical progress and the parallel increase in communications, a means to increasing closeness and interdependence.

22. Therefore, my country has an undeniable and legitimate interest in following closely the development of

affairs in southern Africa, whose effects might eventually be felt on or across the Atlantic Ocean which we share. It is also quite natural that, against this background, we feel that the situation in Namibia and the outcome of the problem created there is a matter of concern to us. To take any other stand would not only imply not being in tune with the times, but would also be a denial of an Atlantic mission which geography and history have naturally bequeathed us.

23. All these factors help to explain why we place such emphasis on the need to find a peaceful and negotiated solution to the problem of Namibia; a solution that would allow the Namibian nation to choose its own destiny, without foreign interference of any kind. We know that furthermore, such a solution would meet the desires of the international community and, more specifically, those of the African States.

24. Mr. JACKSON (Guyana): It was during the month of October 11 years ago that the General Assembly took the authoritative and momentous decision to terminate the Mandate of South Africa over Namibia, then called South West Africa [*resolution 2145 (XXI)*]. The Assembly assumed direct responsibility for the Territory and affirmed that Namibia had an international status which should be maintained until independence.

25. A few months later, in May 1967, the Assembly, meeting in special session, agreed upon modalities through which the United Nations could discharge its responsibilities in relation to Namibia and assist its people to attain independence by 1968 [*resolution 2248 (S-V)*]. The successful exercise of that legal responsibility by the United Nations was, however, premised upon an important consideration. This was the compliance by the authorities in South Africa with the prescriptions of the General Assembly and its co-operation for the transfer of the administration of the Territory to the United Nations Council for Namibia appointed by the Assembly.

26. The response given then by South Africa is a matter of public record. It was predictably defiant. For nothing in South Africa's behaviour since 1946, when this question was first discussed by the General Assembly, had given much hope that the white minority régime in Pretoria was about to place the interests of the people of Namibia above its own pursuit of domination and exploitation.

27. Since 1967 the question of Namibia has engaged the concerned attention of the General Assembly through the activities of the Council for Namibia, the Special Committee on decolonization and the Fourth Committee; and the Security Council, in the discharge of its primary responsibility for international peace and security, has on many occasions deliberated on the situation in the Territory and on its future.

28. It is indeed a sad commentary that for 11 years the United Nations has been unable to secure South Africa's withdrawal from Namibia. But the situation has not remained static.

29. Launching their armed struggle in 1967, when other methods failed, the people of Namibia, under the leadership of SWAPO, their authentic representative, have waged an

unrelenting battle to recover their freedom and to regain their dignity as human beings. In that struggle SWAPO has had and continues to have the unstinted support of the majority of States Members of the United Nations, the Organization of African Unity [*OAU*], the non-aligned movement and many progressive forces throughout the world. We in Guyana have been happy to receive in our country President Sam Nujoma and other high ranking personalities from SWAPO, and we have been able to reaffirm to them our commitment of support, morally, materially and politically. On behalf of Guyana, I today reaffirm that our support will continue until final victory is won.

30. Nor indeed has the United Nations been inactive. The Council for Namibia has, it is true, been unable to proceed to Namibia to accomplish the wide-ranging mandate given it by the General Assembly in resolution 2248 (S-V). But over the years, through a series of programmes authorized by this Assembly, the Council for Namibia has sought resolutely to advance the cause of Namibian independence through diplomatic and political activities. The Special Committee, also, has never neglected its responsibilities in this regard. The record of the Security Council has, however, been somewhat varied on the question of Namibia. In resolutions adopted in 1969—resolutions 264 (1969) and 269 (1969)—the Security Council called for the immediate withdrawal of the South African administration from Namibia and decided that in the event of non-compliance by South Africa the Council would meet immediately to determine effective steps or measures in conformity with the relevant provisions of the Charter. Further, in 1972, at its historic meetings in Addis Ababa, the Security Council once again called upon South Africa to effect an immediate withdrawal from Namibia and again decided that, in the event of failure on the part of South Africa to comply with the provisions of resolution 310 (1972), the Council:

“... shall meet immediately to decide upon effective steps or measures, in accordance with the relevant Chapters of the Charter, to secure the full and speedy implementation of the present resolution”.

31. In spite of South Africa's continued defiance of the Security Council, those promised effective steps or measures have not been taken. And when proposals were put to the Council for a mandatory arms embargo against South Africa they attracted the negative votes of the Western permanent members. Thus it is clear that the Security Council has frequently held back from crossing the threshold of decisive action. It has, however, contributed in some ways to the objectives of this Assembly in relation to Namibia through its two recent unanimously adopted resolutions, resolutions 366 (1974) and 385 (1976).

32. Earlier I alluded to the conduct of South Africa as regards Namibia from 1946 until 1967. But the record of that country since the latter date has been, if anything, worse. It is a record of callous contempt for this Organization and its decisions; it is a record which bears witness to the consolidation of *apartheid* and its derivative, the bantustan, in Namibia; it is a record which bears witness to the intensification of violence, through brutal repression, against the people of Namibia; and it is a record which

bears witness to mass arrests and intimidation and to the unrestrained despoliation of the natural resources of the Territory.

33. For a time the racist régime in South Africa felt secure in the continuation of its defiance of the wishes of the international community and its suppression of the rights of the Namibian people. All it seemed prepared to do was to respond with marginal gestures to the combined pressure of SWAPO's bullets and international public opinion. South Africa felt secure for one other important reason—the economic and military strategic relationships it has maintained and in many areas strengthened with some major Powers.

34. But South Africa also felt secure because it believed that the Lisbon-Salisbury-Pretoria axis drew a *cordon sanitaire* across southern Africa for the maintenance in perpetuity of white supremacy in that area. However, through the efforts of the valiant freedom-fighters of Guinea-Bissau, of Cape Verde, of Mozambique, of Sao Tome and Principe, and of Angola, the boundaries of freedom in Africa have now reached the Cunene and the Limpopo. And the embattled Smith régime in Salisbury cannot for much longer hold its beleaguered ramparts against the relentless forces of the Patriotic Front.

35. The geopolitical situation in southern Africa has undergone dramatic changes. Within South Africa itself, the clamour for the restoration of fundamental human rights is ringing with incessant clarity. The youths of Soweto, linked in common cause with the oppressed majority throughout South Africa, are asserting with words and with their lives their determination to dismantle the *apartheid* structure—that symbol of white domination—and make freedom reign throughout the length and breadth of that unhappy land. Thus the battle for freedom in southern Africa is being waged even in South Africa itself, the epicentre of racism in the south of the African continent.

36. It is therefore timely that this year the question of Namibia should receive full consideration in the plenary meetings of the General Assembly. For it is fitting that after 11 years, the General Assembly should in such a session analyse the present situation, assess the correlation of forces in favour of the Namibian struggle and, in asserting its authority, take such decisions and make such recommendations as would assist the people of Namibia in the early attainment of their long-denied freedom and independence.

37. What is clear is that we must not harbour an illusion that the minority régime in Pretoria will have a so-called "change of heart". For racists never undergo self-induced change. History has attested to this verity no less within societies than in relations which extend beyond national boundaries. Those who practise racism have to be pressured into accommodating to change. There is no iota of evidence to encourage a belief—nay a hope—that the white racists installed in Pretoria are, or will be, different. On the contrary. The minority régime in South Africa understands one thing about international action; and that is pressure. That régime is constant in that appreciation.

38. Not unexpectedly, the armed struggle of SWAPO has been intensified and the resistance of the people of Namibia

to the overlordship of South Africa has been stiffened. We must commend the people of Namibia for their valour and their heroism. We must continue to be behind SWAPO, for our efforts are supportive of theirs.

39. In this regard my delegation has followed with intense interest the initiatives which have been taken over the last few months by five major Western countries—Canada, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, the United Kingdom, and the United States of America—to find an internationally acceptable solution to the question of Namibia. We have done so because we are convinced that, because they are pivotal and essential trading partners of South Africa, as well as for other reasons, those States have a capacity to influence the régime in South Africa to heed the legible signs of defeat. For those five States have at their disposal, individually and collectively, appropriate means which can at least lead the racists in Pretoria to the realization that they cannot for long survive in Namibia if those States act on a decision that the game is over.

40. The ascertainable results of those initiatives have not, I believe, reached a sufficiently mature stage to merit discussion. The process is ongoing. It is my delegation's understanding that the current talks between the five and Pretoria are being conducted within the framework of Security Council resolution 385 (1976); and, we assume, they take account of the corpus of United Nations resolutions, including General Assembly resolutions 2145 (XXI) and 2248 (S-V), which antedate Security Council resolution 385 (1976). This is important, since the States involved are at present members of the Security Council, for in so far as the maintenance of international peace and security is concerned, that organ of the United Nations has primary responsibility under the Charter. Thus it is of extraordinary importance that the five Western countries now engaged in dialogue with the Pretoria régime, should, in their talks, neither lose sight of, nor allow confusion to arise over, the respective roles of the Council for Namibia, the General Assembly and the Security Council in the implementation of measures which the United Nations as a whole could adopt to hasten the independence of Namibia in and of itself. Specifically, the position of the United Nations in international law cannot be compromised.

41. If and when firm proposals resulting from those initiatives are brought to the United Nations, Guyana will make its position clear. In arriving at our determination we will, of course, take fully into account the wishes of the people of Namibia as expressed by SWAPO, their legitimate representative. We will also remain acutely sensitive to the positions expressed by those who speak on behalf of Africa.

42. If on the other hand those initiatives come to naught—though we hope they will not—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.

43. An important necessity is the intensification of individual and collective efforts for the further isolation of the Fascist régime in South Africa and the maximization of pressure upon it. There are various ways of effecting such pressure.

44. Today we are at a stage where the armed struggle daily presses upon the illegal occupier of Namibia. Within the Territory, the people acting under the guidance of SWAPO render the oppressive racist superstructure less and less secure. The Turnhalle escapade, which was nothing but a sham, is over; and Pretoria recognizes it. The marching forces of liberation are in sight of victory in Namibia. The overwhelming majority of the world's peoples is striding with the people of Namibia. Let not this General Assembly waver in its footsteps; let it not flinch from its responsibilities.

45. Mr. MOGWE (Botswana): As a neighbour of and friend to the people of Namibia, a people struggling for freedom and independence, Botswana finds it gratifying to contribute to the discussion on Namibia by speaking of practical problems of transition, in addition to expounding, as we have so often done in the past, principles on which South Africa has consistently, as the Americans would put it, "stonewalled".

46. We may, at this stage in the unfolding Namibian situation, cautiously observe that the efforts of many people inside and outside Namibia may finally bear fruit. I deeply hope that my speech next year will be one of welcome to an independent Namibia on its entry into the United Nations family. The expression of such hopes might have sounded vain and wishful a few months ago. Recent events, however, provide a sense of promise, if we assume goodwill on all sides, that a solution may, at last, be reached.

47. We are conscious of the fact that the obstacles between the present situation and the future goal are multiple, tenacious and difficult of resolution. Literally and figuratively we are still a long way from home base. Before enumerating the obstacles and my hopes about how they might be tackled I wish to express my country's appreciation to those who in the past year have played important roles in the search for solutions. At the Maputo Conference last May the international community closely considered both the issues and the strategies of the Namibia and Zimbabwe struggles.<sup>1</sup> The August meeting in Lagos on *apartheid* emphasized further the need to solve problems in the minority-ruled countries of southern Africa.<sup>2</sup> The Council for Namibia has worked tirelessly on its formidable and often frustrating task of making recommendations to, and implementing the resolutions of, our Organization.

48. The Council, exercising its legal authority, has continued its active vigil as the champion of independent

<sup>1</sup> For the report of the International Conference in Support of the Peoples of Zimbabwe and Namibia, held in Maputo from 16 to 21 May 1977, see *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-second Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1977*, document S/12344/Rev.1.

<sup>2</sup> For the report of the World Conference for Action against *Apartheid*, held in Lagos, from 22 to 26 August 1977, see *Report of the World Conference for Action against Apartheid* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.77.XIV.2 and 3).

Namibia and its activities have been reported to this Assembly by its current, effective Chairman, Ambassador Gwendoline Konié.

49. In my statement to the General Assembly last week [30th meeting] I noted with appreciation the changing posture of South Africa's trading partners as represented by the group of five Western members of the Security Council in undertaking to grapple with problems in the way of reaching a negotiated settlement leading to self-determination and independence for Namibia. I repeat those sentiments today.

50. The leading role in the Namibia struggle throughout has of course been played by SWAPO, the legitimate representative of the people of that Territory. SWAPO has kept the cause of the liberation of the people of Namibia before the world and has effectively increased its political and military support both inside and outside the country. It is highly doubtful whether without SWAPO the negotiations now under way would have been undertaken. The people of Namibia continue to look to SWAPO to achieve an acceptable settlement to enable them to exercise their right to self-determination. We unreservedly support these efforts.

51. The present discussions and negotiations regarding Namibia are, like all negotiations, an effort to establish the processes by which principles can be translated into reality. The guiding principles have been well established over the years and summarized in Security Council resolution 385 (1976). If those principles are to be put into practice, compromises of timing, numbers and even forms of organization may be called for on all sides. Such adjustments must not, however, compromise principles. As we reflect on the efforts to put into effect the principles we have all supported for Namibia it may be worth while to recall that those principles include: the withdrawal of South African occupying military forces; the release and return of detainees and political prisoners; freedom of political activity and the holding of fair and free elections; and the unitary statehood of Namibia.

52. The international community has consistently observed that open political campaigning and free elections cannot be carried out in an atmosphere where there is fear of intimidation from any quarter. Military forces recently in combat are likely to generate such fears. While it is understandable that either side in an armed conflict may be reluctant to entrust security to its opponent, the installation of a United Nations peace-keeping force simultaneously with rapid South African troop withdrawals should allay such anxieties. Botswana believes that both sides will acknowledge the need to ensure security for all Namibians and the desirability of the containment of armed forces and the rapid withdrawal of South African occupying forces, along with the phasing-in of a peace-keeping force under the supervision of the United Nations and the ultimate creation of a Namibian national army.

53. We urge the prompt release of all Namibian detainees and political prisoners. They should be assured of safe return to Namibia along with Namibian refugees now living in many countries. We would also support a call for a general amnesty that would make it possible for all to

participate fully and freely in determining the future life of their country.

54. Self-determination implies that people will have the freedom to elect the government of their choice. Full and open participation in the process of political campaigning should be ensured and, after an agreed period of time, should be followed by United Nations-supervised elections based on universal adult suffrage. We would urge that constituencies be delimited in such a way as to nullify the ethnic character of the Turnhalle proposals, aimed at the bantustanization of Namibia and institutionalized ethnic politics, which would certainly result in separatism and strife.

57 It would appear that, with one caveat, the principle of the territorial integrity of Namibia will be observed. The glaring exception is South Africa's claim to Walvis Bay. Botswana has first-hand experience of the impracticability of maintaining a foreign presence in a country. The pre-independence decision to move our capital from Mafeking in South Africa to Gaborone in Botswana was prompted by the desire to avoid the tensions and friction which can only result from the existence of a foreign enclave within the boundaries of a country. The experience of India with Portuguese Goa is too recent to be forgotten.

56. Politically, economically, logistically and culturally, Walvis Bay is an integral part of Namibia. The Territory has been governed as such for almost 60 years. Powers relating to legislation, elected representation, the judiciary, taxes and customs revenue have been vested in the South West African authorities. It would, in our view, therefore appear to be an act of both spite and petulance for South Africa to press this claim on the eve of Namibia's independence.

57. To facilitate the early transition of Namibia to independence it is vital that a representative of the United Nations Secretary-General should be appointed soon and that his powers and terms of reference should be clearly defined. It is to be hoped that the Administrator-General recently appointed by South Africa will work co-operatively under the authority of the United Nations representative to facilitate the transitional arrangements.

58. As the situation in Namibia develops it may be desirable to revise the roles and functions of the United Nations bodies established 10 or so years ago to deal with circumstances which may now be markedly different.

59. The problem of Namibia has been with us too long. Namibia, a Trust Territory, could have gained its independence before some of our independent States, and certainly long before bogus independence was contemplated for the Transkei and Bophuthatswana, but for South Africa's defiance of United Nations resolutions. We urge this comity of nations to do all in its power to induce South Africa to terminate its occupation of that Territory and enable the people of Namibia to exercise their right to self-determination and independence.

60. Mr. MESTIRI (Tunisia) (*interpretation from French*): The fact that our Assembly is considering the question of Namibia as a matter of priority indicates how strongly the international community feels about the permanent chal-

lenge constituted by the perpetuation in that Territory of an illegal and oppressive administration.

61. The threat which that challenge represents to the peace and security of the African continent is so serious that the Council of Ministers of the OAU at its twenty-ninth session at Libreville considered the convening of a special session of the United Nations General Assembly to deal with this problem [*see A/32/310, annex I, CM/Res.551 (XXIX)*].

62. There could be no better place to echo the concerns expressed by the African States than this Assembly, which, in its resolution 2145 (XXI), 11 years ago put an end to South Africa's Mandate.

63. The authority of our Organization has been flouted all too often by South Africa for us to be satisfied any longer with half-measures and protestations of good faith. The need for firm and resolute action capable of putting an end to the intolerable situation prevailing in Namibia is today recognized and accepted by everyone.

64. We must unanimously and vigorously denounce a régime which responds to the numerous behests of the Security Council by extending the policy of *apartheid* and homelands to Namibia. We must condemn the methods practised by the illegal administration of Mr. Vorster's Government, which is imprisoning and torturing men and women, making large-scale transfers of population and stopping at no atrocity in its efforts to perpetuate its exploitation of the people and the natural resources of the Territory. The acts of aggression against the Namibian people committed in violation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and of the Charter of the United Nations are repugnant to the world's conscience.

65. In these circumstances, we must express our disapproval of any ambiguous attitude on the part of those who, defying world public opinion, continue to maintain normal and even cordial relations with this minority régime. We vigorously denounce and condemn the activities of all foreign companies operating in Namibia which are exploiting the human and natural resources of that Territory. We consider that those activities constitute an obstacle to the granting of independence to the Namibian people and are designed to guarantee the perpetuation of South Africa's domination over that people.

66. Such activities are unacceptable. They must be denounced with increased vigour, especially in the military and nuclear spheres, in view of the potential dangers to which any foreign collaboration with Pretoria gives rise. Indeed, the massive strengthening of the South African armed forces and the fact that the Pretoria administration is increasingly resorting to intimidation and force against neighbouring African States already represent a serious threat to international peace and security. It is therefore of the greatest importance that all States should renounce all forms of military collaboration, direct or indirect, with South Africa.

67. Although the dangers are increasing and they are confronted with brute force, the valiant people of Namibia

is not giving in. The heroic struggle which it is waging under the wise leadership of its national movement, SWAPO, will inevitably bring it independence. For our part, we wish to renew to that people the assurance of our active solidarity and to hail its struggle for freedom. We hope that Pretoria will now understand the foolishness of its delaying tactics and cease its vain attempts to block the course of history.

68. The policy of evasion practised by the South African régime, which is aimed at dividing the Namibian people in order the better to subject it to the will of the white minority, only results in a further deterioration of an already explosive situation and in postponing the chances for a peaceful settlement of the conflict.

69. The leaders of the Namibian people have nevertheless on many occasions reiterated their complete willingness to engage in serious negotiations aimed at avoiding bloodshed.

70. They rightly believe that those negotiations, to be useful and effective, must take place within the framework of the relevant resolutions of the United Nations and the OAU.

71. It is incumbent upon those who argue for the need to maintain relations with South Africa in order to bring it to its senses and to assume their responsibilities. If only they had the will, they could by the numerous means at their disposal contribute to real progress towards the satisfaction of the legitimate claims of the Namibian people.

72. We are convinced that resolute action relying on concerted international pressure and unhampered by particular considerations or short-term economic interests would be capable of furthering the establishment of harmony and justice in southern Africa.

73. If, on the other hand, this solidarity for which we are ardently appealing should once again prove to be lacking and the present impasse should continue, we fear a serious and lasting threat to international peace and security.

74. In this connexion the initiative taken by the five Western members of the Security Council of our Organization can and must lead to a peaceful solution of the conflict. The achievement of independence and the exercise by the Namibian people of its right to self-determination necessarily imply the complete and unconditional withdrawal of the South African troops and respect for the territorial integrity of Namibia. Furthermore, there cannot be free consultation of the population of the Territory without the liberation of the political prisoners. Similarly, there cannot be serious guarantees without the effective participation of the United Nations in all stages of the process leading to the effective liberation of the Territory.

75. Of course, we know that, whatever the South African Government does, Namibia will inevitably win back its freedom; however, no effort should be spared in order to prevent pointless suffering. In this regard we must pay a tribute to SWAPO, the worthy representative of the Namibian people, for having given a negotiated settlement of the conflict every chance of success.

76. It is now incumbent on South Africa's friends to bring it to accept the inevitable: the freedom of the Namibian people.

77. Should this prospect, which is in keeping with the peaceful aspirations of Africa, fail to materialize, it will be up to the Namibian people itself, assisted and supported by all the peoples of Africa and other friendly peoples, to put an end to the oppression of the supporters of *apartheid*.

78. Mr. FARAJ (United Arab Emirates): The United Arab Emirates has since its independence followed with deep concern the developments in South Africa, Rhodesia and Namibia. We strongly condemned the policy of *apartheid* and bantustanization practised by the racist Government of South Africa.

79. Many words have been spoken and many volumes written on Namibia in and outside this body. General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) clearly proclaimed the inalienable right of the Namibian people to freedom and independence.

80. The advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice in June 1971 made it quite clear:

“... that the... presence of South Africa in Namibia being illegal, South Africa is under obligation to withdraw its administration from Namibia immediately and thus put an end to its occupation of the Territory”.<sup>3</sup>

81. General Assembly resolution 3399 (XXX) of November 1975 urged the Security Council to take up the question of Namibia. The Security Council met and adopted resolution 385 (1976) by which it, *inter alia*, demanded that South Africa agree to hold free elections in Namibia under United Nations supervision and control.

82. But again South Africa did not comply with the terms of resolution 385 (1976). On 19 October 1976 the Security Council considered a seven-Power draft resolution<sup>4</sup> calling for, *inter alia*, a complete and mandatory arms embargo on South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations. Unfortunately, the resolution was not adopted because of the negative vote by three permanent members of the Security Council.

83. In the meantime, the South African administration in Namibia made the task of the United Nations Council for Namibia very difficult. The Council has been unable to exercise its responsibility for the administration of Namibia, because of the refusal by the Government of South Africa to withdraw its illegal administration from Namibia, in compliance with the repeated resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council.

84. However, there is a glimpse of hope for Namibia as a result of the recent involvement of the five Western members of the Security Council, who met with South African officials in Cape Town, on 22 April 1977, and expressed their disapproval of the Namibian independence plans under the proposed Turnhalle constitutional solutions

<sup>3</sup> See *Legal Consequences for States of the Continued Presence of South Africa in Namibia (South West Africa) notwithstanding Security Council Resolution 276 (1970)*, Advisory Opinion, I.C.J. Reports 1971, p. 46.

<sup>4</sup> *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-First Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1976*, document S/12211.

in Namibia. It is understood that the position taken by the five Western members is based on Security Council resolution 385 (1976), which is as follows: first, free elections under United Nations supervision; secondly, the withdrawal of South Africa, politically and militarily, from Namibia; thirdly, the abolition of repressive legislation; fourthly, the participation of SWAPO in the process.

85. South Africa continues to defy the decisions of the United Nations and world public opinion. The delegation of the United Arab Emirates denounces the presence of South Africa in Namibia and the fragmentation of the Territory through the policy of "bantustanism". We hope that the finding of the so-called constitutional conference, in which the true representatives of the Namibian people, SWAPO, were not allowed to participate, will be doomed to failure. Therefore, it is clear that the acceptable solution is one that would enable the Namibian people to exercise its right to self-determination and independence, in accordance with the provisions of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), and that the United Nations Council for Namibia should be given the opportunity by South Africa to do its work in helping the Namibian people and preparing them for independence.

86. It is our hope and aspiration that the problem will be solved peacefully. The United Arab Emirates would like to reaffirm its support for the Namibian people.

87. According to Mr. David Owen, Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs of the United Kingdom, negotiations on Namibia by the five Western members of the Security Council are still in progress and it is hard to be specific at this stage. We are hopeful that the outcome of the negotiations in question will be fruitful. By "fruitful" I imply that South Africa should comply with the terms of Security Council resolution 385 (1976). South Africa should be realistic. It cannot stop the march to freedom.

88. In conclusion, I should like to reaffirm that the United Arab Emirates will continue its material and moral support to African liberation movements until they restore the dignity of their peoples and recover their people's sovereignty over their national soil.

89. Mr. NAVA CARRILLO (Venezuela) (*interpretation from Spanish*): With regard to item 91 concerning the question of Namibia, the statement of the delegation of Venezuela will be very short. We only intend to repeat our firm conviction that the delay in reaching a final solution on this question seriously jeopardizes the prestige and effectiveness of the Organization.

90. In parliamentary diplomacy, and this of course is a truism, patience and understanding are tools of known value; but recognition of this fact does not mean that those qualities can be taken to mean tolerance and complicity.

91. With respect to the problem of Namibia the immense majority of States Members have already passed judgement on the situation in all its aspects and implications. The tangible and intangible factors at play are clear to all. We may have failed, not in the analysis of our ability to act, but in our analysis of the features of the international community's machinery for action to solve the problem.

92. And thus we need not devote ourselves to an analysis of the organization of power in the United Nations, or of the procedures for the implementation of decisions, nor to assess the types of capacity for action and the interrelationship among Member States both within and outside the Organization.

93. We have all the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and its organs, by the Security Council, and by the International Court of Justice itself. For years they have stood as repetitions of the same conclusions and they all contain the following elements: that the Namibians have an inalienable right to self-determination and independence; that the administration of the Territory legally belongs with the United Nations; that the occupation by South Africa of Namibia is illegal and constitutes an act of aggression; that the true representative of the population is SWAPO; there are energetic denunciations of the régime of South Africa, innumerable exhortations and appeals to States to cut off the different forms of co-operation with South Africa that have allowed it and still allow it to continue its illegal occupation of the Territory; and there is a condemnation of South Africa for all its legislative, administrative and economic activities linked with that occupation, and the requirement is made that it cease to apply the laws and rules concerned. And we also have the Security Council's offer, decided upon in accordance with the terms of resolution 385 (1976), to meet, if South Africa does not fulfil the provisions of that resolution, "for the purpose of considering the appropriate measures to be taken under the Charter of the United Nations".

94. On 14 March of this year the Special Committee adopted a consensus that has already been put before the Security Council for its consideration which denounces the régime of South Africa for its continued illegal occupation of Namibia, its outright violation of its obligations under the Charter, its attempt to perpetuate its domination over the Namibian people by creating an atmosphere of terror and intimidation, and by employing tactics which have as their objective to destroy the unity and territorial integrity of Namibia and deny the aspirations of its people [*see A/32/23/Rev.1, chap. VIII, para. 12 (1)*].

95. The true representative of that people, SWAPO, has set forth six prior conditions which require our express support: that South Africa publicly accept the right of the people of Namibia to independence and national sovereignty; that it recognize that the territorial integrity of Namibia is absolute and non-negotiable; that it grant freedom to political prisoners and allow political exiles to return home with guarantees that they will not be detained or intimidated; that it withdraw its military and paramilitary forces; that it abstain from continuing to use the Territory as a base for committing acts of aggression against the neighbouring independent African States; and that any constitutional talks on Namibia be supervised by the United Nations and that their purpose be the holding of free elections also under the supervision and control of the United Nations.

96. The report of the United Nations Council on Namibia contains among the recommendations it has submitted for the consideration of the General Assembly, a draft text dealing with the situation prevailing in Namibia as a



consequence of the illegal occupation by South Africa [A/32/24, para. 270]; and we can agree with its terms.

97. The Council of Ministers of the OAU has also reaffirmed the conditions on which to base a negotiated agreement which should, as soon as possible, allow the attainment of the legitimate independence of Namibia.

98. The position of Venezuela on this subject has been very clearly defined in the past. We were present recently at the International Conference in Support of the Peoples of Zimbabwe and Namibia, held in Maputo, and the World Conference for Action against *Apartheid* held in Lagos. Our presence at both those meetings attests to our true interest and concern over the problems of southern Africa which, doubtless, constitute an imminent threat to international peace and security. The Head of Venezuela's Government addressed a message to the Lagos Conference expressing, on behalf of the Venezuelan people, active solidarity with the objectives and purposes of that Conference.

99. In Maputo, the delegation of Venezuela recognized the profound significance the Conference had for the achievement of the aspirations of the peoples of Zimbabwe and Namibia and spoke out in favour of the adoption of new measures to strengthen the struggle against colonialism.

100. This very brief glance at the evolution of the problem, together with the fact that all approaches, both regional and global, are converging together must convince us that the responsibility now lies primarily with that organ that is called upon to ensure rapid and effective action on the part of the United Nations. There are grounds for thinking that the international community is now determined to adopt more realistic and effective measures to solve the problem of Namibia.

101. Be that as it may, as far as Venezuela itself is concerned, by reason of our responsibilities and our commitments as a Member of the Organization, the Foreign Minister of my country has unequivocally stated that in the Security Council Venezuela will do what is necessary to ensure that Namibia obtains its independence in accordance with United Nations decisions.

102. Mr. DE FIGUEIREDO (Angola): As I stand here to address this gathering, it would appear as if history were repeating itself, as if I were pleading the case of my country, Angola, before the world community. Of course, it is no longer so, and the People's Republic of Angola is a sovereign independent State. However, our comrades, our close neighbours, are still suffering through this treacherous period, and I want to assure them, on behalf of my Government, the Central Committee of the Movimento Popular de Libertação de Angola, and all our revolutionary militants in the People's Republic of Angola, that we view the situation in Namibia with as much concern, worry, interest and dedication as we would in our own country. Angola has played a pivotal role in the liberation movement of the African continent, particularly in the southern part. We are proud to have spearheaded the struggle against colonialism and imperialism in our part of the world. Mindful of our role, we do not shirk our responsibilities in so far as they relate to our comrades in all of southern Africa, especially Namibia.

103. The attainment of independence has not ended our commitment, nor the seriousness or the intensity of our dedication to international causes. We feel ourselves an integral part of the struggle now being waged by the people of Namibia, led by their revolutionary vanguard, SWAPO. We share their fears, their turmoil, their hopes and their dreams. Our cause is one, and this is not just a figure of speech. For as long as that hated minority racist régime continues its reign of terror and inhumanity in Pretoria, and through its puppets in Windhoek, my country is constantly threatened with raids, incursions, artillery fire, strafing, sabotage, subversion and even full-scale, outright invasion. The hostile *apartheid* régime on our southern border, like a malevolent enemy, threatens our territorial integrity and our internal security. The South African military base at Grootfontein in the north of Namibia is a source of terror for the security of the whole of southern Africa. Moreover, the Pretoria régime keeps over 40,000 South African troops in Namibia, almost one to every two whites. South African troops, tanks, guns and mortars daily threaten our civilian population in the southern part of Angola.

104. The brutalities perpetrated by the racist régime have caused large numbers of Namibians to flee their homeland and seek refuge and a haven in Angola. We are happy that in these difficult times Angola can be of some service to them. However, that situation would not have arisen if those people had felt safe in their homes and property. The status of refugee is, at best, degrading, and only the most extreme circumstances force one to flee.

105. Let me state here and now that in this debate on the question of Namibia, we do not hold any mandate for the people of Namibia. Only SWAPO, the only recognized, authentic and legitimate representative of the people of Namibia, has the authority to speak on behalf of the Namibian people, to negotiate, to debate, to answer and to accept. We in our position as friends, neighbours and fellow revolutionaries in the common struggle against imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism, racism and *apartheid*, as a people whose memory is still full of our own liberation struggle, as a nation whose life is not yet entirely free of the dangers posed by external invasion and by internal subversion plotted and planned by reactionary forces aligned with imperialist Powers and their lackeys, we, for all these reasons, and many others that have to do with our historical and fraternal ties, stand ready to defend the people of Namibia, to support them, to fight side by side with them and to rejoice with them in the attainment of their independence.

106. The West has long dealt with the struggles of the peoples of the third world, whether political, economic or social, as "questions"—as witness even the topic of today's debate. What "the question of Namibia" is to the ex-colonialist and neo-colonialist Powers who have so long ruled the world is to the African people of Namibia a matter of survival itself, of their existence as a nation, of their right to live in independence and sovereignty. These "questions" are an eloquent testimonial to the arrogance of the West at its worst—whether it be the French *mission civilisatrice* in Indo-China, the British Empire on which the sun never set, or the modern United States empire of transnationals or conglomerates. When a black son of Africa is gunned down like an animal in the Sowetos that dot the face of southern

Africa, the men who sit in the board-rooms of giant Western companies are as much to blame as the man who pulls the trigger, or the Government that sanctions it. Those who remain silent in the face of such monstrosities condone them by not vociferously condemning them; they sanction them by not choking off the vital nutrients needed by the racist minority régimes to survive and flourish. If the sanctions against economic collaboration with Pretoria, the embargoes against investment, trade or any other form of exchange were observed by the world today, Namibia, Zimbabwe and South Africa would be free tomorrow.

107. Until fairly recently, some Western Powers have been the key nations in rejecting United Nations resolutions aimed at putting arms or trade embargoes into effect against South Africa. Pretoria has ruled the Territory and nation of Namibia under a 1920 Mandate from the League of Nations, which was revoked by the United Nations. But Pretoria refuses to give up its empire. After grudgingly agreeing to grant Namibia independence by 31 December 1978 it attempted to install a puppet régime in Windhoek, through a system of bantustans, which would remain totally subservient to Pretoria and be an extension of that minority racist régime.

108. It is not for Vorster to "grant" independence and sovereignty to the Namibian people; that is their inalienable right. It is not for Vorster to "offer" terms; it is for him to accept them. It is he and his Fascist cohorts who are the intruders in Namibia. It is they who must accept Namibian terms.

109. The tribulations being faced by the people of Namibia and certainly by SWAPO are common knowledge; however, for those who do not know the full extent of the crimes being perpetrated against the Namibian people, let me briefly enumerate them. In Namibia, 44 per cent of the total land has been reserved for whites, who form approximately 10 per cent of the population. Two million carats of diamonds are mined per annum through a concession owned by the giant Anglo-American Corporation: 90 per cent of those are of gem quality; 49 per cent of the income goes to the South African Government under the Precious Stones Act; native sons make \$300 per year, while the whites make more than \$5,000 per year. Non-whites are required to live in segregated townships outside the "white" cities, or on tribal homelands; no blacks are allowed to own businesses. The Pretoria régime is hurriedly desegregating lavatories and night-clubs—what a mockery of justice, equality and humanity! This year, the Government has allowed members of any race to buy farmland in a "whites only" sector. Namibia is rich in uranium, which fuels the *apartheid* system and its imperial masters in the industrialized West, while Namibian children walk around with bellies swollen by malnutrition. The racist régime in Pretoria continues to build and expand its nuclear capability, arousing only feeble responses from those Powers who need nuclear raw materials; that is a fact.

110. The five Western members of the Security Council, all of them strong nuclear Powers and all of them with strong and flourishing links with the South African economy, are carrying out a sort of peace plan for Namibia. Actually, South Africa is using this as a delaying tactic to the advantage of both sides. A peaceful transition in

Namibia would demonstrate the credibility of the Western argument that it can offer a non-violent path to the solution of the racial crisis in southern Africa. But the racist régime's violence continues, not in the streets of Western cities nor against Western children, but in the black holes and ghettos to which our black children are consigned. Pretoria wants to bantustanize Namibia and has started training tribal armies. That can only lead to civil war, giving Pretoria the pretext to march in even after independence.

111. There are countless issues yet to be settled—the withdrawal of all South African troops from Namibian soil, the freeing of political prisoners, elections, cease-fire, and so on. But those are issues that only the Namibian people can settle through their representative, SWAPO. The Western Powers are trying to make their arrangements for Namibia more palatable, more acceptable to the world community. Why is that? Those arrangements have only to be acceptable to the people of Namibia, to SWAPO, and they will be automatically acceptable to all of us.

112. Another area in which Pretoria displays its imperialistic designs is with regard to Walvis Bay. Walvis Bay is an integral part of the Territory of Namibia, despite the arguments advanced by Pretoria to the effect that it did not come under the original Mandate. If we followed that argument, the map of the third world would be totally changed today to accommodate every whim and fancy, often clothed in legal phraseology, of the imperial and colonial Powers. No one can allow a colonialist enclave right in the middle of the Namibian coastline, ever a threat to the sovereignty of the State of Namibia.

113. We have already heard the representative of SWAPO speak [35th meeting]. He has stated the position of the Namibian people. The position of the Namibian people regarding their independence is fully endorsed and supported by us. We further support the SWAPO request for a special session on Namibia as soon as it becomes necessary; we endorse their demand that South Africa should make reparation to Namibia for the damage caused by its illegal occupation and aggression since the termination of the Mandate; and we fully support the SWAPO request that all States Members of the United Nations should refrain from recognizing or co-operating with any régime that South Africa may impose upon the Namibian people. On our part, we can continue to mobilize all our resources to back that people with whatever help they may need, in whatever form. If Pretoria insists on making a mockery of the ballot, then perhaps the bullet is the only way. Freedom won through the barrel of a gun is a heavy price indeed, and we know it. The victims are on both sides, but if that is the only way to achieve independence, none of us has ever hesitated. The struggle continues. Victory is certain.

114. Mr. GARBA (Nigeria): Mr. President, please permit me to join other speakers before me in extending to you my warmest congratulations on your election as President of the thirty-second session of the United Nations General Assembly. I am confident that your varied experience and your rich wisdom will prove an asset in our deliberations on this all important question of Namibia.

115. Exactly two years ago during a debate in the Security Council on the question of Namibia, we underlined our

scepticism about the bona fides of the South African Government on the issue of negotiating the termination of its illegal occupation of the Territory.<sup>5</sup> In underlining this scepticism, we drew attention to South Africa's flagrant disregard of previous resolutions of this august Assembly as well as those of the Security Council, particularly resolution 385 (1976), which the racists, in their arrogance, have refused to implement. We also drew attention to the danger that the South African Government, in its desperate bid to maintain its stranglehold over the Territory, would attempt to impose solutions outside the ambit of the United Nations and at variance with the genuine interests of the majority population in Namibia.

116. It was not long before we were proved right, as was clearly evident in the political manoeuvres that characterized the proceedings of the Turnhalle Conference, which was set up to give legality to the imposition of a puppet government in Windhoek. Thanks largely to diplomatic and international pressure the Conference was adjourned by the racists, who then proceeded to act in the worst demonstration of international brigandage in recent history, by annexing Walvis Bay.

117. Walvis Bay is the largest port in Namibia and is the centre of the fishing industry as well as the home of some of the non-white majority inhabitants of the Territory. The annexation by the Pretoria régime even overrode the decision taken at the so-called Turnhalle Conference by the racists' own hand-picked representatives to the effect that the question of the future status of Walvis Bay would be among the matters negotiated between the Conference and South Africa prior to the establishment of an interim government, and ignored the demand of the non-white populations represented by SWAPO, that Walvis Bay be recognized as an integral part of the Territory. That is not even all. The annexation is a distinct set-back to the Western initiative for resolving the question of Namibia, and this in effect reinforces our earlier scepticism that the racists are certainly not prepared to terminate their illegal occupation of the whole Territory. That act, in the view of my delegation is, in the mildest terms, an insult to our noble Organization and an affront to the international community.

118. For our part, we would certainly not acquiesce in any diminution of the sovereignty of the Namibian people over the entire Territory. And since sovereignty, self-determination and independence constitute an integral part of the habiliments of any civilized society, we reaffirm our pledge of total support to the people of Namibia in their legitimate and relentless struggle to free their country from all vestiges of colonialism and, in this instance, to bring about the unconditional reintegration of Walvis Bay into the Territory as part of an indivisible and united Namibia.

119. Meanwhile, our Organization watches helplessly, as it were, while South Africa commits such blatant violation of the territorial integrity of a State for which the United Nations has exclusive responsibility. That, by itself, is only one of the ignoble deeds perpetrated by the Pretoria régime in the Territory. There is now abundant evidence of

increasing militarization of Namibia by the racists. In order to suppress the stiffening challenge to its authority posed, as it were, by the activities of the freedom fighters, the Pretoria régime has further strengthened its troop build-up in the Territory and expanded the string of military bases along its northern border, particularly in the Caprivi Strip, from which it continues to destabilize the friendly Republic of Angola. One recent conservative estimate has placed the number of such troops at 50,000 men. The repressive South African military complex also includes heavy military equipment such as tanks and armoured cars, helicopters, sophisticated communications systems and weapons and an early warning satellite station. Paratroopers and mechanized units of the racist army have been stationed at strategic points all over the country.

120. The African population has also been subjected to new draconian laws under so-called emergency regulations. Those repressive laws could, among other things, make any African liable to arbitrary arrest, interrogation and to indefinite detention without trial; ban all public meetings and boycotts; empower the racist gangsters masquerading as law enforcement agents to remove an entire community permanently from a given area and to take punitive action against anyone refusing to comply; authorize the South African Minister of Bantu Administration and Development and of Education to seal off any area in order for it to be systematically searched; and define failure to report the presence of nationalist fighters as a criminal offence punishable by arrest without a warrant and indefinite detention without trial or access to legal counsel. Under those repressive laws, many Namibians are languishing in the racist gaols and subjected to such mental and physical torture the gravity and enormity of which cannot be adequately described in words.

121. The intensification of the armed struggle in Namibia and the consequent uncertainty with regard to the future status of the Territory have led to a stampede in the indiscriminate exploitation of the exhaustible mineral and other resources of the Territory by Western economic interests working in close collaboration with the racist occupying administration. The interest of Namibia for South Africa and the international business community lies mainly in its known and potential mineral deposits. Namibia is the largest producer of gem diamonds in the world, an important source of copper, lead, zinc, lithium and potentially the largest producer of uranium in the world for the remainder of the century.

122. Capital invested in the Territory by foreign interests has increased by more than 10 times since 1946, but that phenomenal increase has not benefited the majority African population. The racists continue to siphon considerable manpower from the agricultural sector on which the majority African population depends into the commercial and mining sectors where, in order to permit the companies involved to make huge profits, the African workers are paid only subsistence wages. Not only are wages paid on the basis of colour—that is to say, on the basis of discrimination between whites and blacks—they are also paid on the basis of political orientation. Blacks who openly identify themselves with the racist policies in the Territory get, in consequence, marginally higher wages than other blacks who do not.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, *Thirty-first Year*, 1957th meeting.

123. The United Nations Council for Namibia has repeatedly declared that the natural resources of Namibia are the birthright of the Namibian people and has enacted Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia. The exploitation of those resources by foreign economic interests, under the protection of the repressive racist Administration of South Africa and in violation of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and of the resolutions of the Security Council and this Assembly, is thus illegal and contributes to the maintenance of the illegal régime of occupation. The rapid depletion of the natural resources of the Territory, arising from the reckless plunder in which foreign economic interests engage in collusion with the racists, is a grave threat to the integrity and prosperity of an independent Namibia. In the view of my Government, the annexation of Walvis Bay cannot but be seen as a strategic move by the racists to gain a haven inside Namibia from where they could launch armed incursions into Namibian territory should the Government of an independent Namibia decide to terminate the activities of those foreign interests in the Territory.

124. The question that is easily identified on everybody's lips is what can the United Nations do. The United Nations, in my view, can do many things provided there is no lack of political will on the part of its Members. As for my country, Nigeria, we remain unconvinced that an inconsequential Government like the one at present installed in Pretoria can, with such indescribable ease, defy the resolutions of this Assembly and the Security Council that comprises the world's greatest Powers.

125. In other words, we feel that the time has come to put an end to this hypocritical attitude on the part of some world Powers in handling the Namibian question if we are indeed to make progress in the matter. This can be done by replacing the invidious policy of sanctions-breaking with one of faithful and strict compliance with United Nations sanctions against the racists. They should lend their unqualified support to an intensification of the diplomatic isolation of the Pretoria régime and reverse their so-called

policy of neutrality by granting concrete and material assistance to the liberation movements and, in this instance, to SWAPO, which has been recognized by the United Nations as the sole authentic voice of the Namibian people, until every inch of the Territory is free.

126. We would certainly not stand in the way of the current Western initiative or any other initiative that has the final objective of achieving a truly independent Namibia as long as such initiative is carried out within the ambit of the United Nations which remains the legal authority in the Territory.

127. The Council of Ministers of the OAU during its deliberations in Libreville last June reaffirmed that any agreement negotiated to lead Namibia to genuine independence must be based on the following pre-conditions: first, withdrawal of all the military and paramilitary forces of South Africa; second, unconditional release of all political prisoners and the return of all Namibians in exile; third, that any interim authority in the Territory "be of the United Nations Council for Namibia"; and, fourth, accession of the Territory to independence within its present limits, including Walvis Bay [see A/32/310, annex I, CM/Res.551 (XXIX)].

128. While my delegation hereby reaffirms without any reservation its endorsement of the position of the OAU, please permit me to say that Nigeria reserves the right to take additional measures which in our considered judgement would accelerate the process of decolonization and bring about the emergence of genuine independence in the Territory. I should like to assure this Assembly that we believe that no sacrifice is too great and we consider no measures too strong in our drive towards the final objective of freeing our kith and kin in Namibia. This is a responsibility which emanates from our own recent history and the facts of geography, and we certainly do not intend to shirk that responsibility.

*The meeting rose at 5.15 p.m.*