UNITED NATIONS

A

General Assembly

PROVISIONAL

A/42/PV.59
November 1987

ENGLISH

Forty-second session

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE FIFTY-NINTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 6 November 1987, at 3 p.m.

President:	Mr. FLORIN	(German Democratic Republic)
later:	Mr. KOUASSI (Vice-President)	(Togo)
later:	Mr. FLORIN (President)	(German Democratic Republic)

- Question of Namibia [36] (continued)

  (a) Report of the United Nations Council for Namibia
  (b) 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
  (c) Report of the Secretary-General
  (d) Report of the Fourth Committee
  (e) Draft resolutions
  (f) Report of the Fifth Committee

- Adoption of the agenda and organization of work [8] (continued)

  (a) First report of the General Committee
  (b) Amendment

87-64353/A 1133V (E)

The meeting was called to order at 3.20 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 36 (continued)

QUESTION OF NAMIBIA

(a) REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS COUNCIL FOR NAMIBIA (A/42/24)

(b) REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION WITH REGARD TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (A/42/23 (Part V); A/AC.109/916)

(c) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/42/596)

(d) REPORT OF THE FOURTH COMMITTEE (A/42/698)

(e) DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/42/24 (Part III) and (Part III)/Corr.1, chap. I)

(f) REPORT OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE (A/42/716)

Mr. TILLETT (Belize): The question of Namibia is before the Assembly again with no end in sight. Namibia is a black nation raped by multinational companies, colonized by racist South Africa, and enslaved by the degrading system of apartheid.

If words could provide real comfort, the people of Namibia would be the most comfortable in the world. If promises of solidarity could put an end to this conflict, Namibia would have been free years ago. If United Nations resolutions could make Namibia independent, Namibia would be celebrating 21 years of independence.

It is very clear that the international community supports the immediate independence of Namibia with all its territory intact. This is a position that Belize has held consistently, and we continue to call on South Africa and its allies to release their death grip on Namibia.

Twenty-one years ago, the United Nations terminated South Africa's Mandate to administer the Territory of Namibia. The United Nations assumed direct responsibility over Namibia and proposed an independence plan for Namibia. In

(Mr. Tillett, Belize)

1978, Security Council resolution 435 (1978) was accepted, and it is still accepted, as the proper course for Namibian independence to follow.

Last year, in Harare, Belize was represented at the Eighth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, which called on the Secretary-General of the United Nations to

"proceed with the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibian independence now that all outstanding matters have been settled".

The Heads of State or Government concluded:

"The time for Namibian independence is long past. To delay it any longer is immoral. We therefore appeal to all men and women of good will firmly to oppose any delay, for any reason and under any circumstance, of Namibian independence."

Last month, the Commonwealth Heads of Government met in Vancouver. The Prime Minister of Belize, the Rt. Hon. Dr. Manuel Esquivel, was the head of the Belize delegation to that conference. In a communiqué issued at the end of the conference, our Heads of Government declared,

"We are gravely concerned that the impasse in Namibia's progress to independence under the terms of resolution 435 seems to have assumed the proportions of a permanent statement. We again stress the illegality of South Africa's presence in Namibia and we remain unanimously convinced of the view that resolution 435 provides the only basis for an internationally acceptable settlement of the Namibian question."

Belize has always supported the right of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence. We cannot accept any excuse to delay the independence of Namibia. Nor can we accept that Namibia's independence should be linked to the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola.

(Mr. Tillett, Belize)

The presence of Cuban troops in Angola is one issue; the independence of Namibia is another. Removal of the former cannot be made a condition for the latter, and any effort to do so can be interpreted as support for South Africa's policy in Namibia and rejection of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

Document A/42/23 (Part V) contains the report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. Paragraph 11 of that document warns us that any attempt to portray the question of Namibia as part of an East-West confrontation rather than one of decolonization is in flagrant defiance of the will of the international community and could only have the effect of further delaying the independence of Namibia. It is clear that the East is not supporting South Africa. Those who are supporting South Africa cannot expect the Namibians to seek them out as friends. Their policies are having the reverse effect of what they are trying to achieve, and the longer they delay the independence of Namibia, the wider the gap in their relations with southern Africa will become.

In this connection, it is important that the Assembly remembers the words of President Yoweri K. Museveni of Uganda when he addressed this body a few weeks ago:

> "When we were fighting the corrupt, brutal dictatorships of Amin and Obote there was much speculation about our ideological orientation. The question was often raised would we be pro-West or pro-East. In my view, this type of labelling is an insult to the African people." (A/42/PV.45, p. 13)

(Mr. Tillett, Belize)

President Museveni continued:

"Point 10 of our political programme prescribes an economic strategy of a mixed economy. We must stress that this programme is neither pro-this nor pro-that; it is pro-Uganda ... We do not judge the economic programmes of other nations, as we believe that each nation knows best how to address the needs of its people. Let us hope that, although we are a small country, no nation will presume to know what is best for our economy and for our people. We have our own legitimate interests. We shall judge friend and foe according to how they relate to our own interests." (p. 14-15)

I believe that is how the Namibian people will judge Member States of the United Nations. Our actions last year, last month, today, and tomorrow will determine whether we are their friends or their foes.

Belize is supporting the draft resolutions on the question of Namibia, and we call on all Member States to take whatever steps are necessary to implement Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

Mr. BIFFOT (Gabon) (interpretation from French): On 18 October 1985 the President of the Gabonese Republic drew attention to those barriers of incomprehension which still exist between man and which, year after year, are building up the elements constituting a major crisis, and all the rights which make up the life of a people, rights of which the United Nations has set itself up as champion and guarantor, which are denied them. The Gabonese Head of State thus denounced the wide range of delaying tactics hindering Namibia's progress towards independence.

Time goes by, and there is no change. Pretoria's domination of South Africa reinforces its colonial and colonialist system, with almost complete impunity.

The Pretoria Government will go down in history. Historians and researchers in every sphere will have - it already exists in the varying attitudes and behaviour of each Member State of our Organization - a rich source of materials which will make it possible to reveal the most shameful motivations.

Our children's generation, and a fortiori the generation of our great grandchildren, will probably deliver a harsh verdict against Pretoria's henchmen, bearing in mind that, as is revealed by the perpetual conflict continuing through the generations, peoples and nations over the decades, and thus over the centuries, move forward resolutely, as the statistics show, towards that mutual openness that is humanism, ecumenism.

A rational solution to the problem of Namibia's independence is imperative. Connivance and complicity with Pretoria, flirting with Pretoria, constitute behaviour tantamount to advocating, or at least desiring, the maintenance of the status quo.

(Mr. Biffot, Gabon)

The time has come for rational choice. The era of evasion and cronyism should be ended once and for all. Spiritual morality should at last prevail over materialistic morality, for the Namibian people is not asking for a gift; it is asking only for what it is entitled to - its freedom, its true independence and the right to be governed by an Administration that it has chosen itself, not one established by an occupier, an invader. That invader is able to stay in power because it knows that - thanks to the power of its weaponry, which it has been able to acquire and build up during decades of procrastination - it can terrorize and kill on a large scale, and even dictate to peace-loving and humanistic countries of the world the law of silence, if not of participation and connivance.

I shall put on one side all the legal arguments in favour of Namibia's independence. Representatives of other Member States have put foward those arguments very strongly both here and in the Security Council.

I wish to draw everyone's attention to just one argument, totally fallacious, advanced by Pretoria in favour of the postponement sine die of the granting of independence to Namibia. It is the linking of Namibia's independence to the withdrawal of the Cuban troops stationed in Angola. There are some who join Pretoria in saying that the withdrawal of the Cuban soldiers based in Angola is the unconditional pre-condition for granting independence to the Namibian people. They insist - indeed, they are adamant - that there is a risk that those troops would invade Namibia after it regained its national independence. Prevention is better than cure, they say, and they therefore argue that it would be wise and prudent to have the Cuban troops leave Angolan soil before the South African occupying forces - should I say "the Pretoria occupying forces"? - leave Namibian soil.

(Mr. Biffot, Gabon)

The Pretoria Government knows - it is its shameful secret - that the departure of the Cuban troops is desired in order to give Pretoria a better chance to realize its expansionist ambitions. With Namibia lost, Angola would be the obvious prey. Invading Angola would be greatly facilitated if the Cuban troops, whose fighting spirit is well known, were no longer there. The strike force of the South Africa racist State could go in at night, and the world would find itself faced with a fait accompli.

In one of my interventions on the question of Namibia I have advocated the creation of a committee of experts to be entrusted by the Organization with the task of considering dispassionately - in other words, with absolute scientific rigour - the famous linkage argument. I reiterate that suggestion today.

I also reiterate the request made in the Assembly on 6 October by the Minister of State for Foreign Affairs and Co-operation of my country, Mr. Martin Bongo, member of the Political Bureau of the Gabon Democratic Party, as follows:

> "... it is a direct responsibility on the part of the United Nations to guarantee the Namibian people the exercise of the right to self-determination and to ensure the independence of Namibia ...
>
> "The United Nations cannot abdicate its responsibility to put an end to the constant acts of aggression perpetrated by South Africa in the region." (A/42/PV.27, pp. 11 and 12)

In the name of my Government, I repeat Gabon's unswerving support for the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), which was solemnly repeated here on 6 October this year by the head of my delegation, the Minister of State, Mr. Martin Bongo.

Mr. ROSHAN-RAWAAN (Afghanistan): Once again the General Assembly has before it the question of Namibia. We are discussing the natural aspirations, heroic struggle and great sacrifices of a people, a nation, for freedom and independence. Although we, the United Nations, greatly value their aspirations, our words and actions have fallen short of eliminating the need for the continuation of their struggle. We have failed to put an end to their sacrifices and sufferings. This situation of inaction has gone on for quite a long time in terms of human suffering on the part of the Namibians.

It is only proper to remind ourselves that for more than a century and a half the Namibian people have lived under the colonial yoke. For more than 20 years, under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), they have been continuing, like their brothers in South Africa, a valiant struggle for the attainment of their inalienable rights. Two full decades have passed since the United Nations terminated the illegal occupation of Namibia by the racist Pretoria régime and legally assumed responsibility for preparing the nation for statehood. It has been almost a decade since resolution 435 (1978), embodying the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, was adopted by the Security Council. However, Namibia is, regrettably, still not free. It has been criminally enslaved and its people have been brutally exploited. Its territory is being increasingly militarized and used as a springboard for aggression against the front-line States. Furthermore, in Namibia the oppressive and exploitative nature of colonialism has been coupled with the intrinsically inhuman policy of apartheid to subjugate the whole nation and trample underfoot the dignity of an entire people. In defiance of all relevant Security Council and General Assembly resolutions, the Pretoria régime has installed in Windhoek a puppet so-called interim government to perpetuate its occupation of Namibia.

(Mr. Roshan-Rawaan, Afghanistan)

The reason for such intransigence on the part of the apartheid régime of South Africa must be sought in the umbilical cord which attaches South Africa to certain Western States, particularly the United States of America. While condemned and rejected by the international community, the Pretoria régime has been enabled by that tie alone to receive support, in gross violation of many General Assembly and Security Council resolutions. A demonstration of that support was evidenced during the recent discussion of the question of Namibia in the Security Council and the vote on the relevant resolution.

Assistance to the apartheid régime in South Africa is being rendered not in spite of the apartheid policy of the Pretoria régime, both in South Africa and in Namibia, but because of it. The dividends the capitalist countries are receiving from the inhuman exploitation of the Namibian and South African peoples, and the plundering of their natural resources, is so great that they have a vested interest in the perpetuation of the apartheid régime and its illegal occupation of Namibia. The very policy of the so-called constructive engagement pursued by the Washington administration, the destructive nature of which has become fully evident, smacks of collaboration and complicity. It was for whitewashing that complicity that Washington joined the racist Pretoria régime in linking the independence of Namibia to an entirely extraneous matter - the withdrawal of the Cuban internationalist troops from Angola. Linkage of such a nature is not valid. The international community as a whole, and in fact the Security Council itself, has rejected it; yet the report of the Secretary-General clearly shows that linkage, as a pre-condition, is the main stumbling-block on the path of implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia.

It is time that the United Nations took decisive steps towards implementation of its own resolutions, in particular Security Council resolution 435 (1978). That is the demand of the whole international community, which wants to see an immediate

(Mr. Roshan-Rawaan, Afghanistan)

end to the loss of innocent lives in Namibia. The Non-Aligned Movement and the Organization of African Unity have clearly and irrevocably expressed that demand of the international community. Furthermore, the continued illegal occupation of Namibia and the subjugation and inhuman exploitation of its people by the racist Pretoria régime, and that régime's repeated acts of aggression against Angola and other front-line States, constitute a breach of international peace and security.

An important step in this direction is the entrusting by the Security Council of the necessary authority and support to the Secretary-General to place the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG) in Namibia and to start implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia. A cease-fire between the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) and the Pretoria régime, for which SWAPO has shown readiness, would be the first step towards the full implementation of the United Nations plan.

The militant Namibian people, like the people of South Africa, in their heroic struggle for freedom and human dignity have left no doubt that, sooner rather than later, they will attain what is theirs. But the United Nations can and should assist in bringing that day closer. We believe that one of the effective steps this Organization could adopt to that end would be the enforcement by the Security Council of comprehensive mandatory sanctions as provided for in Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter.

In fact, the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the Pretoria régime is something which the majority of United Nations Members - the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan among them - are observing. However, it is time that the Security Council gave a universal character to such sanctions by adopting an appropriate resolution.

(Mr. Roshan-Rawaan, Afghanistan)

The Namibian people, under the leadership of SWAPO, their sole, legitimate representative, are struggling for freedom, independence, self-determination and human rights and dignity. The United Nations can and should do everything within its domain of responsibility towards the realization of those aspirations of the people of Namibia, which every one of us cherishes so dearly in our hearts.

Mr. VALDERRAMA (Philippines): Mr. President, I take this opportunity to congratulate you on your skilful handling of the deliberations of the General Assembly at this session.

The General Assembly is now deliberating on the question of Namibia for the third consecutive day. Speaker after speaker has supported the inalienable right of the people of Namibia to self-determination and independence and called for the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of South Africa from that international Territory.

This has been a ritual in the United Nations for more than 20 years. Just days ago the chambers of the United Nations also echoed with the voices of support at the observance ceremony for the Week of Solidarity with the People of Namibia and their liberation movement, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), and in the Security Council upon the adoption of resolution 601 (1987), the latest in a long series of resolutions, declarations and decisions calling for the settlement of the Namibian situation.

Indeed, there is unanimity on this one political issue, which involves the life of an entire nation kept in bondage and challenges the very credibility of the United Nations. Yet, against this unity of will and resolve of the international community, South Africa stands defiant and continues its illegal occupation of Namibia, flouting the resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly and of the Security Council. South Africa continues to be a Member of the United Nations but violates its purposes and principles with impunity.

No one could listen to or read the statement of the representative of the Pretoria apartheid régime in the Security Council last Thursday without being struck by its detachment from reality. It was a remarkable performance, fit for

(Mr. Valderrama, Philippines)

the theatre of the absurd; indeed, an Orwellian fantasy. Something is fundamentally wrong, South Africa walks the halls of the United Nations with us, but it defies the will of the international community and defies it with scorn.

It would seem that South Africa's obstinacy grows with every resolution concerning Namibia that is adopted. One has only to read the latest report of the United Nations Council for Namibia to confirm that the situation in the Territory has gone from bad to worse. The brutal repression of the Namibian people and the curtailment of their rights, under the cover of emergency rule, continue unabated. The apartheid régime continues to sow violence, and the murder of innocent civilians, torture, mass arrests and "disappearances" have become commonplace occurrences. Life and human dignity, it seems, are held worthless by the apartheid régime.

Twenty-one years ago the United Nations terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia and assumed direct responsibility over the Territory until its independence. South Africa, however, is still illegally in Namibia, firmly implanted, and ignores the United Nations Council for Namibia, the Administering Authority. In June 1985 it dug its heels deeper into Namibian soil when it installed its puppet interim government at Windhoek.

Why does Pretoria remain so defiant? Does the answer lie perhaps in Namibia's abundant natural wealth, which, with foreign economic interests, South Africa controls, exploits and plunders? There should have been cause for encouragement when the Secretary-General informed us recently that there were no outstanding issues which stood in the way of the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). All Member States accept resolution 435 (1978) as the only valid basis for the independence of Namibia. Even South Africa agreed to this settlement plan in 1978. As recently as 29 October 1987, in fact, it reaffirmed its commitment to resolution 435 (1978) before the Security Council.

(Mr. Valderrama, Philippines)

The Pretoria representative, however, spoke of his own "internationally recognized" plan, ignoring the fact that Security Council resolution 435 (1978) is the only acceptable international plan for Namibian independence and nationhood. He insisted on the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola, an extraneous issue which has been rejected by the United Nations, the Organization of African Unity, the Non-Aligned Movement, the Organization of the Islamic Conference, the United Nations Council for Namibia and SWAPO.

The Secretary-General had said in his report released only two days before the apartheid representative delivered his statement that

> "the linkage pre-condition had been rejected by the Security Council and called for the implementation of Council resolution 435 (1978) without further delay." (S/19234, para. 5)

The Secretary-General added that

> "successive attempts in recent years to finalize arrangements for the emplacement of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG) in Namibia, in order to commence the implementation of the United Nations plan, have been blocked by South Africa's insistence on the linkage pre-condition." (para. 25)

This farce reveals the true motives of Pretoria concerning Namibia. One is left to conclude that it is there to stay for as long as it can for its own ulterior motives.

In his report the Secretary-General also said that it should be possible to open the way for the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia if the question were to be examined with "realism and sincere concern" (para. 25) for the well-being of the Namibian people. This should be a clear message to the Pretoria régime and especially to those that provide South Africa with a shield that gives it encouragement and support.

(Mr. Valderrama, Philippines)

The Philippines is of one mind with the Secretary-General and the international community in its support for the cause of the Namibian people and SWAPO, their sole, authentic representative. Our position finds expression in our support for all the resolutions on the question of Namibia; our policy of total isolation of the Pretoria régime; our support for the position of the African Group and the front-line States of southern Africa; and our stand for the application of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter.

Despite its economic situation, the Philippines continues its financial support for the United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa, the United Nations Trust Fund for Namibia and the United Nations Institute for Namibia. It has also donated to the Action for Resisting Invasion, Colonialism and Apartheid (AFRICA) Fund of the Non-Aligned Movement.

(Mr. Valderrama, Philippines)

Modest as those contributions may be, they express the solidarity of the people and Government of the Philippines with the Namibian people's struggle for freedom, justice, equality, independence and the right to self-determination.

The Pretoria apartheid régime is dragging its feet on the Namibian question and challenging the authority of the United Nations. It wilfully violates the Charter and resolution 1514 (XV), containing the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, and resolution 1541 (XV) - not to speak of the numerous other resolutions of the General Assembly and those of the Security Council. That is impermissible. How many more missions, how many more international conferences, how many more resolutions and decisions must we have before the Pretoria apartheid régime heeds the counsel of the international community and defuses a grave threat to international peace and security?

The Philippines supports Security Council resolution 601 (1987) and expresses the hope that at long last the Secretary-General will be able to proceed to arrange a cease-fire between South Africa and SWAPO in order to undertake administrative and other practical steps necessary for the emplacement of UNTAG.

If that should fail because of the intransigence of South Africa, there will then be no other recourse, it seems to my delegation, but for the Security Council to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter. That is the only remaining peaceful means for a just and lasting solution to the Namibian question.

The Filipino people are in solidarity with the people of Namibia and SWAPO in their just cause. South Africa must set Namibia free now. It is time for Namibia to take its rightful place in the family of nations. The United Nations must assert its authority to resolve this issue once and for all.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): The next speaker is the Observer of the Palestine Liberation Organization. I call on him in accordance with General Assembly resolution 3237 (XXIX) of 22 November 1974.

Mr. TERZI (Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO)) (interpretation from Arabic): The General Assembly is now discussing a crucial question - a question that represents one of the many facets of colonialism, occupation and racism. It is no less abominable than the other facets. In fact, what is happening in Namibia is an exact replica of what is happening in Palestine. The apartheid régime's aggression, occupation, racism and fascism in southern Africa are in no wise different from the practices of Israeli Zionism in occupied Palestine and the West Asian region. There is a close relationship between the two racist régimes so far as the crimes they have committed and their violations of human rights are concerned.

On 4 November 1987, on the occasion of the seventieth anniversary of the October revolution, a meeting was held in Moscow between representatives of the Party and of the national liberation movements. It was opened by Comrade Gorbachev. Mr. Yassir Arafat, Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) and commander-in-chief of the Palestinian revolutionary forces addressed the meeting and said the following, inter alia:

"It is my hope that we shall see one day a world without any monopolies, a world that is rid of colonialism, racism, fascism and Zionism. How can peace obtain in Africa at a time when the situation in South Africa is deteriorating daily, when the Pretoria régime pursues its evil policy against the South African people, when the occupation of Namibia continues, when there is still aggression against the front-line States and their peoples?

(Mr. Terzi, PLO)

"Here, on the soil where the great October revolution took place, we reaffirm our support for and our complete solidarity with the South African and Namibian peoples and the front-line States in their resistance to the racist Pretoria régime."

We Palestinians are completely behind our fellow combatants in Namibia and South Africa. That is a position of principle that has been reaffirmed by our National Council at successive sessions - particularly the eighteenth session, held in Algiers in April 1987 - in the following way:

"Privileged relationships unite us with the heroic African national liberation movements, recognized by the Organization of African Unity - and in this particular case, the African National Congress (ANC), the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) and the Pan Africanist Congress (PAC). These co-operative relations exist at all levels, particularly the levels of our common struggle and political support. The battle we are waging against the Zionist entity in Palestine is the same as that waged by all men of conscience throughout the world. The battle waged by the peoples in South Africa and Namibia is also the same as that waged by all men of conscience throughout the world. The enemy is the same in both cases. The allies of the Zionists in Palestine are also the allies of the racist Pretoria régime. A victory by the South African people will be a victory by the Palestinian people. The reverse is also true: a victory by the Palestinian people will be a victory by the South African and Namibian peoples.

"We could not fail on this occasion to express again our position of principle and our solidarity with and support for the African front-line States in their struggle against the racist, aggressive South African régime."

(spoke in English)

(Mr. Terzi, PLO)

The relationship - be it ideological, political or economic - between the two racist régimes, apartheid in Pretoria and Zionist in Tel Aviv, is very well known. Thus, it is no accident that last Wednesday, 28 October 1987, the Board of Governors of the Jewish Agency voted unanimously to elect Mendel Kaplan, a businessman from South Africa, as its next Chairman. Mr. Kaplan still lives in Cape Town. It is a well-known fact that the Jewish Agency was created in the 1920s as the executive instrument of Zionism. The Zionist fund-raisers for Israel could not have made a better choice for that post in order to ensure the continuation of the close links between the two racist régimes.

The General Assembly is called upon, now and not later, to adopt action-oriented, doable decisions to ensure the immediate implementation of the will of the Namibian people and the international community - namely, the termination of foreign occupation by the Boer racist régime, thus enabling the Namibian people to exercise its right to self-determination without any external interference or intervention and to establish its independent Namibian State.

Security Council resolution 435 (1978) established the plan for the independence of Namibia. However, the Pretoria régime has shown neither respect for nor readiness to carry out that decision, thus defying the relevant principles of the Charter.

In the search for a peaceful solution and out of a sincere desire to put an end to the miseries afflicting the Namibian people, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the authentic representatives of that people, has declared its readiness to carry out the provisions of Security Council resolution 601 (1987), which, inter alia, called for a cease-fire as the first step towards the implementation of the relevant United Nations resolutions and towards bringing peace to the area.

(Mr. Terzi, PLO)

We, the representatives of the Palestinian people, share with our brethren the Namibian people the resolute determination to achieve peace, but the price of peace cannot and should not be the abandonment of our rights. The Namibian people will continue their legitimate struggle by all means. Occupation and military adventurism by the occupying Power, namely, the régime in South Africa, engender resistance. The denial of the right to self-determination and independence of the Namibian people is the root cause that should be addressed. This Assembly is duty-bound to uphold the call for a cease-fire agreement between SWAPO and South Africa, the occupying Power. It is up to the Pretoria régime to respect and carry out that call otherwise the Security Council will have no choice but to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions. At the same time the Namibian people will have no choice but to pursue and escalate their legitimate struggle, including armed struggle.

Let the people of Namibia live in peace and freedom. Let the Namibian people pursue the happiness and safety of their children - enough of massacres. Let the children of Namibia look forward to clear, bright skies and safe prospects for the future. Enough is enough. Give the Namibian people a chance to develop and not to live in fear of more massacres and acts of genocide.

Let the peoples of the front-line States mobilize for their welfare and development and the security of their children and not to deplete their resources in confronting the continuing aggression by the racists of Pretoria and their agents. Let us put an end to the destabilization designs of the bloodsuckers.

Let the Namibian resources, including diamonds, be for the benefit of the Namibians and not for the pursuit of aggression by the racist régimes in Pretoria and Tel Aviv.

(Mr. Terzi, PLO)

To our comrades-in-arms and fellow freedom-fighters, SWAPO, we reaffirm our resolute support for and militant solidarity with the Namibian people. The struggle continues.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): We have heard the last speaker in the debate on this item. The Assembly has before it five draft resolutions recommended by the United Nations Council for Namibia and circulated in document A/42/24 (Part III) and (Part III/Corr.1 chap. I). I now call on those representatives who wish to introduce draft resolutions.

Mr. ZUZE (Zambia): For a long time now, Namibia has come up for discussion in this Assembly, in the Security Council, in the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, in the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and in governmental and non-governmental organizations. It is an issue which is familiar to us all and one on whose speedy resolution there is total agreement. From this rostrum many statesmen from all parts of the world have urged positive change in Namibia. They have repeatedly demanded South Africa's unconditional withdrawal from the Territory so that fair and free elections can take place under the supervision and control of the United Nations in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

While the international consensus on Namibia is for the immediate and unconditional implementation of resolution 435 (1978), the linkage policy has prevented this from happening. Thus an impasse exists because of this policy. Meanwhile, the situation inside Namibia continues to deteriorate owing to racist South Africa's increased acts of atrocities against the black Namibians. It is against this critical background that the Council for Namibia has prepared draft resolution A, which I have the honour and privilege to introduce to this body.

(Mr. Zuze, Zambia)

The draft resolution, entitled "Situation in Namibia resulting from the illegal occupation of the Territory by South Africa", constitutes the Council's carefully considered assessment of the situation in and around Namibia, as well as the aims and objectives the United Nations Council for Namibia, as the legal Administering Authority over the Territory, seeks to achieve. Despite its length, the aims and objectives of the draft resolution can be stated in only a few words: to bring to an end the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa and to create conditions in which the Namibian people can freely exercise their inalienable right to freedom, self-determination and independence.

By this draft resolution the Council has sought, on the basis of activities and developments over the past year, to make a thorough assessment of the situation relating to Namibia and to set an agenda for 1988. The text contains many elements which are familiar, yet they must be reaffirmed year after year because they form the political and legal framework for United Nations action on the question of Namibia. As in the past, the draft resolution reaffirms the Namibian people's right to self-determination, freedom and national independence and expresses support for their heroic struggle for national independence. It also declares that South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia constitutes an act of aggression against the Namibian people and calls upon the international community to support the just struggle of the Namibian people, under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), their sole and authentic representative.

Under the terms of the text before us, the General Assembly would declare that the liberation struggle in Namibia is a conflict of an international character and that all captured freedom-fighters should be accorded prisoner-of-war status.

(Mr. Zuze, Zambia)

It would also commend SWAPO for its continued intensification of the struggle on all fronts and affirms that the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, contained in Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978), is the only internationally accepted basis for a peaceful settlement of the Namibian question and demands its immediate implementation without any pre-condition.

(Mr. Zuze, Zambia)

It would condemn Pretoria for the imposition of the so-called interim government and declare that any measures outside resolution 435 (1978) are null and void. It would denounce all fraudulent constitutional and political schemes by which the illegal racist régime continues with its attempts to bluff the world and perpetuate its colonial domination of Namibia.

It would further reject the persistent attempts made by the Pretoria régime to establish a linkage between the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) and extraneous and irrelevant issues, particularly the presence of Cuban forces in Angola.

By this draft resolution, the Assembly would firmly condemn and reject the policy of constructive engagement, which encourages the racist régime to maintain its opposition to the decisions of the international community on Namibia and to continue its apartheid policy. It would strongly condemn the continuing collaboration between South Africa and certain Western countries in the political, economic, diplomatic, military, cultural and financial fields and express its conviction that such collaboration helps to prolong South Africa's domination and control over the people and Territory of Namibia.

Furthermore, the Assembly would deplore the establishment and operation by racist South Africa of the so-called Namibia information offices in France, the Federal Republic of Germany, the United Kingdom and the United States, aimed at legitimizing its puppet institutions in Namibia, and demand their immediate closure.

It would condemn the recent escalation of violent repression and victimization of Namibian workers by racist South Africa and Western transnational corporations operating illegally in Namibia, and the recent arrests and imprisonment of SWAPO's leaders and its members, and demand again that South Africa immediately release all Namibian political prisoners.

(Mr. Zuze, Zambia)

Under the draft resolution the General Assembly would also condemn South Africa for its illegal use of Namibia as a springboard for perpetrating armed invasions, subversion, destabilization and aggression against neighbouring African States and appeal to the international community to contribute generously to the AFRICA Fund of the Non-Aligned Movement for the benefit of the peoples and national liberation movements of southern Africa.

This draft resolution is a true reflection of the situation in Namibia. It addresses the problems hampering United Nations efforts to end South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia and contains recommendations on concrete action to end this colonial situation. It is our hope in the Council for Namibia that the Assembly will give its unanimous support to this draft resolution.

Mr. INSANALLY (Guyana): I have the honour today to introduce to the Assembly draft resolution B, entitled "Implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978)" and contained in document A/42/24 (Part III).

However, before doing so, Sir, I wish to offer you my best wishes for the continued success of your presidency.

In the interval between last year's Assembly and now the question of Namibia's independence has been addressed almost continuously by various organs of the United Nations. The Security Council, for example, has convened on at least two occasions to consider the issue of sanctions against South Africa, a proposal for a cease-fire in Namibia and the early emplacement of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG). As the legal Administering Authority, the Council for Namibia has also met frequently, not only to safeguard the welfare of the Namibian people but also to advance the struggle for their independence. Indeed, many other subsidiary bodies, such as the Fourth Committee, the Committee on decolonization, and the Special Committee against Apartheid have conducted extensive deliberations

(Mr. Insanally, Guyana)

on the future of the Territory and its inhabitants. There can be no doubt therefore about the importance and urgency which the United Nations attaches to the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). The issue is now before the Assembly for further consideration and action.

In large measure, draft resolution B represents a distillation of the main discussions which have been held so far and, more important, a consolidation of the decisions emerging therefrom. It also reflects recent developments which have had an impact, both negative and positive, on the United Nations plan for terminating South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia.

As members will recall, that plan, which is endorsed in landmark resolution 435 (1978), was adopted in 1978 by the Security Council after its approval of the report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of a proposal for a definitive settlement of the Namibian question. The plan was accepted at the time by both the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) and South Africa. In the resolution itself the Security Council called upon South Africa to co-operate with the Secretary-General in its implementation. Such was, in fact, the promise of resolution 435 (1978) that the entire international community was led to believe that its implementation would be both prompt and full. This optimism quickly evaporated, however, when it became clear that South Africa was not prepared, despite its many asseverations of good faith, to honour the undertaking it had given. Using one pretext after another, the Pretoria régime successfully played a game of "artful dodging" and thumbed its nose at the world body in mockery of its credulity.

(Mr. Insanally, Guyana)

In the face of such defiance, this Assembly is obliged once again to condemn South Africa for its lack of co-operation and its continuing subjugation of Namibia. A review of the several reports before this body demonstrates the need to insist on the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) as the only internationally acceptable means of bringing Namibia to independence. Resolution 601 (1987), which gained the overwhelming support of the Security Council just a few days ago, calls for an end to Pretoria's machinations and for practical steps to be taken to ensure Namibia's freedom. It constitutes, in the eyes of many - and certainly in the eyes of my delegation - a clear breakthrough from the impasse to which peaceful negotiation had come. This Assembly must therefore now provide the added impetus needed to sustain the campaign against South Africa and to guarantee victory to the Namibian people.

(Mr. Insanally, Guyana)

We know full well from experience, however, that the Pretoria régime has no qualms about ignoring the decisions of the United Nations. Seeking refuge behind a façade of artificial arguments, it now clings desperately to a false linkage between the implementation of the United Nations plan and the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola, a linkage which has been repeatedly rejected as irrelevant and extraneous to the question of Namibia's independence. Such deviousness can no longer be tolerated and must be deplored in the strongest possible terms.

It is for that reason that draft resolution B emphasizes the fact that the only two parties to the conflict in Namibia are, on the one hand, the Namibian people represented by the South West Africa People's Organization and, on the other, the racist régime of South Africa, which is currently in illegal occupation of the Territory. The linkage issue is thus recognized for what it is: a red herring to divert attention from Namibia's incontestible right to immediate independence.

The text consequently condemns Pretoria for obstructing the implementation of all relevant Security Council resolutions and for the transparent manoeuvres it continues to employ in contravention of those resolutions to perpetuate its control of Namibia. Draft resolution B also reaffirms the direct responsibility of the United Nations over Namibia pending the achievement of independence, and reiterates the thesis that that independence can only be properly attained if the plan outlined in Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978) is scrupulously observed and executed. Finally it requests the Security Council to set an early date, not later than 31 December 1987, for the commencement of the implementation of its resolution 435 (1978). That proposed date cannot be considered unrealistic since, as has already been noted, all necessary conditions for the resolution's implementation have already been satisfied. The Secretary-General is therefore

(Mr. Insanally, Guyana)

requested to undertake consultations with the Security Council, in particular with its permanent members, so as to secure a firm commitment to the speedy and unconditional implementation of that most important resolution.

As draft resolution B clearly recognizes, the responsibility of the United Nations towards Namibia, for the promotion of its self-determination, freedom and independence, is unique. We cannot afford, therefore, to have the authority of the Organization called into question by those who are outlaws of international society. It is imperative therefore that we not fail to discharge the special obligation which has been entrusted to us, for if we do we put at risk the reputation of our Organization and deceive the many who have placed their faith in it. We should consequently do all in our power to avoid such an eventuality.

In introducing draft resolution B to the General Assembly, I strongly urge that it be given the widest possible support. To that end, I invite this body to demonstrate its continued collective support for the struggling people of Namibia under the leadership of SWAPO, their sole authentic representative, by a unanimous vote of "yes" for this draft resolution. Resounding approval of its provisions will not fail to be heard in Pretoria and will, I believe, hasten the day when Namibia can freely join us in this Assembly of independent and sovereign nations.

Mr. DASGUPTA (India): I have the honour to introduce draft resolution C, contained in part III of the annual report of the United Nations Council for Namibia (A/42/24). The draft resolution, entitled "Programme of work of the United Nations Council for Namibia", sets out the specific means by which the Council proposes to fulfil its mandate to promote Namibia's early accession to independence and protect the rights and interests of the Namibian people. The draft resolution also appeals for action by States, intergovernmental bodies and non-governmental organizations to enhance and complement the Council's own activities in support of the Namibian cause.

(Mr. Dasgupta, India)

The preambular section of the draft resolution provides the legal justification and policy framework for the programme of work that follows in the operative section. It reaffirms the principal goal of enabling the Namibian people to attain self-determination and independence. It recalls the United Nations assumption of direct responsibility for Namibia and the Assembly's designation of the Council for Namibia as the legal Administering Authority for the Territory until independence. It also recalls the major pronouncements adopted by the Council over the past year, namely the Luanda Declaration and Programme of Action of May 1987 and the ministerial communiqué of 2 October 1987, and it reaffirms the need for continued consultation with the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) in all matters of interest to the Namibian people.

The programme of work itself calls for many different kinds of action on the part of the Council and the international community. First and perhaps foremost, the Council is requested to continue mobilizing international pressure for the speedy withdrawal of the illegal South African administration from Namibia, for example through consultations with Governments, the organizing of international and regional activities such as seminars and symposiums, and the ongoing campaign to raise public awareness of the Namibian situation. The Council is also asked to denounce and seek universal rejection of all schemes through which South Africa attempts to perpetuate its illegal occupation of the Territory, with particular reference to the puppet political entities installed in Windhoek by the Pretoria régime and the completely unacceptable notion of linking the independence of Namibia to the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola.

The Council's role in representing Namibia in international bodies and conferences, including the specialized agencies of the United Nations system, is also underscored in the draft resolution. The Council is instructed to ensure that

(Mr. Dasgupta, India)

the rights and interests of Namibia are adequately represented in all relevant international forums, while the various intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations are requested to invite and facilitate the full participation of Namibia, as represented by the Council, in their activities and proceedings. The Council is also requested to accede to international conventions as it deems appropriate, in consultation with SWAPO.

(Mr. Dasgupta, India)

The draft resolution requests the Council to promote and secure the implementation of the ministerial communiqué of 2 October, the Luanda Declaration and Programme of Action, and also the Call for Action adopted at the Seminar conducted by the Council in Buenos Aires last April. These documents, taken together, constitute a very specific and comprehensive plan of action not only for the Council itself but for other organs of the United Nations, Governments, regional organizations, non-governmental organizations, support groups and others. The Council is thus encouraged to act as a catalyst for action in support of Namibia across the whole range of international institutions.

A number of specific tasks which the Council has fulfilled for many years are once again entrusted to its care. Among these are research and reporting on political, military and social developments affecting Namibia; the formulation of means to counter the collaboration of Governments and transnational corporations with the illegal occupation régime; and the institution of measures to secure full implementation of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia. The common objective of these provisions is to expose and bring an end to all forms of collaboration with South Africa in its illegal occupation of Namibia, its repression of the Namibian people and its plunder of their natural resources.

Finally, the draft resolution requests the Secretary-General to provide the Council and the Office of the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia with adequate personnel and other resources for the full and effective discharge of their respective tasks and functions.

In the light of the very serious situation affecting Namibia, the United Nations Council for Namibia considers that draft resolution C provides a solid framework for the effective fulfilment of its mandate in the coming year. On that basis, I recommend the draft resolution for unanimous approval by the General Assembly.

Mr. KULOV (Bulgaria): It is my pleasure and privilege to introduce to the General Assembly for its positive consideration draft resolution D entitled "Dissemination of information and mobilization of international public opinion in support of the immediate independence of Namibia".

The draft resolution first and foremost reiterates the importance of intensifying publicity on all aspects of the Namibian question as an instrument for furthering the direct responsibility assumed by the United Nations for Namibia. It also stresses the urgent need to disseminate information on Namibia and to mobilize international public opinion on a continuous basis in support of the inalienable right of the people of Namibia to self-determination, freedom and independence. It emphasizes these important objectives against the background of the total blackout on news on Namibia imposed by the illegal South African régime and the campaign of slander and disinformation which that régime continues to carry on against the United Nations and the liberation struggle of the Namibian people.

In pursuance of the objective of intensifying the international campaign in favour of Namibia's cause, the draft resolution requests the Council, among other things, to focus its activities on greater mobilization in Western Europe and North America; to intensify the international campaign for the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter; to organize an international campaign to boycott products from Namibia and South Africa; and to expose and denounce all collaboration with the racist South African régime.

The draft resolution also envisages a broad and varied information programme including, inter alia, the preparation and wide dissemination of publications on all aspects of the Namibian question, as well as radio and television programmes designed to draw the attention of world public opinion to the current situation in

(Mr. Kulov, Bulgaria)

and around Namibia and to counter the hostile propaganda and disinformation campaign of the racist régime of South Africa.

Furthermore, in view of the continued collaboration of certain States with the racist régime of South Africa, and the need to focus on greater mobilization in Western Europe and North America, the Assembly requests the Council to organize workshops for non-governmental organizations at which the participants will consider their contribution to the implementation of the decisions of the United Nations relating to the dissemination of information on, and the mobilization of support for, Namibia.

Mobilization of international public opinion through the dissemination of information on Namibia represents an important aspect of the efforts of the United Nations to bring about the independence of Namibia. In spite of the upsurge of interest in the situation in southern Africa as a whole, the public at large does not receive adequate information on Namibia. There is, many believe, a conspiracy of silence on Namibia on the part of the media in certain countries. In those few instances when the Western media report on Namibia, the information is, for the most part, biased and distorted. The draft resolution requests the Council to organize media encounters on developments relating to Namibia, particularly prior to the major activities organized by the Council during 1988 in order to counteract such problems.

It is imperative that the position of the United Nations with regard to Namibia be given the requisite publicity, in order to educate and inform public opinion at large. In those countries where governmental policy is not in line with the international consensus on the question of Namibia, the need for such information has never been so pressing. Dissemination of information on Namibia

(Mr. Kulov, Bulgaria)

would be a means of bringing pressure to bear on Pretoria and its allies to comply with United Nations resolutions and decisions demanding the unconditional implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) without further delay.

The draft resolution also highlights the extremely positive and important role that non-governmental organizations play in the dissemination of information and mobilization of support for the cause of Namibia. Accordingly, the draft resolution requests the Council for Namibia to continue to co-operate closely with non-governmental organizations in its efforts to mobilize international public opinion in support of the liberation struggle of the Namibian people, under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO). By the same resolution, the General Assembly decided to allocate resources to be used by the United Nations Council for Namibia for its programme of co-operation with non-governmental organizations, including support for conferences and workshops arranged by those organizations and for such other activities as will promote the cause of the liberation struggle of the Namibian people, subject to decisions to be taken by the Council in consultation with SWAPO.

Furthermore, the draft resolution appeals to non-governmental organizations, inter alia, to increase the awareness of their national communities and legislative bodies concerning South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia, the liberation struggle being waged by the Namibian people under the leadership of SWAPO their sole, authentic representative, the gross violation of basic human rights by the South African régime in Namibia, and the plunder of the Territory's resources by foreign economic interests; and to mobilize in their countries broad political support for the national liberation of Namibia by holding hearings, seminars and public presentations on various aspects of the Namibian question, as well as by producing and distributing pamphlets, films and other information material.

(Mr. Kulov, Bulgaria)

In conclusion, I should like to express my sincere hope that the Assembly will give its unanimous support to draft resolution D, on "Dissemination of information and mobilization of international public opinion in support of the immediate independence of Namibia".

Mr. CARNEVALI VILLEGAS (Venezuela) (interpretation from Spanish): I have the honour to introduce draft resolution E on the question of Namibia, entitled "United Nations Fund for Namibia".

The Fund was established 16 years ago because the United Nations, having terminated South Africa's Mandate to administer the Territory and assumed direct responsibility for Namibia until its independence, undertook the solemn obligation to help the people of the Territory in its struggle for independence, and in that context was to provide it with, among other things, material assistance.

In the early years the scope of assistance activities charged to the Fund was limited, but with the intensification of the liberation struggle the need for assistance increased.

Since the end of the 1970s the Fund has consisted of the following three Accounts.

The first is the General Account, which provides the means to finance education, social and medical assistance to the Namibians. The main activity charged to this Account is a programme of individual fellowships, which provides education assistance to Namibians. At present 214 students are studying under the programme in 16 countries.

Secondly, there is the Nationhood Programme Account. The Programme was conceived to help prepare Namibians for the task of governing their country after independence, through a broad programme of assistance oriented towards development. Under the mandate given by the Assembly to the Council for Namibia, the Programme, which includes both training and research projects, is being carried out in consultation with the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO). At present several hundred Namibians benefit from training opportunities under the Programme, and a number of reports and investigations providing information and outlining policy options in various socio-economic spheres have been carried out.

(Mr. Carnevali Villegas, Venezuela)

Thirdly, there is the United Nations Institute for Namibia Account, the financial basis of the Institute for Namibia, located in Lusaka, Zambia. The Institute, established 11 years ago, carries out research and provides training for future middle-level government officials and teachers, secretaries and magistrates in an independent Namibia. About 600 students are involved in the Institute.

Since the Fund's creation in 1971 more than $61 million has been channelled through it, mainly to provide education and training to a large number of Namibians who, as a result of the Bantu education system, have been denied access to educational means in Namibia. A great deal has been done so far, and, as a direct result of our efforts, the number of Namibians with a sound educational base has increased significantly. However, the need for assistance is far from having been met, and we must intensify our assistance to Namibians so that at the time of independence they are ready to govern their country efficiently for the benefit of the whole population.

In order to maintain the present momentum and improve Council for Namibia assistance programmes considerable financial resources will be required in the coming years. Although in recent years voluntary contributions to the three Accounts have shown an upward trend, the resources available today are not sufficient to meet increasing needs. In this connection, I cherish the hope that the traditional donors to the Fund will be able to increase their contributions next year. I also appeal to those countries that are not now donors to consider pledging contributions at the forthcoming pledging conference, to be held next March.

In that connection, I would point out that the current assistance programmes cover several important projects requiring large financial inputs each year in

(Mr. Carnevali Villegas, Venezuela)

order to keep up their activities. I have in mind in particular the on-the-job attachment programme, established in 1984 to provide Namibians who have finished their schooling with an opportunity to gain practical experience by working in a number of countries, particularly in Africa. The programme has been considerably increased in the past two years, and it is to be hoped that by the beginning of 1988 more than 100 young Namibians will join it.

Another important project is the United Nations Vocational Training Centre, located in Angola, which provides training in technical skills to about 200 Namibians each year.

Those two projects require several hundred thousand dollars a year, which is why I repeat my appeal to all donors to consider supporting them with contributions to the Fund, either of a general nature or for specific projects.

With that short introduction, I commend draft resolution E for unanimous adoption.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes before the voting on any or all of the five draft resolutions in document A/42/24 (Part III) and (Part III)/Corr.1.

I remind the Assembly that, in accordance with General Assembly decision 34/401, such statements are limited to 10 minutes and should be made by representatives from their seats.

Representatives will also have an opportunity to explain their votes after all the votes have been conducted.

Mr. BIERRING (Denmark): I have the honour to speak to the draft resolutions now before the General Assembly on behalf of the 12 member States of the European Community.

A number of familiar but controversial elements remain in the increasingly lengthy draft resolutions before us. We are concerned, first, at the unbalanced approach taken by the Council for Namibia in initiating certain activities and, secondly, at the introduction of a number of paragraphs which are of doubtful relevance to the central aim of securing Namibia's independence. The introduction of such elements makes unanimous approval of the draft resolutions by the General Assembly impossible. Indeed, it risks accentuating divisions among the membership of the United Nations when there is, more than ever, a need to mobilize the full support of the international community in pursuit of the common goal of internationally recognized independence for Namibia.

The Twelve cannot endorse calls for Member States to render increased military assistance to the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) as a means of bringing Namibia to independence. Similarly, we cannot agree to lend our support to armed struggle as a means to this end, in spite of the impatience and frustration felt by the Namibian people owing to South Africa's continuing occupation of their country.

(Mr. Bierring, Denmark)

In the view of the Twelve the general and primary duty of the United Nations is to promote peaceful solutions in conformity with the Charter, thus avoiding any encouragement of the use of force.

The Twelve consider that under the provisions of the settlement plan the constitution of an independent Namibia must be worked out by a constituent assembly appointed as a result of elections in which all political groups are able to participate. None of those groups should therefore be designated in advance as the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people.

The Twelve wish to reaffirm their commitment to the principle of universality of membership of the United Nations. We cannot accept that it should be called into question or that the autonomy of the international financial institutions should be compromised. The total isolation of South Africa would in our view hinder efforts to secure the implementation of the United Nations settlement plan. The Twelve reject any arbitrary and selective singling out of individual countries or groups of countries.

Our respect for the division of competence among the main bodies of the Organization remains unchanged. The Security Council alone is authorized to take decisions binding upon Member States.

I must also register our concern at the financial implications of some of the draft resolutions now before the Assembly. A more thorough scrutiny of the programme of work of the Council for Namibia would have enabled the financial implications to be reduced without endangering attainment of the goals we all seek. As with any new expenditure in the current financial situation, the position will need to be carefully monitored in the light of developments.

As I have already stated, we remain firmly and unequivocally committed to the independence of Namibia. The illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa must be

(Mr. Bierring, Denmark)

brought to an end. The only acceptable basis for a peaceful and lasting solution to the problem is the implementation without pre-conditions or pretext of Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978). The settlement plan endorsed by the second of these resolutions - which has been accepted both by the Government of South Africa and by the South West Africa People's Organization - embodies the only universally accepted framework for a peaceful transition to independence in a manner which is guaranteed to be free and fair. We wish to see the plan implemented without delay and in its entirety so that the Namibian people may move forward to the internationally recognized independence which is their due.

Mr. BLANC (France) (interpretation from French): The United Nations plan under Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978) is the sole acceptable basis for the settlement of the Namibian question. France, which played an important role in the elaboration of that plan, remains firmly in favour of its speedy and unconditional implementation with a view to the Territory's becoming independent.

As noted by the Secretary-General in his latest reports, all the outstanding questions concerning implementation of the plan have now been resolved. Its implementation, however, remains blocked by South Africa's insistence on linkage between the independence of Namibia and the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola. My delegation reiterates that it rejects this South African demand, which links the future of Namibia to considerations unrelated to the question and subordinates the independence of the Territory to the settlement of issues extraneous to resolution 435 (1978).

Last week France voted in favour of Security Council resolution 601 (1987), authorizing the Secretary-General to take new initiatives with a view to arranging a cease-fire between South Africa and the South West Africa People's Organization

(Mr. Blanc, France)

in order to undertake the necessary measures for the emplacement of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group.

The French delegation supports that initiative and reiterates its full support for the Secretary-General's actions.

France is especially concerned at the situation in southern Africa, and in particular in Namibia. With respect to that Territory, France remains ready to contribute to the implementation of the United Nations settlement plan and wishes to maintain a position which will enable it, when the time comes, to co-operate in the completion of the process leading to the independence of Namibia. That is why my delegation will maintain its customary position of abstention on principle on the five draft resolutions before the General Assembly.

Miss BYRNE (United States of America): This extended debate on Namibia in the plenary Assembly comes only one week after the Security Council's deliberation on the topic. The number of speakers in each case demonstrates the importance of the issue to us all.

The United States is totally committed to the goal of Namibian independence through the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). The problem of Namibia stems from the clear and simple fact that the Republic of South Africa is illegally occupying the Territory of Namibia. South Africa has no right to be in Namibia, no right to control the internal and external policies of that country, and no right to use it as a staging area from which to violate the borders of neighbouring States.

One cause for a degree of guarded optimism, however, is that after a hiatus of almost two years Angola has resumed discussions concerning a regional political settlement, the essential condition of effective implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

(Miss Byrne, United States)

Since April, Assistant Secretary for African Affairs Crocker has met with Angolan Government representatives four times. The discussions have been detailed and have helped to clarify the steps to be taken in order to reach an agreement acceptable to all sides in the Namibian conflict. Contacts between ourselves and the Angolans are continuing. The United States remains fully committed to reaching a settlement that will protect the security interests of Angola and the other parties involved, as well as bring independence to the long-subjugated people of Namibia.

Unfortunately, those developments are not reflected in the five draft resolutions on Namibia currently before the Assembly - especially not in the most political and hortatory of these, draft resolutions A and B. At the same time my Government recognizes that these latest resolutions represent some improvement over those of the past few years. They contain no explicitly critical references to the United States.

The United States has traditionally abstained on the annual Namibia draft resolution in the General Assembly because of our active involvement, together with other contact group members, in efforts directed towards a negotiated settlement. We shall abstain again this year, even though these draft resolutions continue to contain language with which we disagree and against which we have voted in other contexts.

For example, we object to the repeated references to the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) as the "sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people". This characterization of SWAPO is disputed by many Namibians. Only the Namibian people themselves, in the free and democratic elections called for in Security Council resolution 435 (1978), can definitively choose their representatives.

(Miss Byrne, United States)

In addition, draft resolution A expresses support for an armed struggle led by SWAPO and commends SWAPO for its intensification of such a struggle. The United States cannot associate itself with such calls to violence. We object to the use of United Nations resolutions as a means to legitimize armed conflict. We oppose any policy that carries the risk of turning southern Africa, already surfeited with grief and misery, into an even more volatile zone of warfare.

Further, these draft resolutions reject and condemn the relationship between the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) and the need for a regional settlement that would permit the withdrawal of foreign forces from both Namibia and Angola.

(Miss Byrne, United States)

It is rhetorically easy to dismiss the issue of the Cuban presence in Angola as "irrelevant" to the goal of Namibian independence. But, as Ambassador Okun noted in the Security Council last week, no amount of wishful thinking can implement resolution 435 (1978) without a settlement that addresses the security concerns of both Angola and South Africa. That is a fact. The South Africans have made it clear that they will not relinquish their hold over Namibia until the question of the Cuban troop presence in Angola is resolved. That is a fact. And the Angolans will not consider their borders secure until the South African presence in Namibia is a thing of the past. That is also a fact. The irony of this situation is that all parties to the conflict have now put forward proposals based on the irrefutable premise that a meaningful and lasting agreement on the independence of Namibia can be achieved only if the security concerns of both principal outside parties - Angola and South Africa - are satisfactorily met.

These draft resolutions also reject and condemn the phrase "constructive engagement", which they mischaracterize as a policy that has encouraged South Africa to maintain its opposition to the decisions of the international community regarding Namibia. These paragraphs of the draft resolutions assert relationships between the United States and South Africa which do not exist. They only serve to obscure the real issues.

Finally, these draft resolutions urge the Security Council to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa. The United States position on this point is well known. The United States has underscored our opposition to apartheid over the years by a series of bilateral measures as well as our support of numerous United Nations resolutions condemning South Africa's racial policies. However, we oppose sweeping world-wide sanctions that would be unworkable and counterproductive. Their impact would be contrary to the interests of both South

(Miss Byrne, United States)

Africa's oppressed majority and the regional economies of States in southern Africa. Every United Nations Member State should be free to take the steps that it believes are most appropriate and effective on both the apartheid and Namibia questions.

Draft resolution B goes even further. It asks the Security Council to set a 31 December 1987 deadline for the commencement of implementation of resolution 435 (1978), after which the Council would be called upon to apply the relevant provisions of the Charter, including comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII. This draft resolution goes on to declare that if the Security Council's efforts are still unsuccessful by 29 September of next year the General Assembly will then consider necessary action of its own.

It is not within the purview of this Assembly to set short and unrealistic deadlines for the work of the Security Council. Such pronouncements only serve further to complicate the solution.

On a separate but related issue, based on the statements made in the Fifth Committee by the Secretariat, it is the clear understanding of the United States delegation that the draft resolutions currently before us involve no change in the practice of the Council regarding language services that would entail costs beyond those listed in the programme budget implication statement submitted to the Fifth Committee, all of which can be accommodated within the proposed programme budget for 1988-89. This understanding has been a key element of my delegation's ability to support a consensus on these issues.

In closing, I wish to emphasize that a Namibia settlement is coming within reach. Unfortunately, these latest draft resolutions do not help to bring our common goal closer to fruition.

Count YORK von WARTENBURG (Federal Republic of Germany): I take it that the position of the Federal Republic of Germany on the question of Namibia is well known. There has been no change in our attitude. As we have repeatedly stated, most recently on 30 October 1987 during the Security Council meeting on Namibia, Security Council resolution 435 (1978) is

> "the indispensable basis for a settlement of the question of Namibia. Resolution 435 (1978) is and remains the only foundation for Namibia's achievement of its internationally recognized independence. In accordance with resolution 435 (1978), the constitution of an independent Namibia is to be adopted by a constituent assembly elected in free and fair elections, under United Nations supervision, and by such an assembly only." (S/PV.2758, p. 12)

As has been pointed out on corresponding occasions in recent years, the Federal Republic of Germany, as a member of the Contact Group, could be involved in negotiations on the implementation of the settlement plan adopted by the Security Council in 1978. In order not to prejudge the outcome of these negotiations in any way, the Federal Republic of Germany has to refrain from associating itself in either a positive or a negative manner with the drafts before the General Assembly. For this reason the Federal Republic of Germany will abstain on all draft resolutions before us concerning the question of Namibia. Such abstention is motivated by purely procedural reasons.

Abstaining for reasons of principle and procedure, my delegation would, as in previous years, not comment on the substantive contents of the resolutions before us. My delegation will restrict its comments to a special aspect of principle.

We regret very much that this year also some countries, including my own, have been singled out in the draft resolutions. Thus, for instance, in operative

(Count York von Wartenburg, Federal Republic of Germany)

paragraph 40 of draft resolution A, the Federal Republic of Germany is called upon

"to discontinue all programmes of development aid and assistance to illegally occupied Namibia".

On this my delegation would like to comment as follows.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany does not, as repeatedly stated, recognize the so-called interim government and considers it null and void. There is no co-operation between the Federal Government and illegally occupied Namibia, nor will there be such co-operation before full independence. But should this mean that the needs of the Namibian population should be totally ignored if calls for help and assistance, especially on humanitarian grounds, are expressed? As a member of the Contact Group and also for historic reasons, my country feels especially committed to the Namibian people. That is why my country has been willing to mitigate, on humanitarian grounds, the suffering of the Namibian people and to prepare the Namibian population for independence. My delegation attaches great importance to the fact that assistance programmes to this effect are benefiting the non-white population in Namibia.

Let me repeat: nothing could more deflect the truth than the insinuation that my country's programmes of assistance to the Namibian people are aimed at supporting the interim government in Windhoek, installed by South Africa and recognized by nobody, in order to perpetuate the present situation there. A restricted number of development projects undertaken by private organizations have been supported by my Government for the direct benefit of the Namibian people. The partners on both sides in such projects are non-governmental agencies. The Namibian partners, preferably the churches, have to fulfil the condition of political neutrality.

(Count York von Wartenburg, Federal Republic of Germany)

My delegation objects as a matter of principle to name-calling in General Assembly resolutions. Apart from that, and for the reasons just set forth, we find it inappropriate and unfair that on account of private-sector development assistance given to the Namibian people mainly for humanitarian reasons, the Federal Republic of Germany has been singled out and called by name in one paragraph of draft resolution A before us.

Furthermore, Mr. President, also in operative paragraph 76 of draft resolution A, my country - in this case together with other countries - has been mentioned by name. We think that the authors of the draft resolution could have formulated the request expressed in this paragraph without doing so. We regret that the Council for Namibia has initiated legal proceedings against a Member State of the United Nations - all the more in view of the fact that this particular country was not offered an opportunity beforehand to state its case in the Council for Namibia.

In addition, I would remark, in conclusion, that I do not consider it opportune to mention one single human-rights organization, as is done in draft resolution A. Private human-rights organizations deserve praise for their engagement in individual cases. Human-rights organizations, however, do not in all cases have access to complete and reliable information. That is why errors can occur when they assess factual situations. But errors of this kind cannot justify summary censure, least of all in a United Nations resolution.

Mr. McDONAGH (Ireland): Ireland shares the reservations held in common by the twelve member States of the European Community, as expressed by the representative of Denmark.

I should like now to explain my delegation's voting positions on the draft resolutions before us.

(Mr. McDonagh, Ireland)

Ireland's position on the question of Namibia has been clearly stated on many previous occasions in the General Assembly. My Government is firmly committed to the independence of Namibia. We wish to see South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia brought to an end without further delay. We unreservedly condemn South Africa for prolonging this occupation, in defiance of the expressed wishes of the international community and of resolutions of the Security Council. We believe that the people of Namibia must be given the freedom to exercise their fundamental and inalienable right to self-determination, in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978). We condemn without hesitation any attempts to delay, through pre-conditions or otherwise, the implementation of the United Nations settlement plan.

It is clear from various actions taken by the South African Government that South Africa is bent on frustrating the goal of Namibian independence. The establishment of an unrepresentative internal administration in Namibia, which has been condemned by the Security Council, is clearly designed to impede and further delay the implementation of the settlement plan. It is totally unacceptable to the international community.

Under international law, as defined by the United Nations Security Council and by the International Court of Justice, South Africa has a clear obligation to end its illegal occupation of Namibia. Ireland has always accepted that if South Africa remained intransigent the process of negotiation might have to be supplemented by specific measures by the international community designed to compel South Africa to honour this clear obligation. We believe that these measures should include a set of mandatory sanctions against South Africa, properly imposed by the Security Council, and that, in order to secure the effectiveness of these sanctions through their widest possible acceptance and implementation, they should be carefully chosen and selective.

(Mr. McDonagh, Ireland)

That is our general approach to the question of Namibia and it was against that background that we examined the five draft resolutions before us. We decided to vote in favour of two of them and to abstain on three.

I turn first to draft resolution A, on the situation in Namibia. As in previous years, my delegation can support many of the provisions contained in this draft. Unfortunately, however, we are also faced with a number of formulations which, as in the past, we are unable to accept. Accordingly, we are obliged to abstain in the voting on this text.

Operative paragraphs 4, 6, 14, 15 and 48 of the draft resolution give explicit support to armed struggle. We have made clear in the past our unreserved opposition to any endorsement of violence by the Assembly, even if we can understand the anger and sense of frustration which drive Namibians to take up arms to secure independence.

I should say, too, that we do not believe that the selective singling out of certain groups of countries for condemnation and criticism in this and other draft resolutions can promote our common objective in the Assembly.

My delegation regrets also that it must abstain on draft resolution B, on the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). As I indicated earlier, Ireland strongly supports the United Nations settlement plan endorsed in that resolution, and we firmly believe that its implementation should not be delayed. We continue, however, to doubt the wisdom or efficacy of calls for the imposition of comprehensive sanctions against South Africa at this juncture. We believe that the right policy for the international community is one of steady and graduated pressure for change through carefully chosen, selective mandatory sanctions to be properly imposed by the Security Council and fully implemented by all.

(Mr. McDonagh, Ireland)

Ireland will vote in favour of draft resolution C, on the programme of work of the United Nations Council for Namibia. We support in general the efforts of the Council to end South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia. However, we have some reservations about the powers of the Council for Namibia in regard to certain issues and we see difficulties about certain recommendations of the Council.

Ireland will abstain on draft resolution D, on the dissemination of information and mobilization of international public opinion in support of the immediate independence of Namibia. We would have wished to be able to vote in favour of this draft resolution. It is important for the United Nations Council for Namibia to consider ways and means of mobilizing public opinion in support of the struggle of the Namibian people for self-determination and independence. My delegation could therefore support many of the provisions of the draft. Regrettably, however, it also contains some formulations which we cannot accept. One example is operative paragraph 12 (c), which appeals to non-governmental organizations, and so forth, to expose and campaign against the political and economic collaboration of certain Western Governments with the South African régime, as well as diplomatic visits to and from South Africa. We fail to see that such a campaign could be anything but harmful to the pursuit of our common objectives.

As regards the references to the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) in this and other draft resolutions, I wish to reaffirm Ireland's appreciation of the leading role which SWAPO plays in seeking independence for Namibia. When free and fair elections are held under United Nations auspices and supervision - a proposal which SWAPO has accepted and which Ireland strongly supports - the people of Namibia will then have the opportunity to choose their representatives freely and through a democratic process.

(Mr. McDonagh, Ireland)

Finally, I wish to mention draft resolution E, on the United Nations Fund for Namibia. My delegation will vote in favour of this draft resolution, as it has voted in favour of draft resolutions on the same subject in the past. We believe that the United Nations Fund for Namibia performs a valuable function in providing assistance to Namibians who have suffered as a result of the illegal occupation of their land by South Africa.

Mr. FONDER (Belgium) (interpretation from French): One week after the Security Council adopted resolution 601 (1987) the General Assembly has once again held a long debate on the question of Namibia. Faced with the intransigence of South Africa, the international community has reiterated its irrevocable and increasingly active commitment to the independence of that Territory. Belgium, a member of the United Nations Council for Namibia, also deplores the unjustified prolongation of South Africa's occupation of Namibia more than 20 years after that Territory was placed under the direct responsibility of our Organization.

In joining in the consensus by which all members of the Council for Namibia adopted its annual report my country wished to confirm its position in the light of this situation and to reaffirm its support for a people which has for so long been deprived of its inalienable right to self-determination and independence.

However, as the Permanent Representative of Denmark has just done on behalf of the European Community, my delegation must recall certain standing principles of its international policy which mean that it cannot but have reservations with regard to the draft resolutions before us.

On draft resolutions A, B and D, which deal respectively with the situation in Namibia, implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and dissemination of information, my delegation will abstain. The reasons for this threefold abstention are identical to those that we have given in the past. Most of the language that caused us difficulty previously has been maintained in these draft resolutions.

On draft resolution A, for example, my country still has some reservations in connection with the status imputed to the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the support given to armed struggle, the selective reference to countries, the breaking off of all relations with South Africa, and the appeal for imposition of the sanctions provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter.

(Mr. Fonder, Belgium)

My delegation would like to recall the position it took on the Luanda documents and the final communiqué of the 2 October ministerial meeting of the United Nations Council for Namibia. Finally, my delegation could not have voted in favour of paragraph 75 of this draft resolution had it been put to a separate vote.

On draft resolution B, my delegation regrets that the Western members of the Security Council have been criticized. Once again we would like to insist on scrupulous respect for the specific mandate of that body. Paragraphs 13, 14, 15, 17 and 18 of that draft resolution are not in line with that criterion.

With regard to draft resolution D, on the dissemination of information, here too my delegation cannot go along with a number of concepts that have been improperly included in the mobilization campaign and which have lessened its efficacy.

On the other hand, my delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution C, on the programme of work of the United Nations Council for Namibia, while recalling the comments made when considering the financial implications. My delegation will also vote in favour of draft resolution E, on the United Nations Fund for Namibia.

My country shares the feelings of frustration felt by the Namibian people and the front-line States at the South African Government's delaying tactics and their consequence: the continued illegal occupation of Namibia.

Belgium firmly believes that the question of Namibia should be resolved as quickly as possible on the basis of Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978). We are convinced that the settlement of this decolonization question will lead to positive developments for the entire region. For this reason we consider that the new mission that has been entrusted to the Secretary-General by

(Mr. Fonder, Belgium)

the Security Council is of crucial importance in the efforts to ensure the rapid implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia.

Mr. NTAKHWANA (Botswana): Botswana will vote in favour of all the draft resolutions contained in document A/42/24 (Part III) and Corr. 1, but we wish to state our incapacity to implement those paragraphs which call for the imposition of economic sanctions against the Pretoria régime.

Mrs. de PERALTA (Guatemala) (interpretation from Spanish): Guatemala has followed very closely the debates that have taken place year after year on the question of Namibia. On this occasion, when we Guatemalans have a democratic Government, we feel very sad that other peoples do not enjoy the same kind of government. We very much regret that South Africa does not comply with Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978), General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), of 14 December 1960, containing the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, and General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI), of October 1966, whereby it was agreed to terminate South Africa's Mandate over Namibia.

My country cannot disregard the fact that this year is the twentieth anniversary of the establishment by the General Assembly of the United Nations Council for Namibia as the legal Administering Authority for that Territory. Therefore, we express our concern that South Africa should have disregarded for all this time the decisions of the Security Council. We affirm our solidarity with the people of Namibia because we feel that today more than ever it is important that the entire international community give its support to those regions which, like Namibia, suffer under the yoke of colonialism and are denied their fundamental

(Mrs. de Peralta, Guatemala)

rights. That is why Guatemala joins all those countries that have repudiated the oppression prevailing in Namibia.

We support the efforts of the Secretary-General of the United Nations to speed up the process that will lead to the independence of Namibia and shall vote in favour of all the draft resolutions submitted to the Assembly, with the sole proviso that my country objects to recourse to armed action since we believe that all conflicts should be settled rationally and peacefully.

We hope that South Africa will soon comply with the decisions and resolutions of the United Nations and grant independence to the people of Namibia so that they may enjoy all their rights.

My Government once again reaffirms its support for and solidarity with the suffering people of Namibia and urges the entire international community to help them to achieve independence.

Mr. PHIRI (Malawi): I should like to state that our delegation is in full support of all the draft resolutions before the Assembly. We firmly believe that the time is long overdue for this problem to have been set behind us so that Namibia should no longer be a subject for talk, but should be a full participant in talking about meaningful issues before this Assembly.

In doing so, however, we should like to restate our position in regard to two aspects. In the first instance, we have not been convinced that certain measures are always the only and the right answers to solving problems. Nevertheless, it has never been our view that only positions held by us are absolute. Therefore, whilst we do not believe that we should stand in the way of others who would wish to have sanctions as the means of solving this or any other problem, we ourselves, because we are unable realistically to participate in such measures, must be honest and say to this Assembly that we find ourselves having to reserve our position on sanctions. We have reservations on various paragraphs of draft resolution A, for example, on operative paragraph 79; we have the same reservations on operative paragraphs 15 and 16 of draft resolution B. We understand why it is necessary for the Assembly to call upon members in these instances, and we fully appreciate it, but our delegation finds itself unable to go along with it, because we would realistically be unable to comply with that request.

Secondly, it has always been our view that, in fairness and in order to be effective in what we do, we must respect one another and seek to carry one another along with our decisions. Therefore, we do not find it helpful to name-call or to single out individual States for condemnation and other isolated actions, when in truth we all know that the issue affects more than those who are singled out. In this respect, I only want to give as an example paragraph 76 of draft resolution A. There are many other examples throughout these draft resolutions.

(Mr. Phiri, Malawi)

Again, my delegation wishes to reaffirm that we shall be voting for those draft resolutions, but we shall reserve our position, as usual, on those aspects where we find ourselves unable to comply.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote before the vote.

Before proceeding to the vote on the draft resolutions contained in document A/42/24 (Part III) and Corr.1, I wish to draw the attention of the Assembly to the provisions of special rule F in annex III to the rules of procedure, which will be applied, as in the past, in the voting on all proposals under agenda item 36, entitled "Question of Namibia", at the current session.

Consequently, a two-thirds majority of the representatives present and voting shall be required for adoption of the proposals before the Assembly.

The Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolutions A to E recommended by the United Nations Council for Namibia in chapter I, paragraph 2 of document A/42/24 (Part III) and Corr.1.

The report of the Fifth Committee on the programme budget implications of the draft resolutions has been issued under the symbol A/42/716.

The General Assembly will now begin the voting process. I shall now put to the vote draft resolution A, entitled "Situation in Namibia resulting from the illegal occupation of the Territory by South Africa".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Côte d'Ivoire, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Draft resolution A was adopted by 131 votes to none, with 24 abstentions (resolution 42/14 A).

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): I shall now put to the vote draft resolution B, entitled "Implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978)".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Côte d'Ivoire, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Draft resolution B was adopted by 130 votes to none, with 24 abstentions (resolution 42/14 B).

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): I shall now put to the vote draft resolution C, entitled "Programme of work of the United Nations Council for Namibia".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotno, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

Abstaining: Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Netherlands, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Draft resolution C was adopted by 149 votes to none, with 6 abstentions (resolution 42/14 C).

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): We turn next to draft resolution D, entitled "Dissemination of information and mobilization of international public opinion in support of the immediate independence of Namibia".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

Abstaining: Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Draft resolution D was adopted by 133 votes to none, with 22 abstentions (resolution 42/14 D).

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): We come now to draft resolution E, entitled "United Nations Fund for Namibia".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

Abstaining: Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Draft resolution E was adopted by 149 votes to none, with 5 abstentions (resolution 42/14 E).*

---

*Subsequently the delegation of Kenya advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): I shall now call on representatives wishing to explain their votes after the voting.

Mr. BIRCH (United Kingdom): My delegation shares the view of all those who have spoken in this debate that Namibia should be brought to internationally recognized independence at the earliest possible time. As one of the authors of the United Nations settlement plan, we remain committed to the full implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). In order to sustain our impartial position in relation to the settlement plan, the United Kingdom has traditionally declined to take a position on the substance of the draft resolutions on Namibia presented to the General Assembly. Accordingly, we abstained in the votes on all five draft resolutions before the Assembly today.*

Although we have serious misgivings about many paragraphs of the draft resolutions, we are pleased that their language is less arbitrary and extreme than in recent years. Selective and unjustified name-calling can only bring discredit to the United Nations and diminish its international standing. We regret that a few instances of name-calling have remained.

We remain concerned at the continuing extravagance of some of the activities of the Council for Namibia. Although the estimates based on the 1988 draft programme are somewhat lower than those in the 1988 portion of the proposed programme budget, the provision for the Council's regular activities has increased. Furthermore, it is proposed that nearly $170,000 be set aside to meet the costs of legal action being taken by the Council in the Netherlands. We greatly doubt the utility or wisdom of that expenditure on an action which we

---

* Mr. Moumin (Comoros), Vice-President, took the Chair.

(Mr. Birch, United Kingdom)

consider inappropriate and misguided. In our view, the Council would benefit from a thorough review of its staffing and activities. We look forward to seeing next year the results of the current review commissioned by the Secretary-General.

Finally, I should like to say that some of the new elements in resolution 42/14 B seem to us unrealistic. The British Government's views on the effectiveness - or otherwise - of mandatory sanctions are well known and I need not repeat them here. We have also made it clear that we do not accept the concept of linkage. But it is a fact of life that the settlement plan can only be implemented with the acquiescence of the South African Government. To set a date for the commencement of implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) without the concurrence of the South African authorities would risk diminishing the standing of the Security Council.

That said, I cannot emphasize too strongly the British Government's commitment to Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and to its early implementation. We understand and we share the frustration of the international community at the unjustified delay in bringing Namibia to independence. We have left the South African Government in no doubt about our views on this point, or about the importance we attach to their co-operation in the implementation of the settlement plan. We support all efforts, particularly those of the Secretary-General and his Special Representative, which are genuinely designed to secure the independence of Namibia. We will ourselves continue to work to achieve this.

Mr. AKYOL (Turkey) (interpretation from French): In conformity with the firm support we have pledged to efforts in favour of the independence of Namibia, my delegation voted in favour of all the draft resolutions recommended to the General Assembly by the United Nations Council for Namibia.

(Mr. Akyol, Turkey)

Although we agree with their main thrust, my delegation regrets that because of a number of controversial elements the draft resolutions were unable to marshal unanimous approval. But we are convinced that, like the recent Security Council resolution 601 (1987), the resolutions just adopted will contribute to solving this problem.

(Mr. Akyol, Turkey)

My delegation would wish, in general, to make reservations with respect to some discriminatory references in both tne resolutions and the annual report of the United Nations Council for Namibia. In principle Turkey is opposed to the designation, specifically or otherwise, of third-party States or groups of States, on the basis of geographical, political or other criteria, for the purpose of criticizing them, condemning them or holding them exclusively responsible for policies followed by South Africa.

In this context, my delegation has serious reservations with respect to the inclusion of paragraph 40 of the first resolution because on 9 September 1987 the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany assured the Council that there was no collaboration between his Government and the so-called provisional government of Windhoek. My delegation has taken careful note of the assurances the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany has just recalled for us.

Mr. JACOBOVITS DE SZEGED (Netherlands): My delegation fully associates itself with the statement on the resolutions given by the Danish representative in the name of the 12 member States of the European Community. My delegation, however, would like to make a few additional remarks with regard to some paragraphs in the resolutions referring directly or indirectly to my country.

On 14 July 1987 the United Nations Council for Namibia decided to initiate legal proceedings against two Netherlands companies, as well as against the State of the Netherlands, in order to halt operations deemed to be in violation of the Council's Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia. Such a step is unprecedented.

That the Council chose to summon a Member State of the United Nations in a court of law is of course a decision for the Council itself. It is unclear to my Government why the Council for Namibia singled out the Netherlands for legal action.

(Mr. Jacobovits de Szeged, Netherlands)

Even less do we understand why the Netherlands was not offered a proper opportunity to state its case in a formal session of the Council prior to the latter's decision to go to Court.

Given the Council's task to protect the natural resources of Namibia, pending its independence, one would have expected the Council to concentrate on real and obvious cases of pillage and depletion of Namibia's wealth. The activities of the Netherlands companies, summoned in court by the Council, by no means fall within this category. Therefore, there is no justification to institute legal proceedings against the State of the Netherlands. In this context, I wish to draw attention to our letter dated 23 July 1987 to the Secretary-General of the United Nations and circulated as document A/42/414 among Member States of the General Assembly, clarifying the position of my Government on the allegations of the Council as presented in its writ of summons.

A matter that does deserve the attention of the Council is, in our opinion, the deteriorating fish stock in the Namibian offshore waters. Documented reports prepared by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and the United Nations Development Programme have focused on massive depletion by some States. Why has the Council for Namibia until now failed to take any decisive action to put an end to this form of exploitation?

In addition to the above-mentioned considerations, we strongly believe that the position of my Government is based upon convincing legal arguments. These arguments will be presented in court. We wish to stress that our votes on draft resolutions in the Assembly, be it in the past or the present, may in no way be construed as supportive of the Council's claim in the case pending before the Court in the Netherlands. In the light of the developments to which I have referred, my delegation has abstained this year on the draft resolution on the programme of work

(Mr. Jacobovits de Szeged, Netherlands)

of the United Nations Council for Namibia, while maintaining our abstention on draft resolution A.

My delegation shares the bitterness and frustration felt by African States, and other members of the international community, at the long lasting impasse over Namibia's future. My delegation wishes to reiterate its full support for all endeavours - including those of the United Nations Council for Namibia - to bring Security Council resolution 435 (1978) to a speedy implementation, witnout any pre-conditions or pretexts.

We therefore welcome resolution 601 (1987), which was almost unanimously adopted by the Security Council one week ago. We firmly hope that the Secretary-General will be successful in his endeavours to arrange a cease-fire between South Africa and the South West Africa People's Organization, and we reaffirm our readiness to participate in the United Nations Transition Assistance Group.

Mr. ZEPOS (Greece): Following the explanations of vote that were given by the representative of Denmark on behalf of the member States of the European Community, I should like to make some additional comments.

My delegation was not able to support all the resolutions just adopted, due to the inclusion of certain elements which we believe do not effectively promote the question of Namibia. Our abstention on some of them, therefore, should in not in any way be construed as reflecting any reservation on their substance. The position of Greece vis-à-vis the abhorrent system of apartheid and the illegal occupation of Namibia is well known.

The question of Namibia has been artificially presented as a complex one. In reality it is simple. All the elements for its solution already exist and are contained in numerous General Assembly and Security Council resolutions. Had these

(Mr. Zepos, Greece)

resolutions, particularly those of the Security Council, been implemented, there would today be no problem of Namibia. However, we see in the case of Namibia, as in other international problems, binding resolutions being ignored and bypassed. Solemn obligations to comply with the provisions of Security Council resolutions are not fulfilled. We have, therefore, a flagrant case of flouting the authority of the United Nations through the non-implementation of its binding resolutions. Namibia has become a major challenge facing the United Nations.

What the people of Namibia, under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) is claiming is simply its right to self-determination and independence from the colonial rule of South Africa, which continues the illegal occupation with an army of almost 100,000 men. The independence of Namibia is long overdue. It is the duty of the international community to exert pressure on South Africa so that it terminates its colonial presence.

As the Foreign Minister of Greece recently stated before the Assembly, the Greek Government strongly condemns the continuation of the illegal occupation by South Africa of Namibia and categorically rejects any linkage of the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) with extraneous issues, as well as all dilatory tactics used for this purpose. We also consider unilateral actions, such as the establishment of the so-called interim government of Namibia, to be null and void. Namibia should, with no further delay, attain its independence with its territorial integrity and unity intact.

Mr. LENNKH (Austria): Austria is on record as having consistently supported the right of the Namibian people to self-determination, which we regard as a matter of the highest priority. Consequently, my country remains firmly committed to the immediate independence of Namibia. Security Council resolution 435 (1978) remains to this day the only internationally accepted and satisfactory basis for a just settlement of the question of Namibia.

We believe that every effort should be made to follow strictly the path delineated by that resolution. Austria rejects the intransigent attitude of the Government of South Africa, which has so far prevented implementation of the United Nations plan. Austria welcomes the recent adoption of Security Council resolution 601 (1987), and urges all the parties concerned to co-operate fully with the Secretary-General to bring about its comprehensive and early implementation.

Austria strongly supports the main thrust of the texts submitted to the General Assembly under this item. However, we regret that we were unable to vote for all the draft resolutions, since they contain some provisions that Austria cannot support. In particular, Austria believes that endorsement of armed struggle and calls for military assistance are in contradiction of the guiding principles of the Charter as well as our conviction that conflicts should be resolved exclusively by peaceful means.

Furthermore, we must generally reserve our position with regard to formulations which would prejudge the deliberations and decisions of the Security Council. Nor can Austria associate itself with the singling out of certain countries.

Finally, references to the role of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) should not be read as prejudging the right of the Namibian people to choose its representatives in a free Namibia through elections under United Nations supervision.

(Mr. Lennkh, Austria)

For the reasons I have stated, Austria abstained in the voting on draft resolutions A, B and D. We voted for draft resolutions C and E, thereby stressing again our commitment to the peaceful transition of Namibia to independence on the basis of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

Mr. FERM (Sweden): On behalf of the five Nordic countries - Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden - I have the honour to give this explanation of vote with regard to the draft resolutions on the question of Namibia.

In our opinion the continued illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa constitutes a threat to international peace and security. We regard as null and void the establishment of the so-called transitional government in Namibia. We categorically reject any unilateral action by South Africa outside the framework of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), the United Nations settlement plan being the only internationally acceptable basis for the achievement of independence for Namibia. The Nordic countries, further, reject the linking of Namibia's independence to irrelevant and extraneous issues.

The international community must increase the pressure on South Africa to speed up the implementation of the United Nations settlement plan. The Security Council should consider effective measures to this end, including comprehensive mandatory sanctions.

The Nordic countries agree with the main thrust of the resolutions just adopted. Regrettably, however, we were not able to vote in favour of all of them. The reason is that this year's resolutions again contain a number of elements that cause us difficulties of principle. I shall outline these well-known difficulties in general terms.

First, we cannot accept formulations that imply endorsement by the United Nations of the use of armed struggle or call for material or military assistance

(Mr. Ferm, Sweden)

for such a struggle. One of the basic principles of this Organization, enshrined in the Charter, is to promote peaceful solutions of conflicts.

Secondly, we deplore the selective and inappropriate singling out of individual countries or groups of countries as being responsible for the policies pursued by South Africa.

Thirdly, we must generally reserve our position with regard to formulations which fail to take into account that only the Security Council can adopt decisions binding upon Member States.

Fourthly, we share the view that all parties enjoying support in Namibia should be allowed to take part in the political process leading to the independence of Namibia and to the establishment of a Government through free and fair elections. The South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), in our opinion, is to be regarded as such a party, and it is fundamental that SWAPO be made part of any solution to the Namibia question. We have, however, reservations concerning formulations which could prejudice the outcome of the political process I have mentioned.

We also want to underline that in the current financial situation all United Nations activities, including those of the Council for Namibia, must be carefully scrutinized to secure effective and appropriate utilization of resources.

In conclusion, I wish to stress our sincere hope that the future recommendations of the Council for Namibia will be changed accordingly, thereby making it possible to express our long-standing support for the Namibian people in our votes on the resolutions as well.*

---

*The President returned to the Chair.

Mr. CISTERNAS (Chile) (interpretation from Spanish): The delegation of Chile voted for the various draft resolutions in document A/42/24 (Part III) and Corr.1 on the question of Namibia, in view of the unswerving support of the Government of Chile for the cause of Namibia's self-determination and full independence, as well as the very positive fact that there has been a serious effort to tone down the various texts.

However, my delegation must once again express its regret, as it has in other United Nations bodies, that texts continue to contain some expressions and provisions that we do not consider to be proper and that only lead to the retention in such draft resolutions, of a language and tone that is uselessly polemic. This, of course, does not help the cause, with whose principles and objectives we all identify.

First, the Chilean delegation does not agree with the support given to the armed struggle in various parts of the resolutions just adopted. Essentially, the United Nations is an Organization devoted to the noble task of peace-keeping. Therefore, we cannot in such documents support war-like action.

Secondly, the specialized agencies and bodies of the United Nations system must preserve their universality and autonomy in order to be able to fulfil their obligations, particularly to member States, without interference. Therefore, the Assembly should not interfere in any way in the decisions and activities of such agencies and bodies as the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank which should bear in mind only the objectives for which they were established by the member States themselves.

In my delegation's view, the same should also be said of some organs of our Organization, such as the Security Council, when objections are raised to decisions made by its members through their votes. While one may question opinions advanced

(Mr. Cisternas, Chile)

by countries in the debates, one cannot question their political decisions manifested in their votes.

The last, but not least important, factor that we wish to highlight is our formal objection - expressed in the past - to specific references to certain countries in such resolutions. Such singling out of countries only causes antagonistic reactions, which are counter-productive. They hamper the attainment of our objective and do not benefit Namibia's cause, at a time when it needs all our support and co-operation.

Mr. ARMSTRONG (New Zealand): The question of Namibia is a straightforward matter of decolonization and self-determination. The people of Namibia are being denied their right to self-determination by the Government of South Africa, which occupies their country illegally in direct defiance of the rulings of the world Court and of the resolutions of the Security Council and of the General Assembly. South Africa has sought to prolong its occupation of Namibia by putting obstacles in the way of the negotiated settlement that the Secretary-General, the Contact Group, the Commissioner for Namibia and the front-line States have made strenuous efforts to achieve. It continues to exploit Namibia's natural resources and in order to cement its colonial hold on the country has installed its own puppet régime in Windhoek in defiance of the United Nations and of the wishes of the Namibian people.

New Zealand deplores South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia. We deplore its obstinacy in the face of international calls for a peaceful settlement that will enable the people of Namibia to choose their own government and to decide their own future in accordance with the relevant Security Council resolutions, in particular resolution 435 (1978).

The international community's confidence in the important role of the United Nations in facilitating the settlement of the Namibia question was confirmed last week with the adoption of Security Council resolution 601 (1987). We wish the Secretary-General well in his difficult task of negotiating a cease-fire, thus paving the way for a just and lasting solution.

We in the General Assembly also have a role to play. Given our views on the main issues, New Zealand would have wished to support all the resolutions before the Assembly today. In so far as they reaffirm the rights of the Namibian people and the need for South Africa to respect the clearly expressed wishes of the

(Mr. Armstrong, New Zealand)

international community, they have unequivocal support. Three of the draft resolutions do, however, contain elements unacceptable to New Zealand.

At previous sessions we have made known our position on such matters as the endorsement of armed struggle in General Assembly resolutions. Similarly we have made clear that we regard it as unproductive to single out individual countries or groups for criticism. Our abstentions on the three resolutions relating to the situation in Namibia, the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and the dissemination of information should be seen in that light. Notwithstanding reservations about the practicality of some aspects of the resolution on the programme of work of the United Nations Council for Namibia, we have supported it, together with the resolution on the United Nations Fund for Namibia.

Mr. POTTS (Australia): Australia's continuing and valued membership of the Council for Namibia gives my delegation a particular commitment to Namibia's right to self-determination and independence. Our national position was clearly explained in our statement in the debate this morning. That statement emphasized our continuing commitment to Security Council resolution 435 (1978) as the only universally accepted plan for Namibia's independence. Given this universal support for the United Nations plan, it is disappointing that the resolutions which the General Assembly considers year after year on this item cannot command general support. My delegation voted in favour of resolutions C, D and E. Resolution C reflects continuing efforts by the Council for Namibia to exhibit financial restraint without substantially affecting the delivery of its programme. Generally speaking the Council's expenditure has continued to decline in real terms. We would place on record, however, that there are a number of items in its programme which continue to trouble us, such as the unduly high expenditure on conference services.

(Mr. Potts, Australia)

As far as resolutions A and B are concerned, my delegation is unfortunately not able fully to support them. They contain language which we regard as unduly colourful - even polemical - and directed against certain States even if they are not directly named. Nonetheless, my delegation must welcome the Council's decision not to include in the resolutions direct references to particular States by name, and believes this to be an encouraging trend. There is, of course, a notable exception to this, to be found in operative paragraph 40 of resolution A. My delegation must express its reservations on that particular paragraph.

I take the opportunity also to express once again my delegation's misgivings over the General Assembly's endorsement of the legitimacy of armed struggle and of the status of the South West Africa People's Organization as the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people. The reasons for our reticence on those two points are well known.

In adopting Security Council resolution 601 (1987) a week ago today, the Council exhibited a near unanimity on the question of Namibia. My delegation hopes that the General Assembly will next year display that same unity of purpose and thus hasten the attainment of Namibia's independence.

Mr. BORG OLIVIER (Malta): Malta voted in favour of all the resolutions on the question of Namibia just adopted by the General Assembly because we are firmly committed to the immediate independence of Namibia in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

While we strongly support the main thrust of the resolutions adopted, our positive vote should not be taken as an unqualified endorsement of all the provisions in the texts. We understand and share the deep feelings of disappointment and frustration of the Namibian people at the endless delays and

(Mr. Borg Olivier, Malta)

procrastinations which up to now have prevented implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibian independence.

The Government of Malta continues to maintain that the best way to achievement United Nations objectives in Namibia is through honest negotiations and constructive dialogue. Accordingly, we cannot support formulations such as those in resolution A, contemplating recourse to armed struggle, which are inconsistent with the fundamental principles embodied in the Charter of the United Nations promoting the settlement of conflicts by peaceful means.

Finally, my delegation regrets that a number of countries have been selectively been singled out for criticism in the resolutions.

Mr. SVOBODA (Canada): As will be well known in this forum, the Canadian abstention on the Namibian resolutions is purely the result of Contact Group procedure. We have chosen once more to follow the Group's practice of not entering into the substance of Namibian debates in the Assembly. However, our abstention should not be taken to imply in any way how we might have voted if we were not a member of the Contact Group. Indeed, our position on a number of matters raised in the resolutions voted on today is also well known.

While we have reservations in some areas, there is much in the resolutions with which Canada can agree. As we noted just last week in the Security Council, we are completely supportive of the speediest possible resolution of the Namibian question, that is the immediate independence of Namibia under the provisions of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

Bearing in mind the intensive programme of activities devoted to the subject of Namibia over the past year or so, especially in the light of the financial constraints facing this Organization, we were pleased to note that requests for budgetary allocations for the future work programme of the Council for Namibia

(Mr. Svoboda, Canada)

appear to be more modest than in the recent past. We hope that this trend to more effective use of limited resources will continue.

We also support the suggestion made by Norway during this debate to the effect that the Council should consider a different approach to the drafting of resolutions and aim at simpler texts more succinctly demonstrating broad support for the Namibian cause and committing nations to increasing their efforts to bring about the early independence of Namibia.

South African intransigence on the question of Namibia, the creation of a so-called interim government and the setting of conditions for the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) are in open defiance of the principles upon which this Organization was founded. South Africa, Namibia and apartheid are rightly given prominence within this Organization.

(Mr. Svoboda, Canada)

We were pleased that near unanimity was achieved with respect to Namibia last week, when the Security Council adopted its resolution 601 (1987). We must of course recall that these topics have already been on the United Nations agenda in one way or another for several decades. The glacial movement in granting the peoples of southern Africa and Namibia their rights, therefore, is increasingly unacceptable. We must all work in solidarity towards a speedy solution of the question of Namibia. Canada has joined with others in taking action to underline our determination for positive and peaceful change in southern Africa and we shall continue to do so. There must be no pause in this pressure. South Africa without apartheid, and a free and independent Namibia, are goals we all share.

Mr. MOEKETSI (Lesotho): My delegation voted in favour of the five draft resolutions just adopted by the Assembly because Lesotho is committed to the cause of the independence of Namibia. However, we should like to restate Lesotho's concern regarding the imposition of comprehensive and mandatory economic sanctions for reasons we have stated on previous occasions in this Assembly.

The PRESIDENT: I call on the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, the representative of Zambia.

Mr. ZUZE (Zambia), President of the United Nations Council for Namibia: On behalf of the United Nations Council for Namibia, the legal Administering Authority for Namibia until independence, I wish to take this opportunity to thank all delegations that supported the draft resolutions on Namibia. Their positive votes have emphasized the high priority the United Nations continues to attach to the question of Namibia and to the urgent task of bringing Namibia to independence.

The adoption of the resolutions gives the United Nations Council for Namibia fresh impetus for proceeding with its varied activities in support of the Namibian cause with determination. The Council will continue to devote its utmost energy and commitment to the responsibilities entrusted to it by the Assembly, until

(Mr. Zuze, President, United Nations Council for Namibia)

Namibia becomes independent in accordance with the United Nations plan endorsed by Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

As the Assembly is well aware, in view of the budgetary problems confronting the United Nations, and particularly in response to the Secretary-General's appeal relating to the need to reduce expenditures, the Council has since 1986 continued to take prudent and practical steps in that direction, without in any way impairing the effective realization of the mandate. In this connection, the Council wishes to note with appreciation the statement of the Secretary-General and the reports of the Fifth Committee, the Committee on Conferences and the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions on the programme of work of the Council for 1988 and its budgetary implications. The reports of the Fifth Committee and the statement of the Secretary-General conclude that no additional appropriations over and above those already requested under the relevant sections of the 1988-1989 proposed programme budget would be required to accommodate the 1988 programme of activities of the Council.

Once again I should like to thank all delegations for the support they have given to the resolutions on the question of Namibia. It remains the fervent hope of the Council that the international community will continue to press vigorously for the immediate and unconditional independence of Namibia. Their active and concerted efforts to implement the relevant provisions of the resolutions on Namibia adopted by the General Assembly today will help advance that objective.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): In accordance with General Assembly resolution 31/152, of 20 December 1976, I call on the Observer for the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO).

Mr. GURIRAB (South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO)): Even though only last week many delegations addressed the Security Council on the very

(Mr. Gurirab, SWAPO)

same issue, the question of Namibia, we are happy to have noted that no less than 94 representatives took the floor in the debate that has just been concluded. Our friends and the apologists of apartheid alike stressed the urgent need for the immediate and unconditional independence of Namibia. Our friends, of course, were genuine. Others only paid lip-service. All of them, however, without exception reiterated their support for United Nations Security Council resolution 435 (1978) as the only internationally accepted basis for a peaceful solution to the Namibia problem.

SWAPO was enthusiastically commended for its determined leadership in the struggle of the Namibian people for freedom, self-determination and independence and for its readiness to sign and observe a cease-fire and also for its expressed willingness to co-operate with the Secretary-General and his Special Representative to secure early independence for Namibia, whose successive generations have suffered and still continue to suffer the horrors of colonialism, illegality, racism and exploitation. At the same time, the racist Boers in Pretoria and their allies, who jointly continue to refuse to accept the implementation of the United Nations plan and instead put forward linkage as a red herring, were roundly condemned and held directly responsible for the endless violence and politics of postponement that our people have to endure in Namibia.

We have been heartened by the repeated expressions of solidarity and renewed pledges of increased and sustained assistance to carry on the struggle, which is destined to be victorious.

Of particular importance to us was the fact that so much significance was attached in the debate, by way of welcoming endorsement, to Security Council resolution 601 (1987) adopted last week, which seeks to trigger implementation of resolution 435 (1978) so that free and fair elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations should be held in Namibia.

(Mr. Gurirab, SWAPO)

Our position in this regard is well known. We are ready to sign and observe a cease-fire. Pretoria must show the same commitment - now. Its friends, who always claim, hypocritically, to eschew violence, must - if they are to be believed - prevail on their racist ally to accept a cease-fire and the emplacement of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG) without any further delay or prevarication. Let them first condemn Pretoria's huge military presence in our country and its violence against our people.

Our attitude and the attitudes of our supporters here have demonstrated magnanimity and flexibility. It is this progressive posture that led to the adoption of Security Council resolution 601 (1987) last week and to the reformulation of language in the draft resolutions which were acted upon this evening here.

But, regrettably, what I heard from certain Western delegations that saw fit to explain their votes gave cause for outrage. Their positions have pretty much remained unchanged, in spite of what they themselves have acknowledged to be an accommodating attitude on the part of the sponsors of the draft resolutions, as reflected in those texts. What is it they are really looking for? Capitulation! Surrender!

A case in point is this inordinate fixation on the part of the United States delegation on Angola. The debate last week in the Security Council and the debate just concluded here were not on Angola but on Namibia. Similarly, the draft resolutions just acted upon dealt with the situation in and relating to Namibia, not Angola. The linkage red-herring and other distortions, however often they may be repeated here and in other forums, cannot change the reality of their authors' obstruction and obfuscation in regard to Namibia's independence process. Angola is

(Mr. Gurirab, SWAPO)

a sovereign State which is defending itself against racist, imperialist and reactionary aggression; Namibia is a colony crying out for liberation.

One is forced to wonder whether some of these delegations really take the care to read the draft resolutions, or just pull out old statements from drawers and read them out, year after year.

On the very day after Pretoria gets out of Namibia - lock, stock and barrel - and its allies end their destructive policies, there will be no need to talk about the costly activities of the United Nations Council for Namibia and its Commissioner, about the armed struggle or SWAPO's status as the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people, or about the introduction of new elements into the draft resolutions - which of necessity must address new elements in and relating to Namibia. The sooner the racists and these recalcitrant States desist from their obstruction and from repeating these falsehoods, the sooner we shall desist from telling the truth about them.

We sincerely thank the delegations that introduced the draft resolutions and all those delegations that voted in favour of the draft resolutions. Their continued support and affirmative votes give encouragement to our people in its struggle and serve as a source of greater confidence among our people to continue the struggle. This indeed gives an operational meaning to the word "solidarity".

Some delegations have always managed to find one or another reason for not voting in favour of these draft resolutions. Even if they are modified -

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): I apologize for interrupting the Observer of SWAPO, but I must draw his attention to the fact that his time has run out. I would request him to conclude his statement.

Mr. GURIRAB (South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO)): Even if the draft resolutions are modified to a point of nothingness, they will manage to find something wrong with the texture of the paper on which the draft resolutions are written.

Finally, I thank you, Mr. President, for a job well done, and I thank Ambassador Reed and his staff for the most helpful service they have rendered to us.

So long as our country remains occupied, it is our right and our duty to continue to struggle.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): A number of representatives wish to speak in exercise of their right of reply.

May I remind members that, in accordance with General Assembly decision 34/401, statements in exercise of the right of reply are limited to 10 minutes for the first intervention and to five minutes for the second, and should be made by delegations from their seats.

Mr. HOSSEINI (Islamic Republic of Iran): My delegation regrets the fact that this morning the Iraqi representative introduced extraneous issues and baseless allegations against my country that could only serve to divert the Assembly's attention from the crimes of the Zionist and apartheid régimes as well as the collaboration between those two régimes.

I have no intention of following his mistaken path. Instead, I wish to avail myself of this opportunity to state that the Islamic Republic of Iran has always supported the just struggle of the Namibian people, under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO). We strongly condemn all the collaboration between certain countries and the racist Pretoria régime, and especially the close, organic ties and alliances between the racist Zionist régime

(Mr. Hosseini, Islamic Republic of Iran)

occupying Palestine and the racist apartheid régime. The only way to bring peace and security to the Middle East and to South Africa is to annihilate those two régimes.

Mr. DE FIGUEIREDO (Angola): I have asked to be allowed to speak in order to make sure that delegations are informed of the situation as it prevails in our part of southern Africa.

The presence of internationalist Cuban forces in Angola is a sovereign decision between two independent and sovereign States: Angola and Cuba.

(Mr. de Figueiredo, Angola)

The contacts between an Angolan delegation and a United States delegation must not - I repeat, must not - preclude the immediate implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). On the question of Namibia all the elements and conditions already exist for independence: a plan, a structure and unanimous agreement, as exemplified in Security Council resolution 435 (1978). The only missing factor is the will of the racist apartheid régime of South Africa and of the United States to allow the implementation of that mandatory resolution.

Mr. AL-RUBAIE (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): What the delegation of Iraq was trying to say in its statement this morning was that one's views on the question of Namibia are reflected in the unequivocal condemnation of the racist régime of Pretoria. That is the substance of the crisis and the problem, as we see it, because the racism demonstrated by the Pretoria régime, which is imposing a policy of aggression and expansionism, that takes the form of an unrelenting war against the people of Namibia and the neighbouring countries, is common to all the racist régimes that collaborate among themselves.

That is why we feel that the most difficult problems facing the international community are those of the usurpation of the right of the Palestinian people by the racist Zionists, who have rejected all the solutions put forward by the international community over a number of years; the occupation of Namibia by the apartheid régime of Pretoria, which stubbornly rejects all the solutions proposed by the international community; and the persistence of Iranian aggression against my country by the racist régime in Tehran, which, in its turn, has for many years rejected all the solutions put forward by the international community.

Those three régimes have in common the fact that they consider terrorism to be a legitimate means of achieving their ambitions and designs and refuse to implement General Assembly and Security Council resolutions which call for an end to the

(Mr. Al-Rubaie, Iraq)

illegal occupation of Namibia, the usurpation of Palestinian lands and the Iranian war against Iraq.

It is pertinent to mention this truth because we are speaking of the problem of Namibia. No doubt many delegations, in particular the African delegations, would like the Security Council to adopt a mandatory decision, in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter, that would compel South Africa to put an end to its occupation of Namibia, that is, a resolution of the kind adopted on the war between Iraq and Iran. The support provided by the Tehran régime could not be more clear: its refusal to abide by Security Council resolution 598 (1987) and its attempts to sabotage that resolution and make it inoperative cannot but enable the South African racist régime to act similarly, if the Council does not adopt a restraining resolution on the lines of resolution 598 (1987).

Needless to say, the service rendered to the Pretoria régime by the Tehran régime sets a dangerous precedent which undermines the foundation of the Organization, its Charter and its humane principles.

It does not take much intelligence to discern the thread that joins together the tripartite alliance: the Zionist entity in Tel Aviv supplies arms to the Tehran régime - the Irangate scandal has provided details of this - and the other part of the alliance is the racist régime of Pretoria, which has the support of the Zionist régime in Tel Aviv.

Mr. FLAX (Israel): A few moments ago the representative of that bastion of freedom, liberty and democracy, Iran, called for the annihilation of my State. That he would do so in this Hall speaks volumes about the nature of his régime; that he has not received the censure of this Hall for using such language speaks volumes about this Assembly.

Mr. HOSSEINI (Islamic Republic of Iran): I wish to speak in exercise of the right of reply with regard to statements made by two representatives, one representing Iraq and the other representing the Zionist base of terror.

First, the Iraqi representative unfortunately, again tried to divert the attention of the Assembly from the main issue, the question of Namibia. He, like his régime, has lost all sense of logic. He is a lawyer, and we could have stopped him on many points. It is well known to all of us that it was the Iraqi régime that launched a total war of aggression against my country on 22 September 1980. That is a fact, but now the representative of Iraq is saying that they did not invade us and the other countries. That is a lie.

I do not want to elaborate further on that, but I would like to deal with one of the horrible crimes that the Iraqi régime has committed against human beings, and that is the use of chemical weapons.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): I apologize to the representative of Iran, but the representative of Iraq has asked to speak on a point of order, and I call on him.

Mr. AL-RUBAIE (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): I think that we are considering the question of Namibia. I have mentioned the resemblance between the racist régimes. It is not necessary for the representative of Iran to mention how the war between Iran and Iraq started. That is outside the area of the discussion.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): I invite the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran to continue.

Mr. HOSSEINI (Islamic Republic of Iran): I said that the gentleman, like his régime, is a liar. He says that the issue is Namibia, but it was the Iraqi delegation itself that this morning spoke about the Iran-Iraq war. We did not ask for that; they are doing that; they are playing this trick.

I should like to continue the story of the use of chemical weapons by the Iraqi criminal régime. Let me describe what happened to the city of Sardasht, which has a population of 12,000. About five months ago the Iraqis attacked the city using chemical weapons and that attack caused the death of -

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): I apologize to the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran, but the representative of Iraq has asked to speak on a point of order.

Mr. AL-RUBAIE (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): Mr. President, I should like to ask you to request the representative of the Tehran régime to talk about Namibia. We are not here to talk about how the war between Iran and Iraq began or how it has evolved. This is taking us far from the question of Namibia.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): I invite the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran to continue and I request him to take into account that the hour is late.

Mr. HOSSEINI (Islamic Republic of Iran): As I said, the Iraqi régime started that, just as it started the war. The Iraqis attacked the city. At first they used conventional bombs. The people came into the streets in order to help the injured and to see the effect of the bombs. When thousands of people ran into the streets, Iraqi aircraft suddenly appeared overhead and bombed the city with chemical weapons. They did so very thoroughly, causing 6,000 casualties, injured or dead. After that bombing with chemical weapons, the Iraqis again attacked the city with conventional bombs. That was a crime committed by that shameless régime.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): I call on the representative of Comoros, who has asked to speak on a point of order.

Mr. MOUMIN (Comoros): I think that we are all responsible people here, but I feel that the debate is deteriorating. I do not feel that this is the sort of debate that should be held in this body. Therefore, I ask you, Mr. President, to bring some order to what is degenerating into a disorderly debate.

The PRESIDENT: I give the representative of Iraq two minutes to finish his statement.

Mr. AL-RUBAIE (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): Mr. President, I have asked to speak to support what the representative of Comoros has just said. The people of Namibia would undoubtedly be angry if they could hear the representative of the régime of Iran leading the Assembly into a disorderly debate.

The PRESIDENT: I give the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran three minutes to finish his statement.

Mr. HOSSEINI (Islamic Republic of Iran): I am not going to respond to the representative of Iraq because I have finished my reply to him. I should like now to exercise my right of reply to what the representative of the Zionist base of terror stated a few minutes ago against my delegation.

It is the conviction of my delegation and of all Muslim people that the presence and existence of the Zionist base of terror is totally illegal. So we should like the annihilation of this cancerous régime in the region, in order to solve all the problems of the Middle East.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): I call on the representative of Israel, who wishes to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

Mr. FLAX (Israel): I just want to say that the exchange of compliments between the representatives of Iraq and of Iran has been most edifying for all the representatives sitting here.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): I call on the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran who has asked to speak on a point of order.

Mr. HOSSEINI (Islamic Republic of Iran): Mr. President, this was going to be my second exercise of the right of reply, to reply to the Zionist representative. I have the right to reply to his statement. This is going to be very brief, of course.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): I must say, Sir, that you have already spoken in exercise of the right of reply. I can only authorize you to speak if you are raising a point of order. I call on you on that basis.

Mr. HOSSEINI (Islamic Republic of Iran): I spoke in response to the statement made by the representative of the Zionist base. Then he replied to me.

(Mr. Hosseini, Islamic Republic of Iran)

So I have the right to reply to him. This is in exercise of the right of reply a second time.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): I must tell the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran that he has already spoken in exercise of the right of reply twice. Under the rules of procedure, he is not entitled to anything more.

I call on the representative of Malawi, who has asked to speak on a point of order.

Mr. MANGWAZU (Malawi): I think the representative of Comoros is right. It is rather difficult for us to comprehend the attitude of the representatives who have spoken, and spoken again, on matters totally irrelevant to the question of Namibia. We regard the Namibian question as an important matter as far as Africa is concerned and, I think, the rest of the world also. We cannot tolerate the subject of Namibia, which is a very important one, being reduced to such confusion and irrelevance. Mr. President, we request you to use your authority to stop this.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): At the conclusion of our consideration of the question of Namibia I should like to note that the debate has impressively highlighted the General Assembly's resolve to see Namibia emerge as a free country and to remove the last bastions of colonialism on Earth. The statements made have reaffirmed the international community's determination finally to implement the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council, with a view to establishing a free, independent and non-aligned Namibia. Namibia must and will take its rightful and equal place in the community of nations.

The debate has clearly shown that the struggle waged by the Namibian people under the leadership of its legitimate liberation movement, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), is a part of the toilsome but ultimately successful struggle of peoples for independence and self-determination, for peace and development. That is a process which, I believe, has left a deep mark on our century.

Of late, one event has been recalled repeatedly in that connection as having exerted a lasting influence on the course of history. That event is the October revolution in Russia, whose seventieth anniversary will be celebrated on 7 November. I believe it was in the spirit of that event that the USSR initiated the adoption by the United Nations of one of its most important declarations, the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. The principle laid down in the first operative paragraph of resolution 1514 (XV) reads as follows:

> "The subjection of peoples to alien subjugation, domination and exploitation constitutes a denial of fundamental human rights, is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations and is an impediment to the promotion of world peace and co-operation". (resolution 1514 (XV), para. 1)

(The President)

The continuing illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa flagrantly contradicts that Declaration. At the same time it is a serious and growing threat to peace and security in the region and the world as a whole. The course and results of the debate which has now come to a close should be considered as a mandate for unified, speedy and consistent action. Time is pressing: Namibia must be free.

The General Assembly has thus concluded its consideration of agenda item 36.

AGENDA ITEM 8 (continued)

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND ORGANIZATION OF WORK

(a) FIRST REPORT OF THE GENERAL COMMITTEE (A/42/250)

(b) AMENDMENT (A/42/L.18)

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): The General Assembly will now turn its attention to paragraph 36 of the first report of the General Committee (A/42/250). In that connection, the Assembly also has before it an amendment submitted by the delegation of Cameroon, which has been issued as document A/42/L.18.

Delegations will recall that at its 12th plenary meeting, on 25 September, the General Assembly decided that consultations should be continued with regard to the recommendation of the General Committee concerning the title and inclusion in the agenda of item 140 of the draft agenda contained in paragraph 36 of the first report of the General Committee.

Intensive consultations have been held, in particular with the current Chairman of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and the Chairman of the OAU ad hoc committee. I wish to thank all parties concerned, including the Permanent Representative of Madagascar in his capacity as Chairman of the Group of African States for the month of October, the Permanent Representatives of Gabon and

(The President)

Cameroon and other representatives, for their co-operation. I am most grateful for the understanding and support shown during our talks. Consultations were, of course, held in the first place with the parties involved. However, I am not in a position today to submit to the General Assembly for discussion and decision a proposal other than the recommendation of the General Committee contained in paragraph 36 of document A/42/250.

As representatives will recall, the process leading to the recommendation made by the General Committee are outlined in paragraph 34 of the report of the General Committee.

In accordance with rule 23 of the General Assembly's rules of procedure,

"Debate on the inclusion of an item in the agenda, when that item has been recommended for inclusion by the General Committee, shall be limited to three speakers in favour of, and three against, the inclusion. The President may limit the time to be allowed to speakers under this rule".

However, as the Assembly also has before it document A/42/L.18, containing an amendment to the recommendation of the General Committee, under rule 90 of the rules of procedure the amendment shall be voted upon first.

I call on the representative of Cameroon, who wishes to introduce that amendment.

Mr. ENGO (Cameroon): My delegation feels compelled to explain to the General Assembly the nature of the amendment before it today. It may be recalled that you, Sir, requested that my delegation join in consultations and report to you on what we considered the best way to achieve consensus.

There were two major problems facing the General Assembly in accepting the recommendations of the General Committee. The first was the wording of the agenda item proposed by Chad, which had elements that proved distasteful to certain

(Mr. Engo, Cameroon)

delegations which felt that the situation should not be prejudged by the use of words such as "occupation" and "aggression". My delegation proceeded to consult with others, and the wording found in document A/42/L.18 is a statement of fact rather than anything prejudicial.

I think we must also say that another issue before the Assembly was the question of the timing of the discussion of the item. One of our great fathers from Africa cautioned that we should not in fact do anything here that was likely to prejudice initiatives that were being taken up in Africa; he was the well-known leader Mr. Kenneth Kaunda of Zambia.

For that reason, after consultations we came to the conclusion that after including the item, an action to which no one objected - no one said we should not do this - it might be useful to delay any consideration of the item until such time as it became obvious that it was expedient for us to do so, bearing in mind the initiatives in Africa.

(Mr. Engo, Cameroon)

So two issues face the Assembly and the international community, as represented here. The first is the wording that the item should take. It is our submission that what is before the Assembly in document A/42/L.18 satisfies that requirement. The second issue is completely divorced from the first; it is the timing for taking up this issue.

It is our opinion that in the circumstances we may wish to take a separate decision to postpone the discussion of this matter to some future date, bearing in mind the initiatives that are being taken in Africa. In this case, the President would be in a position to consult with the membership of the General Assembly to decide when the subject could be taken up.

Therefore, our proposal contained in document A/42/L.18 must be read in the light of those two considerations: that we inscribe the item as it now stands amended and that we take a decision that this matter will in fact not be taken up immediately and that future consideration will depend on the outcome of the initiatives that are currently taking place in Africa.

I sincerely hope that this will sort out the problem and avoid any of the complications Mr. Kuanda outlined, and that it will be possible for us to adopt this formula without a vote.

The PRESIDENT I now call on the representative of Zambia.

Mr. ZUZE (Zambia): I have asked to speak in order to make a specific proposal. There is no dispute whatsoever as to the right of a Member State to inscribe any item and to debate any matter it desires.

I think the question we now face in the Organization of African Unity (OAU) is whether or not doing so is in the interest of the major goals: first, the unity of the organization itself; and, secondly, the current efforts of the OAU's Ad Hoc Committee which are aimed at a regional settlement, as provided for in the Charter.

(Mr. Zuze, Zambia)

Members of the OAU should ask themselves whether a particular course of action would enhance rather than destroy the unity which we value so much. We must ask ourselves whether, by belonging to a plural organization, we are prepared to give up a little of our sovereignty. Indeed, we must ask the question whether we are willing to die a little for our organization. These questions must have weighed on the mind of the current Chairman of the OAU and when on its behalf he made the appeal to the African Group he cautioned restraint on this matter.

Let me remind my brothers from Africa that in any war when the guns have gone silent it is time to talk and one invariably ends up at the negotiating table. The name of the game is dialogue, to reduce mistrust and foster confidence. It seems to us that a possibility for dialogue between the parties to the conflict now exists which could lead to a regional settlement - an African settlement - to the conflict that has destroyed so much for so many. Any erratic behaviour at this stage could disturb the waters, and I am sure that the guns which are now silent would suddenly come to life again.

In view of what I have just said, I wish to propose that for the time being the Assembly take no action on the inscription of item 140 and also on the proposal to amend the title of the item, in accordance with rule 74 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

Let me reiterate the point: this proposal should not be interpreted as taking away the right of any Member State to inscribe any item on the agenda of the United Nations. This is a right we all respect and cherish.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): The representative of Zambia has moved, within the terms of rule 74 of the rules of procedure, that no action be taken on the recommendation for inclusion of the item as well as the amendment circulated in document A/42/L.18. Rule 74 reads as follows:

(The President)

"During the discussion of any matter, a representative may move the adjournment of the debate on the item under discussion. In addition to the proposer of the motion, two representatives may speak in favour of, and two against, the motion, after which the motion shall be immediately put to the vote."

I should like to accede to the requirements of rule 74.

I call on the representative of the Cameroon on a point of order.

Mr. ENGO (Cameroon): I apologize for having to speak again, but my delegation would like to know exactly what it is we are to vote for or against, or abstain. My brother from Zambia suggests suspending the item for the time being. That could be five years; it could be ten years; it could be three months; it could be two days. If the intention is that this should be suspended indefinitely, then I would agree, in the light of the proposal we have made, that adjournment of the debate should be limited to the substance rather than the inscription of the item. But I should like him to make it clear whether he is talking about inscription, because I heard him say that he was not opposed to this and that every country had a right to inscribe an item. But I think we would both agree if we are asking for adjournment of the discussion on the item. I should like clarification on this point because it is material.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): I understood the representative of Zambia to mean that he proposes under rule 74 of the rules of procedure that no decision be taken on the recommendation to include the item, as well as on the amendment. Is that understanding correct? I call on the representative of Zambia.

Mr. ZUZE (Zambia): That is the substance of our proposal.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): I call on the representative of Cameroon on a point of order.

Mr. ENGO (Cameroon): My question may have been misunderstood, Sir. I am a Cameroonian African, and English is not my native tongue. If I could speak Bulu or Douala here I should probably be more explicit.

My brother talked about adjourning "for the time being". What is the time-frame? There is great difference between taking no action and taking no action for the time being, which could mean any length of time. May we have some clarification as to the time-frame for the suspension? That would influence decisions - at least, the decision of my delegation. We should be quite happy if the adjournment were merely because we are all fatigued; we have gone through a gruesome day. At the same time, we want to know for exactly how long we are supposed to be adjourning the debate.

I urge you, Sir, to allow my brother to answer.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): I call on the representative of Zambia.

Mr. ZUZE (Zambia): As I understand my brother from Cameroon, I should state precisely what constitutes "for the time being".

The representative of Cameroon stated that there were events taking place currently in Africa. There is the Ad Hoc Committee, which has to sit in one of our capitals, and at the end of this month most, if not all, of our Heads of States will assemble in Addis Ababa, where, in addition to the item on the agenda for their discussion, which I understand is a date problem, they will consult. So it is that kind of time-frame I am looking at. It will be determined, first, by events in the Ad Hoc Committee, which is already in place and working on its programme and on material collected, and, secondly, by further consultations by our Heads of State. I cannot be any more helpful than that, other than to refer again to the provisions of rule 74.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): I call on the representative of Jamaica on a point of order.

Mr. BARNETT (Jamaica): The issues raised so far in this discussion are of some importance - not only the specific issue of the conflict itself, but the underlying principles involved in the consideration of the item in the General Assembly.

You will already have noted, Mr. President, evidence of weariness and incipient confusion. I rise simply humbly to suggest and formally to move that the meeting be adjourned until next week, under rule 76 of the Assembly's rules of procedure. That rule reads as follows:

> "During the discussion of any matter, a representative may move the suspension or the adjournment of the meeting. Such motions shall not be debated but shall be immediately put to the vote. The President may limit the time to be allowed to the speaker moving the suspension or adjournment of the meeting."

The basis of my motion is that it is late on Friday evening; we are tired and we have to think deeply about the principles involved and come refreshed to make a substantive and careful analysis of the issues before us.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): Is there any objection to the application of rule 76?

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): I call tne representative of Jamaica on a point of order.

Mr. BARNETT (Jamaica): It was precisely to avoid a debate and discussion while we are tired that I invoked and quoted rule 76, which admits of no debate - that is, the motion is immediately put to the Assembly for its approval or otherwise.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): The representative of Jamaica is correct.

That being so, I put to the vote the motion for the adjournment of the meeting under rule 76 of the rules of procedure.

The motion for the adjournment was adopted by 78 votes to 24, with 18 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 7.45 p.m.