



CONTENTS

Agenda item 27:

Question of Namibia (concluded):

	<i>Page</i>
(a) Report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples;	
(b) Report of the United Nations Council for Namibia	1911
Suspension of the session	1923

President: Mr. Rüdiger von WECHMAR
(Federal Republic of Germany).

AGENDA ITEM 27

Question of Namibia (concluded):

- (a) Report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples;
- (b) Report of the United Nations Council for Namibia

1. The PRESIDENT: We shall proceed to the vote on draft resolutions A/35/L.50 and Add.1 through A/35/L.59 and Add.1. The report of the Fifth Committee on the administrative and financial implications of these draft resolutions is contained in document A/35/801.

2. The General Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolution A/35/L.50 and Add.1, 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, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia,

Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, 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 Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

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

The draft resolution was adopted by 114 votes to none, with 22 abstentions (resolution 35/227 A).¹

3. The PRESIDENT: I now invite the General Assembly to proceed to draft resolution A/35/L.51 and Add.1, entitled "Intensification and co-ordination of United Nations action in support of Namibia". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, 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 Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, 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

¹ The delegations of Grenada, Haiti, Saudi Arabia and Singapore subsequently informed the Secretariat that they wished to have their votes recorded as having been in favour of the draft resolution.

Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, 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.

The draft resolution was adopted by 131 votes to none, with 5 abstentions (resolution 35/227 B).¹

4. The PRESIDENT: We now turn to draft resolution A/35/L.52 and Add.1, 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, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, 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 Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, 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 Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, 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.

The draft resolution was adopted by 132 votes to none, with 5 abstentions (resolution 35/227 C).¹

5. The PRESIDENT: We shall now proceed to vote on draft resolution A/35/L.53 and Add.1, entitled "Action by intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations with respect to Namibia". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi,

Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, 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 Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, 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 Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, 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.

The draft resolution was adopted by 133 votes to none, with 5 abstentions (resolution 35/227 D).¹

6. The PRESIDENT: Next we come to draft resolution A/35/L.54 and Add.1, entitled "Support for the United Nations Institute for Namibia". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, 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 Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, 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 Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, 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.

The draft resolution was adopted by 133 votes to none, with 5 abstentions (resolution 35/227 E).

7. The PRESIDENT: Next, we turn to draft resolution A/35/L.55 and Add.1, entitled "Nationhood Programme for Namibia". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, 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 Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, 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 Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, 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.

The draft resolution was adopted by 133 votes to none, with 5 abstentions (resolution 35/227 F).¹

8. The PRESIDENT: We now come to draft resolution A/35/L.56 and Add.1, entitled "United Nations Fund for Namibia". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica,

Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, 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 Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, 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 Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, 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.

The draft resolution was adopted by 133 votes to none, with 5 abstentions (resolution 35/227 G).¹

9. The PRESIDENT: Next, we come to draft resolution A/35/L.57 and Add.1, entitled "Dissemination of information on Namibia". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, 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 Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, 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 Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, 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.

The draft resolution was adopted by 133 votes to none, with 5 abstentions (resolution 35/227 H).¹

10. The PRESIDENT: We now turn to draft resolution A/35/L.58 and Add.1, entitled "Question of Namibian uranium". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chad, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Sao Tome and Principe, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, 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 Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

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

The draft resolution was adopted by 108 votes to none, with 26 abstentions (resolution 35/227 I).¹

11. The PRESIDENT: Finally, I put to the vote draft resolution A/35/L.59 and Add.1, entitled "Situation resulting from South Africa's refusal to comply with United Nations resolutions on Namibia". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chad, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen,

Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, 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 Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

The draft resolution was adopted by 125 votes to none, with 13 abstentions (resolution 35/227 J).²

12. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes after the voting. Members will recall that such statements are to be made from their seats and that the time limit is 10 minutes.

13. Mr. PASTINEN (Finland): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the five Nordic countries—Denmark, Iceland, Norway, Sweden and my own country, Finland.

14. The Nordic countries remain convinced that the illegal South African occupation of Namibia must be brought to an end and that the Namibian people must be allowed without further delay to exercise their right to self-determination and independence by means of free and fair elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations, in accordance with Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1973). In the opinion of the Nordic countries, the United Nations plan remains the best for an internationally acceptable solution of the problem of Namibia. After the failure of the pre-implementation meeting at Geneva in January, the process of negotiation has reached a stage where it is necessary to exert the greatest possible pressure on South Africa to make it comply with the United Nations plan.

15. The Nordic countries have voted for most of the resolutions that have just been adopted. They regret that they have not been able to support them all. A number of elements have caused us difficulties; they

² The delegations of Grenada, Haiti and Singapore subsequently informed the Secretariat that they wished to have their votes recorded as having been in favour of the draft resolution.

are a matter of principle, which I shall outline in general terms.

16. First, the Nordic countries cannot accept endorsement by the United Nations of armed struggle. The United Nations was established in order to promote peaceful solutions to international problems. For the same reason, the Nordic countries have reservations concerning provisions calling for military assistance. The Nordic countries will of course continue their humanitarian support of the people of Namibia.

17. Secondly, because of the strict adherence of the Nordic countries to the Charter of the United Nations, we must make a general reservation of our position with regard to formulations which fail to take into account that only the Security Council can adopt decisions with binding effect on Member States.

18. Thirdly, the Nordic countries deplore the arbitrary singling out of individual countries or groups of countries.

19. Fourthly, no party enjoying popular support should be excluded from a political solution through free and fair elections. The South West Africa People's Organization [SWAPO] is such a party and must be part of any solution in Namibia.

20. Finally, the Nordic countries wish to put on record their appreciation of the efforts of the Secretary-General and his Special Representative, as well as all parties which have been constructively involved in the negotiation process. We urge them to continue these efforts to find an internationally acceptable solution to the Namibian problem within the framework of the United Nations.

21. Mr. AZAR GÓMEZ (Uruguay) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Uruguay voted in favour of the draft resolutions that have just been adopted because we support their aim, independence for Namibia.

22. Although we have already expressed our position in the general debate, we should like to state our reservations on some aspects of the terminology employed and the selective criteria used in some paragraphs. In particular we wish to refer to operative paragraph 12 of draft resolution A/35/L.58 and Add.1. Had that paragraph been put to a separate vote, the delegation of Uruguay would have abstained because of the selective criterion used.

23. With regard to draft resolution A/35/L.50 and Add.1, operative paragraphs 4 and 15, my delegation wishes to state that it will be for the people of Namibia to choose its legitimate and authentic representatives once it has achieved its long-awaited independence.

24. With regard to the seventeenth preambular paragraph of that draft resolution, we wish to express reservations because it is our understanding that sovereign States cannot be subject to restrictions in the conduct of their diplomatic relations. Our country, Uruguay, entertains relations with countries with the most varied political systems, and those relations cannot be interpreted as indicating support for their policies.

25. With regard to the express reference to armed struggle, we should like to indicate that within the

Organization, the fundamental purpose of which is to achieve world peace and security, it is not appropriate to advocate violence and give legitimacy to armed struggle.

26. Mr. VANREUSEL (Belgium) (*interpretation from French*): The delegation of Belgium abstained in the votes on draft resolutions A/35/L.50 and Add.1, A/35/L.58 and Add.1 and A/35/L.59 and Add.1.

27. Belgium cannot subscribe to the use of armed struggle to achieve independence. Namibian independence should be achieved through peaceful means and negotiations, as is provided for in the Charter of the United Nations.

28. Further, the Belgian delegation expresses serious reservations with regard to the imposition of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa. It feels that such sanctions are difficult to apply. Moreover they would clearly harm several African States whose supplies and exports depend to a large extent upon the South African economy.

29. With regard to the seven draft resolutions in favour of which the Belgian delegation has voted, we wish to say that draft resolutions A/35/L.52 and Add.1, A/35/L.53 and Add.1 and A/35/L.57 and Add.1 have not escaped the contradiction of qualifying SWAPO as the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people, while elsewhere the principle of organizing free and fair elections is commended.

30. These are some of the reservations we wished to express.

31. Mrs. NOWOTNY (Austria): In the course of the general debate Austria had the opportunity to reaffirm its position of principle with regard to Namibia's independence and the endeavours of the United Nations to achieve it. On this basis Austria found it possible to support the majority of the draft resolutions which have just been adopted by the Assembly. There are, however, some reservations my delegation has to make.

32. We have consistently stated our firm belief that the transition of Namibia to full independence will have to be achieved by peaceful means only and as the result of negotiations. We understand the impatience and disappointment of the Namibian people in view of the protracted negotiating process. Nevertheless its long-term benefits should be balanced against the sufferings and sacrifices which armed struggle inevitably demands. Austria is convinced that in the light of the principles and goals of the Charter of the United Nations, armed struggle should not be endorsed or supported by a General Assembly resolution, nor should military support for any armed struggle be encouraged.

33. Austria is fully aware of the significant and important role which SWAPO has assumed in the fight of the Namibian people for their independence, as well as in the negotiating process, a role which undoubtedly will continue in the political future of the Territory. The final endorsement of that role, however, will be given by the Namibian people themselves in free and fair elections. The General Assembly should not prejudge this free and democratic expression of political will by the population of Namibia.

34. I also wish briefly to comment on the draft resolution concerning Namibian uranium. The hearings on the exploitation of Namibian uranium conducted by the United Nations Council for Namibia in July 1980 brought to light interesting and valuable information, and Austria followed them with interest. Austria shares the belief expressed in the draft resolution that the Namibian people should not be deprived of full enjoyment of the rich natural resources of their country and of the economic advantages resulting from their exploitation. There is no doubt that the orderly conduct of such exploitation should be based on mutual agreement with a legitimate Namibian Government and that, therefore, a final and internationally recognized solution to the Namibian question is also imperative. We do not, however, believe that the arbitrary singling out of certain industrialized States for condemnation is justified or in any way advances the legitimate interests of the Namibian people.

35. Furthermore, Austria has strong reservations about the attempt to prejudge and to influence the independent work of the Security Council, an attempt which is in contradiction of the relevant provisions of the Charter.

36. Mr. NISIBORI (Japan): My delegation would like to make a few comments on the draft resolutions that have just been adopted.

37. We abstained on draft resolutions A/35/L.50 and Add.1 and A/35/L.59 and Add.1 because they include some paragraphs which Japan cannot accept, particularly those in support of armed struggle.

38. Japan also abstained on the draft resolution on the question of Namibian uranium for the following reasons. Operative paragraph 8 of draft resolution A/35/L.58 and Add.1 makes specific requests of Japan and several other countries. The Government of Japan fully recognizes the political significance of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia and, as I made clear in my statement of 3 March [104th meeting], has taken measures to bring it to the attention of all companies concerned by publishing it in an official bulletin. As a result, the only Japanese company which had concluded a contract for the purchase of Namibian uranium has suspended the implementation of the contract and will continue that suspension for as long as the present circumstances in Namibia exist.

39. Thus there is absolutely no reason why Japan's name should appear in the recommendations contained in the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia. My delegation sought to have the mention of Japan deleted from the recommended draft resolution contained in the document, but unfortunately our efforts were to no avail. Consequently Japan is specifically mentioned, without justification, in draft resolution A/35/L.58 and Add.1. We therefore would have liked to vote against that draft resolution; however, because it is our position to co-operate with all peaceful efforts towards the early realization of an independent Namibia, we abstained.

40. With regard to draft resolutions A/35/L.51 and Add.1 and A/35/L.53 and Add.1, in favour of which we voted, Japan continues to have the same reservations it expressed at the thirty-fourth session

41. Also, as I explained in my recent statement, my delegation has reservations on some parts of the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia.

42. Lastly, our affirmative vote on some of the other draft resolutions does not mean that Japan supports all the provisions contained therein, as is clear from our position, which has been previously expressed.

43. Mr. KATAPODIS (Greece): The Greek delegation has voted in favour of most of the draft resolutions put to the vote today, including draft resolution A/35/L.59 and Add.1. However, there are certain aspects of this last draft resolution on which I should like to clarify our position.

44. First, in connexion with operative paragraphs 5, 6 and 7 we consider that although SWAPO undeniably constitutes an important political factor in Namibia, its designation as "the sole and authentic representative" of the Namibian people is contrary to the principle of political pluralism which is a prerequisite for holding free elections in the Territory.

45. Secondly, as regards operative paragraph 13, we believe that although the situation fully warrants its consideration by the Security Council, it is not up to the General Assembly to prejudge the decisions of that organ.

46. And thirdly, we cannot support any incitement or condone any recourse to force by any of the parties concerned. It is the duty of the United Nations, in accordance with its Charter, to exhaust all possibilities of arriving at a peaceful settlement of international disputes. Should this prove impossible, the Charter prescribes the means of remedying the situation.

47. Mr. KIRCA (Turkey): My delegation has just voted for all the draft resolutions concerning agenda item 27 and is among the sponsors of draft resolutions A/35/L.52 and Add.1, A/35/L.54 and Add.1, A/35/L.55 and Add.1 and A/35/L.56 and Add.1. Our support for all, and co-sponsorship of some, of these draft resolutions should be interpreted as a reflexion of our well-known position regarding the question of Namibia.

48. However, as regards operative paragraph 24 of draft resolution A/35/L.50 and Add.1, operative paragraph 12 of draft resolution A/35/L.58 and Add.1 and some of the preambular paragraphs of draft resolution A/35/L.59 and Add.1, I should like to put on record that we accept them to the extent that they comply with the general principles underlying our foreign policy and the context of our statement before the Assembly on 4 March [107th meeting].

49. Mr. BOLE (Fiji): My delegation voted in favour of all the draft resolutions which have been adopted on the question of the international Territory of Namibia. This is because we firmly support the right of the people of Namibia to self-determination and independence in a united Namibia, in accordance with the appropriate United Nations resolutions, including, in particular, Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978). These resolutions provide the basis for a peaceful solution of the question.

50. We therefore deplore South Africa's failure to implement these resolutions as manifested most

recently by its failure to accept an agreement for a cease-fire at the pre-implementation talks at Geneva in January of this year.

51. My delegation fully subscribes to the view that the United Nations should continue to exert all efforts towards the speedy attainment of a peaceful solution in Namibia. Consequently, we have reservations with regard to operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/35/L.50 and Add.1. We also believe that the enumeration of certain States—as, for instance, in operative paragraphs 8 and 12 of draft resolution A/35/L.58 and Add.1—could be counterproductive as far as the search for a negotiated solution is concerned.

52. Finally, my delegation reiterates the view that SWAPO should continue to participate fully in all efforts directed towards the attainment of an internationally acceptable solution on Namibia.

53. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of the United States, who wishes to speak on behalf of the five Western States.

54. Mrs. KIRKPATRICK (United States of America): The Governments of Canada, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, the United Kingdom and the United States have today abstained on the 10 draft resolutions placed before the General Assembly under agenda item 27. In explanation of the vote I wish to make clear that our collective abstention neither reflects nor implies any judgement on the merits of the various draft resolutions offered.

55. We naturally regret the circumstances that have given rise to this debate. As Sir Anthony Parsons noted in his statement on behalf of the five Western States, "our objective remains to secure a peaceful, internationally recognized settlement" [109th meeting, para. 124]. Few of the draft resolutions before us contribute to the objective, and we again urge all concerned to look for positive ways forward.

56. Mr. MASHINGAIDZE (Zimbabwe): The General Assembly this week has been debating agenda item 27, under which draft resolutions A/35/L.50 and Add.1 through A/35/L.59 and Add.1 were submitted; their aim was to bring pressure to bear on those forces hindering progress towards the freedom of Namibia. The delegation of the Republic of Zimbabwe has joined hands with all progressive freedom-loving and peace-loving delegations present here in support of all 10 draft resolutions. Zimbabwe was one of the sponsors of draft resolutions A/35/L.51 and Add.1 through A/35/L.55 and Add.1, A/35/L.57 and Add.1 and A/35/L.58 and Add.1.

57. We supported those draft resolutions because of our total commitment to the liberation and independence of Namibia from South Africa. However, the delegation of Zimbabwe felt compelled to speak at this stage in order to explain its position regarding operative paragraph 29 of draft resolution A/35/L.50 and Add.1 and operative paragraph 13 of draft resolution A/35/L.59 and Add.1 calling upon the Security Council to impose mandatory economic sanctions against South Africa. Although Zimbabwe sees the justification for this call and fully supports the objectives and the demands of sanctions, Zimbabwe feels that because of the historical and geographical

factors linking its economy to South Africa, it would not be possible for Zimbabwe to give full, practical effect to the sanctions policy against South Africa. Moreover, as we have already stated before the Assembly, at the end of a war of liberation which was economically and socially devastating, Zimbabwe is at this time faced with staggering resettlement, reconstruction and rehabilitation programmes which, together with the historical and geographical factors already mentioned, make its full implementation of the sanctions policy practically impossible.

58. Finally, we should like to point out that, despite these considerations, the delegation of Zimbabwe voted in support of all 10 draft resolutions, including those which I have just mentioned. We did this because we do not wish to give any solace or comfort to those forces working against the speedy liberation of Namibia.

59. Mr. ANDERSON (Australia): Australia voted in favour of seven of the draft resolutions just adopted and was pleased to co-sponsor three of them. My delegation's support for the search for peace and independence for Namibia was outlined during the debate on this item. That support has been given concrete expression in, among other things, our membership of the United Nations Council for Namibia and our contributions to the Nationhood Programme for Namibia.

60. Australia will continue to play a constructive role in this vital area, and it is therefore with some regret that we found ourselves obliged to abstain on the other three draft resolutions just adopted, because of reservations which we have on some of the formulations they contain.

61. First, being committed to the search for a peaceful solution in Namibia, we cannot support explicit or implicit calls for intensification of the armed struggle.

62. Secondly, our position on the status of SWAPO, which is well known, was not reflected in some of the draft resolutions.

63. Thirdly, the Charter of the United Nations is quite clear in assigning duties and responsibilities to particular organs of the Organization. We do not consider it proper to upset that division of duties and responsibilities.

64. Lastly, my delegation is opposed to the specific naming of countries when it is apparent that this is being done on an arbitrary basis. We do not believe that formulations such as these are helpful to the search for a peaceful solution.

65. Mr. CARRASCALAO (Indonesia): Indonesia has always supported the struggle for independence of the Namibian people. We have clearly shown this support by co-sponsoring and supporting various draft resolutions on the issue.

66. In this connexion, my delegation once again has been a sponsor of most of the draft resolutions submitted at this session and has supported all of them. However, my delegation wishes to note its unhappiness about certain operative paragraphs of two draft resolutions which specifically single out some countries, since this is not in line with the principles of the foreign policy of my Government.

67. Mr. DORR (Ireland): We are extremely concerned at the situation following the failure of the so-called pre-implementation meeting at Geneva. This concern has influenced our approach to certain of the draft resolution before us.

68. Draft resolution A/35/L.50 and Add.1, on the situation in Namibia resulting from the illegal occupation of the Territory by South Africa, contained much with which we could agree. We regret, however, that we were obliged to abstain in the vote on that draft because it contained a number of formulations which we could not accept—in particular, operative paragraph 5, which explicitly supports armed struggle. We fully understand the anger and the sense of frustration which impels people in Namibia to take arms to achieve the independence which the international community recognizes as their right but which has so far been denied them. But we do not want to see the General Assembly endorse violence.

69. I would note, however, that if we support the independence of Namibia and yet believe that the General Assembly should not endorse violence, then we must be all the more ready to consider what other forms of action by the international community will bring that aim about.

70. We voted in favour of draft resolutions A/35/L.51 and Add.1 through A/35/L.57 and Add.1, with the contents of which we are the most part in agreement. While generally supporting the activities of the United Nations Council for Namibia and most of its recommendations, we maintain some reservations about the extent of its competence. Similarly, while appreciating the leading role which SWAPO plays in seeking independence for Namibia, we note that, in free and fair elections under United Nations supervision, the people of Namibia would themselves have the opportunity to choose their representatives.

71. There was much in draft resolution A/35/L.58 and Add.1, on the question of Namibian uranium, with which we agreed. However, we abstained, as we could not support operative paragraph 9, with its reference to the European Atomic Energy Community [EURATOM], or operative paragraph 12, which condemned selectively four named countries for activities, some of which have been denied.

72. I come now to draft resolution A/35/L.59 and Add.1. We viewed this draft resolution, relating to the situation after the breakdown of the Geneva pre-implementation meeting in January, as particularly important, and we gave very serious consideration to the position which we should take in our vote. The draft resolution contains important formulations with which we fully agree. I refer, in particular, to the endorsement of the right of the Namibian people to genuine self-determination. But it also contains formulations which we would find it difficult to endorse.

73. We do not accept the implied criticism of the motives of the Western contact group in the preamble. On the contrary, we think that the five countries concerned deserve credit for their sustained efforts over several years.

74. Furthermore, although we strongly favour Namibian independence, we must also express reserva-

tions about the call in operative paragraph 7 for military assistance to the liberation struggle, and we regard the extravagant language in operative paragraph 5 as unwise.

75. It will be clear, then, that we have significant reservations. But in considering our vote, we decided that we must give particular attention to what seems to us to be the main thrust of the draft resolution, the call for action by the Security Council in operative paragraph 13. It is true that the particular terms in which this call is formulated create some difficulties for us, because they seem to prejudge consideration by the Security Council of the measures which should now be taken. In other circumstances we might have reflected these reservations by abstaining in the vote. Nevertheless, despite these reservations and the others I have mentioned, we decided, after the most serious consideration, that the present circumstances required us to vote in favour of that draft resolution.

76. For some years now we have hoped that all parties would agree to implement the plan for Namibian independence approved by the Security Council in resolution 435 (1978), in accordance with its previous resolution 385 (1976). For our part, we have fully supported the praiseworthy and continuing efforts to bring this about. We are all the more deeply disappointed at what appears to be the flat refusal by South Africa to implement the plan, despite its original acceptance, in principle of the proposal and despite the reassurances given on so many points.

77. If we are committed to independence and self-determination for Namibia, if we do not want to support violence, and if there is little indication of new moves to persuade South Africa, what other course remains? For our part, we can see no option but to accept that the matter should now be referred to the Security Council so that the Council itself may consider how to ensure that its own past resolutions are implemented. It is because we viewed this as the main point of draft resolution A/35/L.59 and Add.1 that we decided to vote in favour of it. We regard this vote as an expression of support for a call on the Council to decide on appropriate action. I must, however, make it clear that we reserve our position on the exact terms of the action which the Council may decide to take in relation to South Africa. We agree, however, that the Assembly may call on the Council to impose sanctions, as it does in operative paragraph 13, but it must be for the Council itself, in exercise of its own powers under the Charter and taking account of all the circumstances, to decide whether it should take action and, if so, exactly what action it should take.

78. Finally, as to operative paragraph 14, although we are prepared to consider a special session of the Assembly in due course, we do not wish to prejudge the outcome of the Security Council's consideration of the problem which is now to be referred to it.

79. Mr. SCHELTEMA (Netherlands): I am speaking on behalf of the Netherlands delegation in order to explain the position of my Government on the resolutions just adopted by the General Assembly.

80. The Netherlands is deeply disappointed that the South African Government has been unwilling to agree to a cease-fire or to agree to set a date for the implementation of the settlement plan adopted by the

Security Council in resolution 435 (1978). My Government subscribes fully to the Secretary-General's conclusion that the outcome of the pre-implementation meeting at Geneva must give rise to the most serious international concern.

81. We regret that the prospect of Namibia attaining independence by the end of 1981 seems to have receded. The Netherlands Government understands that those parties that have so far played an important role in efforts aimed at the implementation of the settlement plan adopted by the Security Council in resolution 435 (1978) and consistent with resolution 385 (1976) are seriously contemplating what course of action to take in the future. We urge them once again to consider all ways and means that could lead to Namibia's independence in an internationally acceptable manner.

82. In the meantime, the Netherlands remains committed to an early implementation of Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978). The United Nations has a special responsibility for the Territory. We are ready to support Security Council action in case South Africa refuses to end its illegal occupation of Namibia and to grant its people an opportunity to exercise its right to self-determination and independence through free and fair elections.

83. The Netherlands delegation regrets that it could not vote in favour of all the draft resolutions. I shall explain some of the considerations that prohibited us from doing so. We dissociate ourselves from explicit and implicit endorsement of armed struggle. It is the responsibility of the United Nations, in accordance with its Charter, to seek peaceful solutions. Our commitment to the Charter and its division of competences remains unchanged.

84. As I have said before, we are of the opinion that the people of Namibia have the right to choose their own Government through free and fair elections. In our view, none of the participants in those elections should therefore be designated in advance as the sole and authentic representative of the population.

85. The Netherlands rejects all arbitrary and unjustified attacks on individual Member States. In particular, my delegation cannot subscribe to passages in the draft resolutions that cast doubt on the motivations of Governments that have made an earnest attempt to promote agreement between the parties concerned on the implementation of the settlement plan.

86. In conclusion, I wish to state that the Netherlands' abstention on the draft resolution concerning the question of Namibian uranium is primarily based on the unjustified condemnation of friendly Governments contained in operative paragraph 12. Our vote in no way detracts from our recognition of Decree No. 1 of the United Nations Council for Namibia for the protection of the natural resources of Namibia.

87. Mr. LEGWAILA (Botswana): I would simply like to reserve our position on operative paragraph 29 of draft resolution A/35/L.50 and Add.1 and operative paragraph 13 of draft resolution A/35/L.59 and Add.1.

88. Mr. KHOJANE (Lesotho): The Lesotho delegation voted in favour of all the draft resolutions before the General Assembly on the question of Namibia.

However, we wish to reiterate for the record, as we have previously pointed out in the Assembly and elsewhere, that Lesotho cannot, for reasons already given on those previous occasions, support comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa.

89. We therefore reserve our position with regard to operative paragraph 29 of draft resolution A/35/L.50 and Add.1 and operative paragraph 13 of draft resolution A/35/L.59 and Add.1.

90. Mr. SANDIGA (Peru) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Peru considers that it should explain its vote on the draft resolutions that have just been adopted relating to agenda item 27, and we should like to express the following reservations.

91. First, we have reservations on the draft resolution that condemns some Member States in one of its operative paragraphs, as we consider that this condemnation is excessively selective and discriminatory as there have been considerable changes recorded over the past few years.

92. Secondly, we do not like the wording of certain parts of the draft resolutions adopted today which urge the international community to give military assistance, as we consider that solutions of that nature fly in the face of the spirit and the text of the Charter, and because the machinery that would be utilized in providing that type of assistance and the form the action would take are not clearly specified, with the result that it might go beyond the limits and the requirements of the Charter.

93. The delegation of Peru would like to state for the record that our reservations do not in any way diminish or affect our position of firm and unwavering support for the just cause of total independence for the people of Namibia or our condemnation of the system of *apartheid*.

94. Mr. HALFHUID (Suriname): My delegation has voted in favour of draft resolution A/35/L.58 and Add.1, but had a separate vote been taken on its operative paragraph 12 my delegation would have abstained in that vote.

95. Mrs. KEKEH (Togo) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/35/L.58 and Add.1, on the question of Namibian uranium, in view of our well-known position on all aspects of the Namibian problem and our full support of SWAPO. However, with regard to operative paragraph 12 of that draft resolution, my delegation considers that it would be preferable to avoid any enumeration when the list of States collaborating with South Africa in various areas cannot be guaranteed to be exhaustive.

96. The PRESIDENT: As there are no other delegations that wish to explain their vote after the vote, I now call on those representatives who wish to make brief statements, which will be made from their places. I first call on the representative of the United Republic of Cameroon, who wishes to make a statement in his capacity as chairman of the group of African States.

97. Mr. OYONO (United Republic of Cameroon) (*interpretation from French*): At the conclusion of this important debate on the question of Namibia, I have

the honour and the privilege of speaking on behalf of the group of African States to convey to you, Mr. President, and to the international community as a whole, our thoughts on the developments on this question, which is crucial for the authority and the very future of the Organization.

98. It is a pleasure, first and foremost, to extend to you, Mr. President, an expression of our profound admiration and our warmest congratulations for the courage, lucidity, objectivity and competence you have so consistently displayed in the course of this session and which have enabled the General Assembly to adopt a series of measures of great importance for the liberation of the oppressed people of Namibia, despite attempts at sabotage by the Pretoria régime.

99. In so doing, Sir, you have maintained and indeed enhanced the prestige and the dignity conferred by the Charter on the role of the President of the highest assembly of plenipotentiaries in the world.

100. Our thoughts go out also to Mr. Kurt Waldheim, who will be responsible for the implementation of the many resolutions we have just adopted; we know that he will discharge this lofty task with characteristic dedication, persistence and foresight. The momentum he has imparted to the search for a peaceful and internationally acceptable solution of the Namibian problem in recent years deserves a special tribute from us.

101. At this late stage in our meeting, I shall not dwell on the draft resolutions we have just adopted or on the many statements we have heard in the course of the debate. But it does appear to us necessary to say how surprised and disappointed we are at the negative attitude of a group of countries in the Assembly, in particular the Western countries. By the statement made on their behalf yesterday by the representative of the United Kingdom [109th meeting] and by the votes they have just cast they have displayed a desire to shirk the responsibility we all have towards the people of Namibia.

102. In the course of the 35 years of conflict between racist South Africa and the rest of the world community, the Western countries have argued that a dialogue must be maintained with the Pretoria régime in order to bring about a peaceful settlement of the Namibian problem, since ostracism of that régime would lead to an impasse. We had been told that the settlement plan in Security Council resolution 435 (1978) would be the last attempt to make Pretoria see reason.

103. It was principally out of respect for the framers of the plan that the world community in general, and the African group in particular, finally supported it, while emphasizing its ambiguities and weaknesses and bearing in mind the customary untrustworthiness of the Pretoria racists.

104. To give that initiative all possible chances of succeeding, the General Assembly decided last December to postpone its debate on agenda item 27 until after the meeting convened by the Secretary-General at Geneva with a view to setting dates for a cease-fire in Namibia and for free and democratic elections under the control and supervision of the United Nations.

105. After the failure of the Geneva pre-implementation meeting, the international community expected that those Western countries would, at the very least, draw the necessary conclusions and allocate responsibility by defining their role in the development of this serious problem, which maintains a dangerously unstable situation in southern Africa and represents a threat to international peace and security.

106. We expected those countries to acknowledge and denounce the bad faith and the arrogance of the racist régime of Pretoria, which, by stating at Geneva on 13 January that it was not prepared to implement Security Council resolution 435 (1978), doomed to failure a settlement plan which had been drawn up with its participation and solemnly accepted by it more than three years before.

107. We had also ventured to expect that the Western contact group, which had negotiated at length with SWAPO, would recognize the good faith of those authentic representatives of the Namibian people and their continued willingness to sign a cease-fire agreement without any preconditions so as to deliver the Namibian people from the suffering and atrocities to which it is subjected by the colonial, illegal South African régime and its barbarously repressive forces.

108. We must be quite clear about the wretched situation of the Namibian people and the atmosphere of generalized violence that exists in southern Africa.

109. The international community as a whole knows what a heavy responsibility that racist minority bears for having seized power in Pretoria and basing its policies on terrorism and the oppression of an entire people thus taken hostage and denied its most fundamental human rights.

110. The South African régime, built on repression and institutionalized violence and on the systematic negation of the rights of the black man, has repeatedly been judged and condemned by the entire Assembly, by the Security Council and by the conscience of all mankind. It has been recognized as a crime against humanity.

111. Those who condemn violence in ambiguous terms should recall the clarity of the statement made in this Hall in 1969 by Mr. Ahmadou Ahidjo, President of the Federal Republic of Cameroon, when he submitted the Lusaka Manifesto on behalf of the whole of Africa:

“We do not, of course, preach violence, but rather an end to all violence, and more particularly an end to the violence done to human dignity by the oppressors of Africa. In southern Africa, however, we are faced with the most systematic violence ever seen in human history since the days of nazism. It goes without saying that, should our appeals still go unheeded, we shall have no option but to continue to give the African peoples still under domination all the support of which we are capable in their struggle for freedom and independence. The United Nations itself will be unable to continue evading the need to use all means, including force, to safeguard both the human dignity of those peoples and international peace and Security.”³

³ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fourth Session, Plenary Meetings*, 1780th meeting, para. 18.

112. The African group is fully aware of the weight of the geostrategic, economic and other interests which, in the view of some States, temporarily obscure the aspirations of the Namibian people and its inalienable right to self-determination and independence.

113. Without trying to teach anyone a lesson, we should none the less like to express our grave concern at an attitude that would tend *de facto* to legalize the colonial occupation of Namibia. The statement that the Western contact group is not prepared to take any specific action in the future is a real failure on the part of those States to meet the responsibility they had assumed towards the international community for the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

114. No reasons of domestic policy and no consideration of hegemonic rivalry can justify indefinite postponement of the decolonization of Namibia, which is the special responsibility of the United Nations.

115. The African group urgently appeals to all States to take decisive action, without further delay, action that will lead to the liberation of the Namibian people and thereby to the triumph of the ideals of liberty and independence and to the strengthening of an international society based on the force of law.

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

117. Mr. LUSAKA President, United Nations Council for Namibia: Now that the results of the voting have been announced for all of us to see, I should like to take this opportunity, on behalf of the United Nations Council for Namibia, to thank those who have sponsored the draft resolutions, those who have voted in favour of them and also those who have participated in the debate, regardless of what position they have taken. The resolutions on the question of Namibia are action-oriented, and they represent further steps forward in the struggle to achieve independence for the Namibian people.

118. I should like also to express thanks to those countries which voted in favour of some of the draft resolutions while abstaining on others. It is the hope of the United Nations Council for Namibia that at the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly, which is not far away, some of those countries will be able to move their position forward and vote in favour of all the resolutions on Namibia.

119. The voting also indicates that a number of countries have abstained on all the resolutions.

120. It is now clear that the attempt to find a solution to the Namibian question by means of elections supervised and controlled by the United Nations, which was set in motion five years ago by Security Council resolution 385 (1976), has reached an impasse. It is also clear, as was openly stated by the racist South African delegation at the recent talks at Geneva, that South Africa is responsible for this impasse.

121. In the light of this situation, which is well known to all of us, I was amazed to see that some countries in the course of their general abstention even abstained on resolutions of a humanitarian and educational character. I must say that I find that not easy to understand, as those countries have gone on

record in the past indicating that they support humanitarian and educational assistance for Namibians. It is my fervent hope that, in spite of those abstentions, those countries will nevertheless provide assistance and support to Namibian refugees in accordance with their stated principles.

122. However, in the light of the present impasse, I fear that more unpalatable considerations come to mind. It appears to be necessary for us to ask ourselves what are the real reasons which made certain countries unable to condemn South Africa at the present time. A possible hypothesis is offered in the resolution on the question of Namibian uranium which was just adopted. However, I fear that the phenomenon may go deeper than that. I fear that extensive economic, political and even sentimental links with South Africa itself have led some countries to develop some kind of solidarity with the racists and that this is what is preventing them from taking the action that would lead to the implementation of their own plan.

123. Solidarity with the racists has led to the creation of negative and even hostile attitudes in the world as a whole. These attitudes have become deeply rooted in the public opinion of many countries, and they will not easily be eliminated. The only solution lies in a united stand by the international community to ensure that South Africa ends its illegal occupation of Namibia.

124. Finally, Mr. President, I wish to extend to you our sincere congratulations on the very efficient manner in which you have conducted the deliberations of the debate on the question of Namibia.

125. In the same vein, we thank the Secretary-General for his painstaking efforts in dealing with the question of Namibia. We wish him good luck in his continued interest.

126. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with General Assembly resolution 31/152 of 20 December 1976, I now call on the Observer for SWAPO.

127. Mr. GURIRAB (South West Africa People's Organization): I am most grateful that before I asked to be allowed to speak I was able, this morning and again this afternoon, to listen to remarks made by the representatives of India and the United Republic of Cameroon, and a few seconds ago by the representative of Zambia, the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia. Frankly, I had not intended to speak, as I had an opportunity to do so during the 103rd meeting. But I would have failed in my duty if I did not ask to be allowed to speak to place on record the views of the suffering people of Namibia before the adjournment of this meeting.

128. Some people have a nagging proclivity for persistent distortion of the reality of the situation prevailing in Namibia. I am referring to the key representatives and spokesmen of the military alliances of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization [NATO] and international monopoly capital. What I have to say may not be diplomatic and may not be according to protocol. But we are honest and sincere; as freedom fighters and revolutionaries we have nothing to hide and, therefore, I shall say the following.

129. Yesterday Sir Anthony Parsons, representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern

Ireland, on behalf of the five Western Powers, made a statement that was unique for its elusive brevity, sarcasm and hypocrisy.

130. The item included in the agenda of the resumed thirty-fifth session is the perennial problem of Namibia, which has been debated in the United Nations for the past 35 years, to no avail. Throughout those years, the plight and the tragedy of the oppressed Namibian people have been dramatized time and again, and the overwhelming majority of Member States have time and again ordered the racist colonial oppressors in Namibia to terminate their illegal military and administrative occupation of our country, so that our people can exercise their inalienable right to self-determination, freedom and independence. The question of Namibia is nothing more and nothing less than a question of decolonization and of illegality.

131. The problem of Namibia, therefore, is a problem of colonial oppression and subjugation, of illegality and of ruthless, illegal exploitation of the human and natural resources of our occupied country by the Pretoria racists and the major Western countries and their transnational corporations. In this connexion, the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia submitted to the Assembly and referred to by many representatives during the debate, confirmed and further clarified the extent of the plundering of Namibian resources. The hearings on the plunder of Namibian uranium organized last year by the United Nations Council for Namibia revealed still further the collusion between the illegal occupying régime and its Western collaborators. Sir Anthony's country is the primary culprit in this uranium axis.

132. For example, we are reliably informed that that country has decided to extend beyond 1982 the contractual arrangements whereby it continues to plunder Namibian uranium at Rössing in our country.

133. Although SWAPO also wishes to reaffirm its unabated commitment to searching for a negotiated settlement for Namibia, we firmly believe that the first step in that direction is the ending of the hostilities raging in Namibia by the signing of a cease-fire agreement between SWAPO and South Africa, the two warring parties in our country. We reiterated our readiness to sign such an agreement only recently at Geneva; the other side rejected the idea. In this regard, we blame not only the racist régime for its intransigence and prevarication, but we also blame the five Western States for their unwillingness to bring pressure to bear on the Boers. We remain ready to implement Security Council resolution 435 (1978), once the racists agree to the implementation of that resolution.

134. Namibia shall be free, either through armed struggle or through negotiations. We are ready for both. We are not convinced—and we will not allow ourselves to be misled into thinking—that the only way for the Namibian people to realize the objectives of freedom and independence is through a so-called peaceful solution. We remember, for example, for we were taught this, that these United States of America were able to achieve their liberation through armed struggle. That is why the American people proudly celebrate the Fourth of July. Why do they want to deny us that?

135. Those who profess opposition to armed struggle by SWAPO should also have the courage of their convictions and condemn the presence in Namibia of more than 70,000 South African army troops and police. The cause of the struggle in Namibia, the cause the bloodshed and suffering in Namibia, is the occupation of our country by the illegal colonial régime of South Africa. It is, therefore, that illegal presence that must be brought to an end before we can talk about a negotiated settlement or a peaceful settlement.

136. We wish that the five Western States would acknowledge that fact rather than urging the Namibian people, the victims of aggression, to continue to die to make possible the extraction of our resources and the expropriation of super-profits.

137. We note that we are being threatened with the loss of lives and the destruction of property in Namibia. We interpret that to mean that the racists have been enabled militarily to destroy valuable lives and property in our country, perhaps by nuclear means. We take note of that.

138. We are surprised that, in the statement by Sir Anthony, the five Western States could not even find words to express surprise, shock or dismay at the deliberate wrecking of the Geneva meeting by racist South Africa. Should we conclude that those five States have now reneged on Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which is the product of their initiative?

139. We have come to the General Assembly time and again to dramatize the plight of our people and to galvanize the international community into supporting and assisting our just cause. This afternoon, in no uncertain terms, the overwhelming majority of Member States renewed their support for, and solidarity with, the heroic struggle of the Namibian people under the leadership of SWAPO, their sole and authentic representative.

140. We are gratified and most grateful. The positive votes cast attest to the legitimacy of our struggle and to the inevitable victory that will surely come as a result of the sacrifices and suffering that we endure today. We were gratified to witness, early in the debate, the rejection of the credentials of the non-representative minority delegation from South Africa. We thank all the delegations which spoke in support of our cause, and we reassure them this afternoon that we shall intensify the armed liberation struggle in Namibia for the early independence of our country. We are ready to continue to talk. We are ready to continue to negotiate, provided that those efforts are aimed at ending the illegal colonial occupation of our country.

141. In this context, I should like to reassure the United Nations, and particularly the Secretary-General, of our continued readiness to co-operate with him and with his assistants in the common search for genuine independence for Namibia.

142. The struggle continues. The victory is certain.

143. The PRESIDENT: I call on Mr. Lusaka, the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, who wishes to exercise the right of reply.

144. Mr. LUSAKA, President, United Nations Council for Namibia: I have asked to speak again in order to place on record the right of reply of the

United Nations Council for Namibia in the light of what was said in the Assembly on 5 March 1981.

145. Speaking on behalf of the five Western Powers which have recently been engaged with the régime of South Africa in negotiations for the independence of Namibia, the representative of the United Kingdom, Sir Anthony Parsons—who is a personal friend of mine—said yesterday that the objective of the five Western Powers was “to secure a peaceful, internationally recognized settlement” [109th meeting, para. 124] through a negotiated peace plan.

146. Incidentally, the representative of the United Kingdom spoke for five minutes, thereby allocating one minute to each of the five in the contact group.

147. In the period before and after the termination of South Africa’s Mandate for Namibia, the United Nations made numerous peaceful efforts to achieve a peaceful settlement for the independence of that Territory. The United Nations call for the support of the people of Namibia to liberate themselves through armed struggle has been acknowledged and supported by this body purely because South Africa has consistently defied many proposals for a peaceful settlement made by the United Nations and, indeed, those made by the five Western Powers in recent years.

148. The people of Namibia took to arms in the first place because of South Africa’s inability to understand any other language but that of armed struggle.

149. The representative of the United Kingdom stated further that violence could only bring “immeasurable suffering to the people of Namibia and to the region” [ibid., para. 126]. It has to be realized that South Africa obtains weapons from some Western Powers, including the United Kingdom. It uses these arms not only against the people of Namibia but also against independent African States. The liberation struggle which the people of Namibia have waged against the South African defence forces in Namibia cannot be equated with the violence which South Africa has been perpetrating against the people of that Territory. Indeed, the violence which South Africa has been perpetrating against the people of Namibia and independent African States will be felt by many generations to come in Namibia and in the other African States, not because of any efforts of SWAPO, determined to liberate its country, but largely because the same Western Powers have been arming and continue to arm South Africa, thereby enabling it to cause such damage. By permitting their transnational corporations to exploit the mineral and human resources of Namibia, these very same Western Powers are aiding and abetting South Africa’s efforts to consolidate its economic resources, and this has enabled it to acquire nuclear capability.

150. We have been told that the Governments of the five Western Powers are engaged in mature reflection and a reconsideration of the question of Namibia and that one of them, the Government of the United States, is conducting an extensive review of its policy.

The problem is that any further delay in resolving the Namibian question is bound to work in favour of South Africa, as experience has shown, while the people of Namibia are being killed day by day by the racist régime. What assurance do we have that further delays will not amount to further stalling, thus creating more favourable conditions for South Africa to entrench itself in Namibia? At any rate, should the outcome of the United States review of its policy turn out to be at variance with United Nations resolutions, where do we go from there? I think that there is more need to reflect on that question.

151. It has further been suggested that any action of the United Nations in support of the armed struggle in Namibia may further isolate South Africa. South Africa has long been driving itself into isolation from the world community. After numerous efforts by the people of Namibia and the United Nations aimed at inducing South Africa to live up to its responsibilities in Namibia, the United Nations had to terminate South Africa’s Mandate for the Territory in 1966. Thus patient persuasion and negotiations were continually met with flagrant violations and intransigence by South Africa. Since the termination of the Mandate, there have been an additional 15 years of United Nations negotiations with South Africa, which continues up to this day to isolate itself by its arrogant defiance of United Nations initiatives, the most recent of which was the pre-implementation meeting held at Geneva this year.

152. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the United Kingdom in exercise of the right of reply.

153. Sir Anthony PARSONS (United Kingdom): I think that my colleague from Zambia suggested that my country was continuing to supply military equipment to South Africa.

154. I simply want to make clear that my delegation voted for Security Council resolution 418 (1977), that we have maintained its provisions throughout and that my Government is not supplying military equipment to South Africa and does not break mandatory resolutions of the Security Council.

Suspension of the session

155. The PRESIDENT: I should like to remind members that the only two items remaining on the Assembly’s agenda are the following: agenda item 30, entitled “Question of equitable representation on and increase in the membership of the Security Council” and agenda item 123, entitled “Launching of global negotiations on international economic co-operation for development”. I suggest that the Assembly take up these items at a later date after appropriate consultations have been held.

156. The thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly is hereby suspended.

The meeting rose at 5.20 p.m.