It is perilous to presume that anything written today will be up to date tomorrow, but with that limitation we offer these observations in response to questions frequently asked.

1. WHO ARE THE MAIN ACTORS IN THE PRESENT NEGOTIATIONS?

Until about April, 1977, the main actors were the United Nations Organization (U.N.), the South African Government (SAG), and the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO). In response to U.N. Security Council (UNSC) resolutions calling for withdrawal of the SAG, South Africa initiated a process for an "internal settlement." This involved sponsoring a constitutional convention, familiarly named for its setting, The Turnhalle. The delegates were not representative of the population of Namibia, but were sympathetic to South African principles of apartheid. Consequently, The Turnhalle was repudiated by most Namibian leaders in the church and community, as well as by the United Nations. It was evident that the SAG had not complied with the directives of the UNSC and that another impasse was shaping up.

In April of 1977 another group was added to the cast of actors, known as the 5. These are the five Western states who are currently members of the UNSC, namely: United States, United Kingdom, France, Canada and Federal Republic of Germany. This Western initiative was taken in order to break the impasse. Representing no one but their governments, they have been able to consult with the SAG, SWAPO, and the governments of the so-called front-line and neighboring states: Angola, Mozambique, Botswana, Zambia and Tanzania.

An additional actor in this whole drama is the so-called Administrator General of South West Africa who has been appointed by the Prime Minister of South Africa to administer the territory "during the transition."

2. WHAT IS THE BASIC NEGOTIATING INSTRUMENT?

While in a sense it is non-negotiable, the basic instrument is UNSC Resolution 385 of 30 January 1976. This calls on SAG to withdraw its administration from Namibia, release all political prisoners, and permit the return of exiles without penalty, so that the people of Namibia may participate in free elections under United Nations supervision and control in order to determine the form and leaders of their government.
3. HOW ARE THE 5 AND THE UNSC RESOLUTION 385 BEING RECEIVED?

First, the 5. It depends on who you talk to.

SWAPO says officially that it believes the efforts of the 5 are serious and in good faith. It is willing to negotiate because it believes that the 5 are in the best position to influence the SAG.

It is interesting to note that the group one would expect to be most opposed to the 5, namely SWAPO, is on record as the most supportive of their initiative.

What about the U.N., the internationally recognized administrator of the territory? Because the 5 have no official standing as a negotiating team, it is not possible to relate formally to the U.N. in the process. Having said that, however, it would appear that informal avenues of communication have not been sufficiently explored or utilized.

SAG has been willing to use the 5 as a negotiating team but resents their association with SWAPO and claims that the 5 really do not understand the Namibian situation.

A variety of critics are disturbed by the intrusion of the 5. They say "These states have done nothing for Namibia before; why should they get involved now?" or "All of these states are economically involved in South Africa and are only interested in protecting their own business interests." Others look upon the extended negotiating process as a delaying tactic where South Africa has everything to gain and Namibia everything to lose.

Resolution 385.

SWAPO buys it completely, supports it fully, and would like to see it implemented without delay.

SAG resents the resolution passionately, considers it arbitrary and unjust, but realizes that independence for the territory is past due and some concessions are in order.

The 5 affirm their commitment to Resolution 385 and contend that they are working for compliance with its demands.

4. HAS THERE BEEN ANY PROGRESS IN THE LAST YEAR?

Yes. Some would say there has been a great deal of progress, but that is an exaggeration. Progress has been slow and slight.

The interim government and constitution proposed by The Turnhalle were officially scrapped. That was progress. On the other hand, the same group that promoted The Turnhalle has organized politically and is having rallies all over Namibia without opposition from the authorities. Anti-Turnhalle groups, however, find that their meetings are broken up or their leaders harassed.

Some petty apartheid laws have been repealed and given wide publicity as great steps forward. They do not correct basic injustices, however. As a matter of fact, the limited scope of their accomplishments can be illustrated by excerpts from an article in the Windhoek Advertiser of 17 February 1978.

CONVENT KIDS BARRED FROM CITY LIBRARY

Painful Dilemma for Municipal Officials

"WINDHOEK: A painful and embarrassing situation arose yesterday for two of Windhoek's top municipal officials. They had to tell the Librarian and staff of the Public Library not to allow dark-skinned pupils of the private schools either to enter the building or to take out books.

"An incident occurred at the Public Library when the Sub B pupils of the Holy Cross Convent, with a few dark-skinned children among them, arrived at the library to take out books in terms of a long-standing arrangement between the Library and that particular school.
"The result of the incident was that Mr. W.J. Kotze, the City Secretary, and Mr. Nantes Botha, his deputy, yesterday conferred with the Librarian, Miss Viljoen.

"Mr. Kotze said the hands of officials were tied as far as the discharge of regulations was concerned.

Whites Only

"The private schools have always taken their children in the past to our Library, where these children then collected books. Some of these schools have in the meantime become mixed institutions. The situation is that the regulations stipulate that our Library is an institution for White people only.'

"We are now confronted with this problem: If we do not bar these non-White pupils, how can we prevent their parents from coming to the Library?'

"We simply do not have the facilities to open that Library for the entire community,' he said. Mr. Kotze was emphatic about the fact that the actions of Mr. Botha and himself were dictated by regulations and the Ordinance under which the Library has been placed in the hands of the Municipality."

Travel restrictions to the Northern part of Namibia have been lifted. This is one of the major improvements to take place.

The other is an apparent diminishing in the amount of hostility toward the Namibian citizens by South African troops. Just a year ago church authorities in the North listed in one month the names and addresses of 25 persons killed, 9 homes burned, and numerous persons injured by South African soldiers. No such documentation is forthcoming today; it may be however that these conditions still exist in remote areas where it is not possible to observe them.

Many repressive measures remain in force. Exiled Anglican bishops have been refused re-entry; the terrorism act remains in effect; a book containing sworn testimony by people who were tortured by police has been banned.

5. WHAT ARE THE MAIN ISSUES IN DISPUTE?

There are two major issues. The size and location of the South African Army in the territory and the status of Walvis Bay.

SOUTH AFRICAN ARMY: UNSC Resolution 385 calls for withdrawal of South Africa's illegal administration from Namibia. This includes the army. South Africa claims to have 20,000 troops in Namibia, mostly along the Northern border, ostensibly to protect the territory's population from the "terrorists." Estimates by the people of Namibia, however, range as high as 50,000. Regardless of the number, black Namibians say openly, "The freedom fighters are not our enemies. The South African Army is our enemy." In addition to the military, the South Africans control the police force. Furthermore, many of the white farmers who own aircraft are in a voluntary defense unit known as commandos. All of these constitute a formidable cluster of armed units which in the past have intimidated the residents of the territory.

South Africa is demanding that it retain 3500 troops in Namibia at Northern locations. The 5 have proposed that 1500 remain in these locations and the rest withdraw. In spite of the fact that UNSC Resolution 385 calls for complete withdrawal, SWAPO has agreed to a residual army of 1500 South African troops, but contends that they should be based in the South to protect the South African border since SWAPO has agreed to allow the U.N. to monitor the activities of its liberation army after the cease-fire is in effect.

WALVIS BAY: UNSC Resolution 385 makes several references to preserving the "national unity and territorial integrity" of Namibia. This expression is used to denounce bantustans, on the one hand, and on the other, to lay claim to the unbroken land mass within its borders.

South Africa has claimed Walvis Bay (434 square miles of deep water harbor) under an old coloni-
al agreement between the British and the Germans. While the legal status of this question may be clouded in mystery to all but a few international lawyers, the moral and ethical issues are clear. Walvis Bay is a minimum of 400 miles away from any part of South Africa, which has dozens of ports for its shipping, fishing, recreation and the like. Walvis Bay, however, is the only viable port on the whole Namibian coastline and an essential economic link between Namibia and the rest of the world. Without it, Namibia may as well be a landlocked country, deprived of the wealth which can come from fishing, sealing, shipping, deep sea mining and possibly off shore oil pumping. Adding insult to injury, Namibia will be further impoverished by being subject to tariffs and docking fees, and what is most grievous, threatened by naval, army and air bases of a foreign power on its own shoreline! It is no wonder that SWAPO has taken the position that South Africa must recognize that the territorial integrity of Namibia includes Walvis Bay. The 5 recommend that the matter of Walvis Bay be delayed until after independence. (In November, 1977, Lutheran World Ministries adopted the position that the territorial integrity of Namibia includes Walvis Bay and has so informed the South African Government, the United States Government, and the United Nations.)

6. WHAT ARE THE NEXT STEPS?

Negotiations are continuing in spite of South Africa's walk-out from the mid-February high level "proximity talks" in New York. Armed struggle also continues. No action is expected in the United Nations Security Council until May at the earliest.

What is scheduled is a Special Session of the U.N. General Assembly from 24 April to 3 May. The objectives of this Special Session are not clear, but special sessions are not casually convened. This will be only the eighth in U.N. history.

7. WHAT CAN I DO?

a. Namibia is largely a Christian community and church leaders have called for intercessions in behalf of their country and expressions of solidarity in their efforts toward liberation. Corporately and individually you may respond to that request. Letters of solidarity may be sent to The Right Rev. Leonard Auala, Bishop of the Evangelical Lutheran Ovambo-kavango Church, Onipa, P/Bag 2018, Ondangwa, South West Africa, and the Rev. Lukas de Vries, President of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in South West Africa, P.O. Box 5069, Windhoek, South West Africa.

(Lutheran World Federation churches support humanitarian programs of various kinds in Namibia and for Namibian exiles through their regular contributions.)

b. As a U.S. citizen, you may write your congressional representative supporting fully the provisions of UNSC Resolution 385, and carbon your letter to the Secretary of State, Washington DC 20520.

c. If you or any organization with which you are affiliated own stock in Newmont Mining Company, you may support the Shareholder's Resolution calling for complete disclosure of the company's operations in Namibia. This resolution is sponsored by Gettysburg Seminary and the United Church of Christ.

You may inform your bank manager that you will discontinue your business with that bank if it makes any loans to the South African government or its agencies.
AND AS OF 28 FEBRUARY

On 27 February, we received word through the office of the Episcopal Churchmen for South Africa that on Wednesday, 22 February, the Security Branch of the South African Police raided three religious places in Windhoek: the ecumenical Christian Centre office, the office of the Anglican diocese and the residence set aside for the Anglican bishop.

Armed with warrants from the South African occupation regime, the security police made thorough searches of all premises, including the chapel and under beds in the bishop's house. All typewriters were seized and taken to police headquarters. The South Africans refused to give reasons for their action. We assume that the type on the typewriters are being recorded for past and future comparisons of written material confiscated by the police. If true, this demonstrates the low esteem and lack of trust which the police have for church institutions.

Moreover, on 21 February, some 200 students at St. Mary's Anglican school at Odibo in northern Namibia voluntarily crossed the border (a half-mile away) into Angola to join the SWAPO liberation movement. South African Police (backed by heavily armed South African soldiers) conducting an investigation harassed the Anglican vicar general, the Rev. Edward Morrow, other priests and teachers at the mission. St. Mary's hospital which was part of the mission-school complex, was shut down by occupation officials in October 1974. The church's telephone has been cut since 1976.

During the same week a memo of 28 January was made public. It was addressed to the Administrator General of Namibia, Mr. Justice M.T. Steyn and signed by Bishop Leonard Auala of the Evangelical Lutheran Ovambokavango Church (ELOC). Among other things the memo noted that while there had been "some improvement" recently and the security forces were not intimidating civilians to the same extent as in 1976 and early 1977, nevertheless, people feel safer with liberation army forces than they do with South African troops, even though they fear both.

ELOC cited the following examples of recent violence and harassment by the security forces:

--Battalion members and ministers' bodyguards violently retaliated against people who greeted them with the black power sign. "The SWAPO meeting in December showed that the Army and Police still act as under R17 (a repressive piece of legislation which was repealed by Steyn) as teargas was used without reason."

--When the travel document requirements were abolished, a new system was quickly established. Civilian officers then "pretended to look for raw meat and hides," although everybody knew it was something else they searched for. If movement was free, ELOC asked, then why did the "meat inspectors" have to write down the registration number, driver's name and destination?

--Accusations against "churches, church leaders and staff are everyday items on Radio Ovambo." We are used to this, and know that neither "we nor the church can be harmed by this," Auala stated.

--Finally, ELOC claimed that Army soldiers (!) were going around with a questionnaire which aimed to get a picture of support for the Turnhalle, SWAPO and the Army. The memo stated that the people "certainly answered what (the soldiers) wanted to hear, not what (the person) really thought."

Finally, on 26 February, the Washington Post carried a lengthy article asserting that South Africa is now pushing hard for "an internal settlement" following the Ian Smith pattern. Part of South Africa's strategy is to use every occasion to divide Namibians in the church and in the political parties. It creates disagreements by quoting leaders out of context and soliciting responses to such statements from others. When the church voices long-held concerns about potential communist alignments, for instance, government or its agencies seize the opportunity to interpret this as a softening of the church's stand against the equally abhorrent racist repression which it is experiencing currently.

These are critical times in Southern Africa. They call us again to observe St. Paul's admonition:

"First of all, I urge that supplications, prayers, intercessions and thanksgivings be made for all who are in high positions that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life, godly and respectful in every way."