



General Assembly

PROVIS IONAL

A/43/PV.54  
22 November 1988

ENGLISH

Forty-third session

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

PROVIS IONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE FIFTY-FOURTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Thursday, 17 November 1988, at 3 p.m.

<u>President:</u>	Mr. RANA (Vice-President)	(Nepal)
later:	Mr. MOUSHOUTAS (Vice-President)	(Cyprus)

- Question of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) [34] (continued)

- (a) Report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples
- (b) Report of the Secretary-General
- (c) Report of the Fourth Committee
- (d) Draft resolution

/...

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the Official Records of the General Assembly.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, within one week, to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

- Question of Namibia [29] (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
- Appointments to fill vacancies in subsidiary organs and other appointments [17]
  - (j) Appointment of the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia; note by the Secretary-General

In the absence of the President, Mr. Rana (Nepal), Vice-President, took the Chair.

The meeting was called to order at 3.25 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 34 (continued)

QUESTION OF THE FALKLAND ISLANDS (MALVINAS)

- (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 (A/43/23 (Part VII), A/AC.109/962)
- (b) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/43/799)
- (c) REPORT OF THE FOURTH COMMITTEE (A/43/801)
- (d) DRAFT RESOLUTION (A/43/L.27)

Ms. RUIZ CERUTTI (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): This new debate on the question of the Malvinas Islands is taking place in exceptional international circumstances. Indeed, the recent agreements on disarmament and the new dialogue between the super-Powers, as well as the progress achieved towards the settlement of important regional conflicts, have created a new, more positive international context. The traditional scene, in which tension and confrontation prevailed, has been modified by significant advances towards détente and the search for peaceful and concerted solutions to international disputes.

A process of transformation in international relations has begun, in which reason and diplomacy prevail over force and intolerance, and the General Assembly has encouraged this process by continuing patient, significant efforts. Nevertheless, this encouraging framework has not proved beneficial in the case of all international conflicts. Some remain unaffected by the new atmosphere and continue in a climate of misunderstanding and tension.

(Ms. Ruiz Cerutti, Argentina)

Against the background of the present international reality, the lack of progress in relation to these issues appears increasingly to be an unjustifiable anachronism. It is truly going back to a stage of political and strategic thinking that has been superseded, in which confrontation appeared to be a legitimate, even necessary, means of defending national interests. Today a growing number of Governments recognize that those interests can hardly be protected in a framework of conflict and that, on the contrary, their defence is more feasible in a context of co-operation and dialogue.

As everybody knows, the question of the Malvinas Islands is one of the international problems that have not benefited from recent progress in the international arena. In fact, I regret to inform the General Assembly once more that Argentina and the United Kingdom have not yet resumed the indispensable substantive negotiations on a just and lasting solution of the problem of the Malvinas Islands, despite the repeated appeals of the General Assembly and the flexibility and moderation displayed by my Government.

(Ms. Ruiz Cerutti, Argentina)

As is confirmed in the report of the Secretary-General, the question of the Malvinas Islands has shown no progress whatsoever in the last 12 months, thereby causing understandable disappointment. The reason for this disturbing situation is well known. The British Government does not agree to resume with Argentina the negotiations repeatedly called for by the General Assembly and continues to refuse to face a peaceful and concerted solution to this serious problem, whose continuation conspires against stability and progress in the South-West Atlantic.

That refusal coincides with the United Kingdom's insistence on setting pre-conditions to any dialogue with my country. That amounts to expressly refraining from putting forth the question of sovereignty. This pre-condition is not only unacceptable but also illogical. It is unacceptable because the Malvinas, South Georgias and South Sandwich Islands belong to the Argentine Republic, which will never give up its right to claim them and have them returned to it.

The pre-condition is also illogical. In effect, the question of sovereignty is at the heart of Argentine-British relations and, as stated in General Assembly resolution 42/19, the normalization of those relations would be facilitated by comprehensive bilateral negotiations that would allow us to rebuild mutual confidence on a solid basis and resolve the pending problems, including all aspects of the future of the Malvinas Islands.

The global negotiations called for by the Assembly cannot be replaced by unilateral acts that touch upon collateral aspects of the bilateral relations. I am referring to the British declaration of July 1985, whereby the United Kingdom announced that the restrictions that it had itself imposed on Argentine imports in 1982 had been lifted, claiming since then an alleged lack of reciprocity.

On that occasion, and on many later ones, the Argentine Government repeated its invitation to the United Kingdom to hold comprehensive negotiations

(Ms. Ruiz Cerutti, Argentina)

encompassing all pending problems between the two countries. Argentina's readiness to negotiate continues and has been supported by the majority of the international community. Our country is still waiting for a realistic and constructive attitude on the part of the British Government, on the understanding that it is within the framework of the aforementioned negotiations that such problems will find a definitive and satisfactory solution.

The good faith of both Governments is an indispensable prerequisite for dealing not only with our differences over the Malvinas Islands but also with the secondary problems stemming from that dispute or linked to other specific aspects of the relationship between the two countries.

We cannot rationally admit the existence of a conflict, regardless of its nature, span or complexity, which cannot be resolved through negotiations and understanding among States. This is the cornerstone on which the United Nations itself is built, bilateral negotiations being the means that more fully respect the will and initiative of States. In the circumstances, the Argentine Government asks the most elementary questions: how is a dispute, whose existence has been acknowledged by both parties, to be settled if the way of dialogue and negotiation is not accepted? Can the constant and reiterated call by the General Assembly for resumption of the negotiations be disregarded any longer? What is the answer of the United Kingdom to these questions?

Why does the United Kingdom vote against a resolution that is only procedural, which does not pre-judge the outcome of the negotiations or the position adopted by the parties? Why does the United Kingdom vote against the simplest of the draft resolutions put forward at the General Assembly, a draft resolution that ultimately says "since there is a dispute, get together to negotiate its settlement"?

We are not voting here on a draft resolution that supports or condemns the position of one of the parties. We are voting for the enforcement of a principle,

(Ms. Ruiz Cerutti, Argentina)

the principle from which stems nothing more and nothing less than the whole functioning of our Organization, namely, the negotiated settlement of disputes.

The Government of Argentina has repeatedly and clearly expressed its will to negotiate with Great Britain, thereby complying with the mandate of the United Nations, as has been recorded in a number of statements, communiqués and notes to the Organization. The Argentine position on the substance of the Malvinas question is well known to the international community, and the Government demonstrated its readiness to negotiate and its spirit of dialogue when it maintained that such dialogue should cover all aspects of relations between the two countries, including the future of the Islands, as has been stated by the Assembly in its resolutions. But this is not intended to prejudge in any way the final outcome of the dialogue.

In this context, with Argentina only calling for dialogue, the United Kingdom carried out military manoeuvres in the Malvinas Islands in March this year. For a month, the idea of turning the Islands into a military training camp was revived.

The prolonged deadlock in the dispute over the Malvinas Islands is, I am sure, a source of concern to the entire international community. This was demonstrated by fact that General Assembly resolution 42/19 was supported by the overwhelming majority of Member States of the United Nations, including some very close friends and allies of the United Kingdom. That overwhelming support reflects the general conviction that the present status quo in the South-West Atlantic militates against a stable future in the region and that the solution is inextricably linked to the dialogue between Argentina and the United Kingdom.

In spite of the British position, Argentina has resisted the temptation to escalate the climate of misunderstanding by similar behaviour. At all times, my Government has maintained a positive and conciliatory attitude.

It is paradoxical to see that the two nations, which are at present members of the Security Council and which in the last few years on several occasions shared

(Ms. Ruiz Cerutti, Argentina)

the great responsibility of ensuring the restoration of peace in critical situations, have not yet been able to sit face to face and initiate a dialogue aimed at solving their own differences.

Ever since democracy was restored in my country in 1983, Argentina has given all possible evidence of its firm will to pursue a negotiated settlement of the dispute with the United Kingdom over the Malvinas Islands. In 1986 the Argentine Government had already expressly shown its readiness to initiate, as a preliminary preparatory step towards comprehensive negotiations, according to the terms of the General Assembly resolutions, an open dialogue with the United Kingdom in order to create the necessary conditions of trust to undertake the negotiations successfully and establish a schedule for them.

The Argentine Government, while reaffirming its sovereign rights over the Malvinas, the South Georgias and South Sandwich Islands, and the surrounding waters, wants to state once more its readiness to provide adequately for the interests of the present inhabitants of the Malvinas Islands, through a special statute of safeguards and guarantees. We are willing to envisage the necessary measures to ensure the maintenance of the lifestyle of the islanders, their welfare, traditions and cultural identity and to ensure the full exercise of their individual rights.



(Ms. Ruiz Cerutti, Argentina)

As a country that throughout its history has welcomed large flows of immigrants we can affirm that we have the spiritual, political and legal capacity to ensure full respect for the individuality and cultural heritage of its inhabitants. That is part of the very essence of Argentina.

Once again we reiterate our appeal to the Government of the United Kingdom for the initiation of negotiations with a view to finding the means of solving peacefully the pending bilateral problems, including all aspects of the future of the Malvinas Islands. In this context we express our gratitude to the Secretary-General for the mission of good offices he is carrying out within the framework of the relevant General Assembly resolutions. Mr. Perez de Cuellar has already received unanimous expressions of support during the general debate for his activities in connection with various conflicts. We reaffirm our confidence in his ability and our gratitude for his dedication.

For all these reasons, and because of our conviction that we must strive for the best means of reaching a solution to a long-drawn-out, complex international controversy, our country hopes that the Assembly will again make an appeal for wisdom, rationality, and détente and call urgently for the resumption in good faith of negotiations between the parties in order to arrive at lasting solutions that will permit the development of the region and ensure the security that is achieved through peace.

Mr. VILLAGRAN DE LEON (Guatemala) (interpretation from Spanish): The question of the Malvinas Islands has been taken up in this forum and in other forums, and in each of them it has been agreed that this is a dispute that the parties should resolve peacefully through negotiations conducted in good faith and in keeping with the principles of the United Nations Charter.

(Mr. Villagran de Leon, Guatemala)

When the Secretary-General, in his report on the work of the Organization, listed in an optimistic spirit the regional conflicts that have benefited from the new climate of détente in international relations he noted that there continued to exist "points of strain and danger, visible or lurking" (A/43/1, p. 2). There is no doubt that the question of the Malvinas Islands is precisely one of those points of tension which the international community wishes to see resolved.

However, the report of the Secretary-General on this question is not encouraging, especially as it points out that the negotiations we have asked the parties to initiate with a view to finding the means to resolve peacefully and definitively the pending problems have not taken place. It is with great concern that we note that they have not taken place because one of the parties has ignored the repeated appeal of the General Assembly and refuses to begin talks to lead to a solution of the dispute.

It therefore seems appropriate yet again to draw the attention of one of the parties involved in this dispute to the meaning and value of General Assembly resolutions. Their purpose is to ensure the maintenance of peace, and, in addition to largely reflecting the conscience of mankind, they form a whole system of criteria and recommendations which guide us in our conduct as States, while the extent our compliance with their provisions serves as a gauge of our willingness to live together in peace and abide by the principles of international law. Compliance with General Assembly and Security Council resolutions is crucially important to ensure the effectiveness of the United Nations system. Moreover, confidence in the United Nations system, which has been revived recently, depends to a large extent on the implementation of General Assembly and Security Council resolutions relating to the solution of conflicts. The permanent members of the Security Council bear a particular responsibility for complying with those

(Mr. Villagran de Leon, Guatemala)

resolutions. It is for this reason that we hope that the Government of the United Kingdom will give clear evidence of its willingness to comply with the new draft resolution which we have no doubt the Assembly will adopt on this subject and that it will start negotiations with Argentina on the future of the Malvinas Islands.

With regard to the substance of this issue, Guatemala's position is well known, but I wish to reiterate it in the Assembly. We fully support Argentina and are convinced that it has both reason and law on its side. Our solidarity with Argentina is total and absolute and has been further strengthened by Argentina's active contribution, through its participation in the Support Group, to the Contadora efforts and to the settlement through peaceful negotiations of the Central American conflict.

We have no doubt at all that Argentina's claim to sovereignty over the Malvinas Islands, the South Georgias and the South Sandwich Islands is based on historical, and legal rights. As acknowledged by the International Court of Justice and by the General Assembly, it is essential to reaffirm the pre-eminence of the principle of territorial integrity over the principle of self-determination in cases in which colonial occupation has affected on the sovereign territory of independent countries. Clearly it is not appropriate for the population of the colonizing Power to exercise self-determination, and it is also clear that support for self-determination must be limited by the need to uphold the territorial integrity of the sovereign State.

The question of the Malvinas Islands continues to have negative repercussions in Latin America because justice, morality and law have not yet prevailed. The United Kingdom must show that it is willing to contribute fully to the maintenance of peace and the consolidation of the principles of international law enshrined in the United Nations Charter.

Mr. SERRANO CALDERA (Nicaragua) (interpretation from Spanish): More than 150 years ago the United Kingdom, by dint of its military and naval hegemony, occupied by force the Malvinas, South Georgias and South Sandwich Islands, an integral part of Argentine territory. That act of force deprived the Republic of Argentina of that territory, but not of its rights.

Today those Argentine sovereignty rights are as valid as they were then, and the development of international law and the enactment of legislation have come to ratify and support Argentina's just claim to its territory.

The General Assembly, because of the persistence of a colonial situation and the unjustified delay in negotiations, requested the Governments of Argentina and the United Kingdom to initiate negotiations to find a peaceful and definitive solution to the dispute.

Regrettably, as stated by the Secretary-General in his report on this question, there do not appear to exist the necessary conditions to enable him to carry out the mandate entrusted to him by the General Assembly in resolution 42/19 with a view to promoting negotiations between the parties. He added,

"their inability to enter into a meaningful dialogue of the kind referred to in resolution 42/19 is a matter of disappointment". (A/43/799, para.6)

While we must recognize as a positive fact the improvement in diplomatic relations between the parties, we must also point out that the United Kingdom's refusal to enter into a meaningful dialogue on the fundamental problem of sovereignty and future of the islands is a matter of serious concern.

We have already stated on many occasions that this is not an exclusively Argentine problem, since underlying the claim of that sister Republic are the dignity and sovereignty of Latin America. Affected as it is by such an unacceptable colonial attitude and practice, Nicaragua has emphasized its

(Mr. Serrano Caldera, Nicaragua)

solidarity with the Government and people of Argentine in their just struggle to recover what is theirs historically and by right.

Given the reality of the problem, the search for a just and peaceful solution is what is required.

Unfortunately, the attitude of Argentina and the appeal of the international community have found no echo in the United Kingdom as regards the quest for a peaceful solution within the framework of the obligations and principles enshrined in the Charter.

We see with optimism and hope that, within the framework of the United Nations and with the participation of the Secretary-General, other conflicts and other situations are finding the path to just and peaceful solutions.

Those who do not yet wish to recognize the existence of this problem nor respond to the appeals contained in resolutions adopted in the United Nations should not disdain this new conciliatory spirit that is today reawakening hopes for peace in the world community.

A constructive readiness to tackle the problem should be directed towards the proper implementation of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), preserving its essence and intention without any attempt at undermining its content and purposes in order to side-step the good offices mission and direct negotiation.

In March this year the Security Council met to consider the deterioration of the situation in the islands as a result of the British decision to carry out military manoeuvres in and around those territories. This shows once again that the continued existence of a colonial situation constitutes a permanent menace which could very easily lead to a serious threat to international peace and security. The danger is even greater if we note the progressive escalation of the British military and naval presence in the area, and in that context the recent

(Mr. Serrano Caldera, Nicaragua)

Conference of Foreign Ministers of the Non-Aligned Movement, held in Nicosia, Cyprus, in September, stated that:

"The establishment of bases and other military installations in dependent territories obstructed the application of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV)) and was incompatible with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and with the aforementioned resolution".

(A/43/667, para. 228)

We wish once again to express our solidarity with the people and Government of Argentina in their struggle to recover full sovereignty and territorial integrity. Once again we urge the United Kingdom to desist from its attitude and to undertake the negotiations to resolve peacefully and definitively outstanding problems between the two countries, including all aspects on the future of the Malvinas Islands in accordance with the United Nations Charter.

Nicaragua's solidarity with Argentina in this instance is and always has been beyond question. But beyond the brotherhood that binds our peoples as Latin Americans, our attitude transcends all emotional feelings and is, above all, a matter of principle. We do not accept colonialism in any form, old or new.

For reasons of justice we shall always be morally on the side of peoples struggling for total independence and sovereignty - for ethical reasons and not out of sympathy, for historical and not geographical reasons, for reasons of principle and not of convenience.

We dream of a decolonialized and free world, and we know that at the core of every struggle there is always a dream, and at the root of any reality a Utopian aspiration.

(Mr. Serrano Caldera, Nicaragua)

For all of these reasons, because in this case we have an expression of those principles, we reaffirm our solidarity with Argentina and trust that dialogue will prevail in the context indicated by the United Nations in its worthy endeavour to bring about the just and peaceful solution of this problem.

Mr. GUTIERREZ (Costa Rica) (interpretation from Spanish): There is an informal division of the subjects which come before the United Nations into those problems which can be solved fairly quickly and those concerning which, because of the difficulty of the dispute or the radical differences in the positions of the parties, it is practically impossible to foretell when a solution will be found.

Recently the efforts of the members of the secretariats of the Security Council and the General Assembly, headed by the Secretary-General himself, have scored a series of successes which have increased the number of problems falling into the first category - those for which prompt solutions can be found - and reduced the number of those in the second category.

Unfortunately, to judge from the Secretary-General's report, the case now before the Assembly belongs to the second category, for which no solution seems possible. This is clear from the following sentences in the Secretary-General's report:

"I must conclude that the positions of the two Governments remain substantially unchanged. The Government of the United Kingdom remains committed to seeking more normal relations with Argentina while standing by its commitments to the Falkland islanders. It has proposed setting aside the sovereignty issue over the Falkland Islands (Malvinas), on which it considers that views are fundamentally opposed, with a view to making progress on other matters, such as fisheries, which it considers to be of a practical nature and which could be of benefit to both countries.

(Mr. Gutierrez, Costa Rica)

"The Government of Argentina, for its part, has expressed continued readiness to comply with the terms of General Assembly resolution 42/19 and to that end to initiate negotiations to settle all issues outstanding between the two countries, including all questions relating to the future of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas)." (A/43/799, paras. 4, 5)

The Secretary-General goes on to say:

"While both Governments have shown commendable restraint in preventing a worsening of the situation in the South-West Atlantic, their inability to enter into a meaningful dialogue of the kind referred to in resolution 42/19 is a matter of disappointment. This is all the more so in view, inter alia, of the time that has elapsed since the 1982 conflict and the existing trend towards a renewed search for peaceful solutions to international disputes." (ibid., para. 6)

The Government of Costa Rica considers it to be one of its most important duties to support Argentina's legitimate aspirations to recover a part of its territory which was snatched from it at the very dawn of its independence by the nation which at the time which was the leading world Power. This duty derives from the common past of peoples which came into being as a result of the expansion of the European peoples to this continent and then demanded, as did all the peoples of Asia, Africa and Oceania, the right to self-determination.

As a result of the errors of the period of independence, Hispano-Americans acquired their freedom when they were divided, and that division and the consequent weakness of the structures of the various States that were then set up, made us easy prey for the European nations, which still in the nineteenth century maintained an attitude of dominion over all continents. Although the original division has been consolidated meanwhile, the bonds of spiritual union and



(Mr. Gutierrez, Costa Rica)

militant solidarity which make us recognize each other as brothers have never been severed.

In no area are those bonds closer than in that of the struggle against the last vestiges of the colonial past. The great majority of Hispano-American countries have had an independent life for more than 150 years. But, having spent more than 200 years in a colonial situation, we fully identified with the peoples of Africa, Asia and Oceania at the inception of the United Nations when they were struggling for liberation. Since we felt such solidarity with those peoples, we could not be less supportive of a Hispano-American people fighting the remnants of colonialism.

The struggles against colonialism were for centuries thought of as wars. In a society of nations with a high level of civilization it is proper to think of them as efforts at negotiation, as a means of recognizing such important factors as the historical ties and territorial continuity that make it possible to consider the Malvinas Islands a part of Argentina and to give proper recognition to the status of the inhabitants of the archipelago, who must continue to enjoy the rights they enjoy at present.

Other problems which seemed difficult have become capable of solution and we hope that this will be possible in the case of the problem of the Malvinas. We maintain our solidarity with Argentina and support its position. We also support the draft resolution, which would help to advance the movement towards decolonization until no vestige of colonialism remains.

Mr. MELENDEZ BARAHONA (El Salvador) (interpretation from Spanish): The General Assembly has been giving direct consideration to the question of the Malvinas Islands since 1982 and has adopted resolutions on the subject at each session urging the parties involved - namely, the Republic of Argentina and the

(Mr. Melendez Barahona,  
El Salvador)

United Kingdom - to resume negotiations to resolve their differences and determine the future of the islands and requesting the Secretary-General to continue his mission of good offices in the interest of a rapprochement between the parties, so as to contribute to the achievement of a negotiated settlement, thus putting an end to a situation that is a source of tension in the southern part of the Latin American continent.

During last year's debates statements were low-keyed and carefully worded. They reasonably expressed the hope that dialogue and negotiation would be established, without prejudging or making value judgements on the form and content of those negotiations. More than one delegation expressed the hope that in 1988 substantive progress would be made in the pacification of the southern region and that at the present session we would not have to repeat our demands for a negotiated political settlement.

(Mr. Melendez Barahona,  
El Salvador)

However, after reading the report of the Secretary-General on this particular matter, document A/43/799, we cannot but regret that the desires and aspirations of the majority of the international community, as expressed in the provisions of the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly, have elicited no positive response, and that the pacifying process is at a standstill. Hence there remains latent a climate which is not truly conducive to the relaxation of tension in favour of international peace and security.

For Latin America, as we have seen and observed from the positions adopted by countries of the region in the United Nations, in the regional context of the Organization of American States, and at other international meetings such as those of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, the issue of the Malvinas Islands is a matter of great importance, interest and concern, especially given the lack of willingness to take the initial steps that would make it possible to create the necessary conditions for dialogue and negotiation, or even to create conditions that would facilitate fulfilment of the mandate given to the Secretary-General under resolution 42/19.

Although difficult to understand in the present international circumstances, characterized by a trend towards the relaxation of international tensions by the peaceful settlement of disputes, especially through dialogue and negotiation, with the efficient, responsible and dedicated participation of the Security-General, including that of the conflicts between Iran and Iraq and in Afghanistan, Korea, New Caledonia and the Western Sahara, it is disturbing to note that there should still be rigid positions which run counter to the views, interpretation and position of the majority of the international community in this particular instance and which, rather than contributing to the strengthening of our Organization, in

(Mr. Melendez Barahona,  
El Salvador)

accordance with the principles of the Charter, weaken multilateralism and its values, calling it into question.

The Government of El Salvador has been and still is in solidarity with Argentina, and has therefore supported both in the United Nations and in the Organization of American States its claims to sovereignty over the Malvinas Islands.

My delegation considers the position of the Republic of Argentina reasonable and understandable, especially in the light of its explanations and clarifications to the effect that the resolutions on the Malvinas Islands in no way prejudice the outcome of the negotiations, as it does its readiness to tackle bilateral problems in good faith, in a flexible framework, with an open agenda and without pre-conditions, so as to resolve differences with the United Kingdom through peaceful means, in accordance with the United Nations Charter.

Bearing in mind the report of the Secretary-General and the content of the statements made before the General Assembly in the past, my delegation once again urges the parties concerned to establish proper contacts in order to create conditions and an appropriate climate which will make it possible to hold negotiations with a view to achieving peace and stable security in the region and which will also contribute to the consolidation of the South Atlantic as a zone of peace and co-operation, in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly.

With regard to draft resolution A/43/L.27, concerning the question of the Malvinas Islands, my delegation will vote in favour of that draft resolution for reasons of principle, and because of our solidarity with and support for the people and Government of Argentina, and because we consider that it is a balanced text. We also share the view that the draft resolution in no way prejudices the outcome of

(Mr. Melendez Barahona,  
El Salvador)

the negotiations. We hope the parties concerned will make every effort and muster the necessary political will to comply with that desire. We are convinced that compliance with the draft resolution will promote understanding and reconciliation between two Member States of the United Nations with which my Government maintains excellent relations, and will put an end to a hotbed of tension that is still a matter of concern to the international community, because until a permanent, stable and lasting solution in the region is found, the risk of destroying the present relative stability remains, adversely affecting all efforts in favour of international peace and security.

Sir Crispin TICKELL (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland): Many delegations are no doubt wondering why there is a need for a debate today at all. Why go through the same arguments and vote on a draft resolution very similar to those put forward in the last six years? Why cannot the Governments of Britain and Argentina agree to talk about the issues which continue to divide them? Let me briefly explain once more why we find such difficulties with this draft resolution, and try to set out a better and more imaginative approach.

The draft resolution before the Assembly calls for negotiations on all aspects of the future of the Falkland Islands. Representatives of the Argentine Government have likewise repeatedly expressed their willingness to institute a dialogue with the United Kingdom "without pre-conditions and with an open agenda". A casual observer - and indeed several speakers today - could be forgiven for wondering why it has not been possible to begin discussions on that basis. The answer lies in what the Argentine Government means when it talks about such a dialogue, and what it means by negotiations about the future of the Islands.

(Sir Crispin Tickell, United Kingdom)

In his address to the United Nations third special session on disarmament in June, the highest authority in Argentina - President Alfonsin himself - had the following to say:

"In the spirit of peace and consistently with the provisions of the Charter of our Organization, my country affirms the need to start a broad dialogue, with an open agenda and without pre-conditions, with the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, regarding our ongoing dispute with that State over the territory of the Malvinas, South Sandwich and South Georgia Islands and the surrounding sea".

That might seem innocuous enough. But then the President went on to explain further:

"That dialogue may create conditions which will facilitate the beginning of negotiations, which, I insist, are the only method Argentina can envisage for recovering its sovereignty over those territories". (A/S-15/PV.2, p. 24-25)

In other words, the President of Argentina saw the broad dialogue with that open agenda and without those pre-conditions as the means by which Argentina could acquire sovereignty over the Falkland Islands. We are grateful to President Alfonsin for making this point so clear. It illuminates the differences between us. For the outcome he envisages is one which - let there be no doubt about it anywhere - would be unacceptable to the people of the Falkland Islands.

The people of the Falkland Islands - and their wishes - are at the heart of the British Government's policy on this question. The Falkland Islanders form a distinct and homogeneous community. Many of their families have been settled in the Islands for five or six generations, longer than many Argentine families have lived in Argentina. I said it in last year's debate, and I repeat it now: the Falkland Islands have been British for longer than Argentina has been Argentine.

(Sir Crispin Tickell,  
United Kingdom)

The Assembly should recognize, as should the Argentines, what the islanders have repeatedly made known through their elected representatives, most recently in the Fourth Committee last week: that they have no desire to become part of Argentina and that they wish to remain British. Self-determination is one of the fundamental principles of the Charter of the United Nations. It is a right dear to all Members of the Assembly which we - each of us, and especially the smaller among us - ignore at our peril. The same goes for individual human rights. My country has consistently upheld the right to self-determination and the Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. We find it strange and disturbing that they should apparently be ignored in this case.

The islanders' attitude is not hard to explain. I do not want to rub salt into the wounds of recent history. I know that the present Government of Argentina is very different from that which launched the invasion of 1982. We welcome the democratic Government of Argentina and wish it all success. But the islanders have their democratic rights too. I have been to the islands and talked to the islanders. I ask you now to understand how they feel. Six years ago their powerful neighbour, in breach of international law and the Charter of the United Nations, invaded and occupied the islands. Subsequently the Argentine Government of the day defied a mandatory resolution of the Security Council ordering it to remove its forces. It thus compounded the illegality of its action; it put an end to negotiations then in train and breached assurances it had previously given that the security, institutions and way of life of the Falkland Islanders would be safeguarded.

The invasion profoundly affected the attitude of the islanders towards Argentina, towards Argentina's protestations of goodwill, and towards

(Sir Crispin Tickell,  
United Kingdom)

Argentine assurances that under alien sovereignty their way of life would be guaranteed. Not surprisingly, we shall continue to defend them. To those in the Assembly who complained about the military exercise we conducted last March, I say this. After the armed invasion of 1982, when 84 soldiers withstood the armed might of Argentina, my Government had two possible courses: to maintain a large permanent garrison or to make sure that we could reinforce a small one in case of need. We chose to reduce our garrison to the minimum and to test from time to time our ability to reinforce the islands rapidly. Anyone who can describe a military exercise involving a few aircraft and less than 1,000 men as a grave threat to the stability of the area is abusing the credulity and good sense of the Assembly.

Let me assure the Assembly of this central point: the British Government continues, and will continue, to uphold the right of the islanders to self-determination. That is why we are not prepared to accede to calls for talks about sovereignty.

That does not mean that there is nothing else to talk about. For years Britain and Argentina enjoyed a warm and mutually beneficial relationship. Many of the old links subsist; many old friendships have not died. Since 1982 we have steadily worked to restore more normal relations between our two countries. But it is we who have made the running. For example, in September 1982 - only three months after the end of the conflict - we gave unilateral effect to the agreement reached with Argentina on the reciprocal abolition of financial restrictions. In 1983 we proposed the resumption of air links. In 1984 we took the initiative in proposing talks in Berne. In 1985 we renewed our offer through the Red Cross to permit visits by Argentine next of kin to war graves; and we offered to return the bodies of those who had fallen. Shortly thereafter we unilaterally lifted our



(Sir Crispin Tickell,  
United Kingdom)

restrictions on imports from Argentina. Even now Argentina continues to impose unilateral restrictions on British goods and commercial interests and has not responded to our proposals for a resumption of air and sea links.

In the Security Council last March I asked the Argentine Foreign Minister why Argentina had failed to respond positively to these and other British initiatives. I received no reply then, nor have we received one since, except what we have just heard from the representative of Argentina: a renewed demand for a comprehensive negotiation including the question of sovereignty. Let me therefore ask the same questions again. When will Argentina reciprocate our action over commercial and financial matters? When will Argentina respond to our proposal for resumed air links? When may we expect Argentina to lift its restrictions on imports from Britain? When will it reconsider its other unilateral measures? When will the Argentine Government allow its grieving families to visit the graves of the fallen?

Happily there is one area, one possibility, however slight, of progress. In October 1986 we invited the Argentine Government to review with us possible ways to co-operate on fisheries conservation in the south-west Atlantic. This time our invitation was not ignored. Since 1987 our two Governments have continued to exchange ideas through the United States Government about ways of working together on fisheries conservation and on reducing tension. For our part, we remain committed to developing this exchange. If trust can be established during a detailed discussion on technical issues of concern to us both, we would hope that this might form a basis for Argentina to respond to some of the British initiatives I have mentioned which are aimed at restoring normality to Anglo-Argentine relations.

(Sir Crispin Tickell,  
United Kingdom)

I much regret that the effect of this debate and the draft resolution before us is to emphasize not what we can build upon but the one issue of irreconcilable difference between Britain and Argentina: that of sovereignty. We are not ready to enter into negotiations on "all aspects on the future of the Falkland Islands" (A/43/L.27). As President Alfonsín has told us, that means the beginning of negotiations which would represent the method by which Argentina could "recover" its sovereignty over the islands. But sovereignty over the islands is not for negotiation. It is ours. The islanders wish to remain under it. Calls for negotiations which could bring it into question are pointless. To the vast majority of delegations here which maintain friendly relations with both Britain and Argentina, and which would dearly like to see us resolve our differences, I say very simply this: refrain from giving your support to this misleading draft resolution and allow us and the Argentines to try to resolve the practical problems between us in a practical way.

The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on representatives who wish to make statements in explanation of vote before the voting.

May I remind members that, in accordance with General Assembly decision 34/401, explanations of vote are limited to 10 minutes and should be made by delegations from their seats.

Mr. PHIRI (Malawi): The Chairman of my delegation has already had the opportunity of expressing to Mr. Dante Caputo the congratulations of the people and the Government of Malawi on his election to the presidency of the forty-third session of the General Assembly. He congratulated the other officers of the Assembly, also. I should like to associate myself with those sentiments.

I wish to state, too, that my delegation is completely satisfied with the manner in which the President has been conducting our work. In that connection, allow me to avail myself of this opportunity to reiterate the assurances of my delegation's readiness to co-operate with him fully at all times as he carries out the duties and responsibilities entrusted to him.

In speaking to explain my delegation's vote on the draft resolution now before the Assembly, I wish to state again Malawi's continuing belief in the principle of the peaceful resolution of differences and conflicts between States. In that connection, I should like to remind the Assembly that one of the principal corner-stones of Malawi's foreign policy is the concept of contact and dialogue - parties with differences between them coming together in order to find formulas for solutions to those conflicts or differences.

Given that, it would ordinarily appear that the draft resolution now before us merits - nay, demands - our support. However, our limited experience of the historical evolution of this draft resolution and the issue to which it pertains would caution us otherwise.

(Mr. Phiri, Malawi)

Notwithstanding that, let me reiterate the Malawi Government's continuing adherence to and support for the principles contained in the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. In that regard, allow me to state that we are not certain that these principles are at the centre of the proposals so far presented to us by either side. We look forward to the day when the problem of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) will be solved in favour of the real wishes of the people of that Territory.

My delegation will therefore be abstaining on this draft resolution.

Mrs. DITLHABI-OLIPHANT (Botswana): My delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/43/L.27, as a reaffirmation of our belief in a negotiated settlement of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) dispute.

We are talking here about negotiations free of pre-conditions and other obstructive encumbrances, negotiations that must strictly conform to the letter and spirit of the United Nations Charter. So we urge the United Kingdom and Argentina to proceed without further delay to the conference table to negotiate seriously a final end to their Falkland Islands (Malvinas) dispute.

The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform the Assembly that the Dominican Republic and Zimbabwe have decided to become co-sponsors of draft resolution A/43/L.27.

May I also inform the Assembly that the Secretary-General has reviewed this draft resolution and has indicated that he does not foresee at this time any additional programme-budget implications.

The Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolution A/43/L.27.

We shall begin the voting process. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, 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, Ethiopia, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Italy, Japan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Belize, Gambia, Oman, Sri Lanka, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Abstaining: Antigua and Barbuda, Bahrain, Belgium, Bhutan, Brunei Darussalam, Denmark, Dominica, Fiji, Finland, Germany, Federal Republic of, Grenada, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Lesotho, Luxembourg, Malawi, Maldives, Malta, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Portugal, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Solomon Islands, Swaziland, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, Vanuatu

Draft resolution A/43/L.27 was adopted by 109 votes to 5, with 37 abstentions (resolution 43/25).

The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on representatives who wish to explain their vote.

Mr. KARINEN (Finland): I have asked to speak in order to explain Finland's vote on draft resolution A/43/L.27, entitled "Question of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas)".

The question of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) is basically a dispute between two Member States, with both of which Finland has the most friendly and cordial relations.

(Mr. Karinen, Finland)

As it did in previous years in regard to similar draft resolutions, Finland abstained in the vote on the present draft resolution. Yet it is our conviction that international disputes should be solved by negotiations or other peaceful means.

Mr. JANUS (Netherlands): The Netherlands voted in favour of draft resolution A/43/L.27 because its wording does not in any way prejudge the outcome of negotiations between the United Kingdom and Argentina, and because it confirms the General Assembly's primary purpose of facilitating an early resumption of negotiations between those two countries on all issues dividing them.

Concerning the question of sovereignty, my Government firmly believes that any future arrangement should give effect to the right of self-determination of the inhabitants of the islands. Decolonization, as in the case of the Falklands, must be based on resolution 1514 (XV).

The Netherlands wishes to support efforts by the Secretary-General to engage both Governments in a dialogue to solve the differences that stand between them.

Mr. BLANC (France) (interpretation from French): France voted in favour of draft resolution A/43/L.27, concerning the Falkland Islands.

By means of this vote my country sought to associate itself with the efforts which have been made by the international community ever since the conflict of June 1982 to find a just and lasting solution to the dispute between two nations with which France has friendly relations.

My delegation is convinced that only negotiations without prior conditions and dealing with all aspects of the problem are capable of reaching a solution consistent with the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter, which provides inter alia for the peaceful settlement of disputes, international co-operation and the right of peoples to self-determination.

The vote of the French delegation is intended to support the arrangements proposed by the authors of the text to induce the parties to resolve their dispute. It should not be interpreted as a position on the substance of this question on the part of France.

The PRESIDENT: We have concluded our consideration of agenda item 34.\*

---

\* Mr. Moushoutas (Cyprus), Vice-President, took the Chair.

AGENDA ITEM 29 (continued)

## QUESTION OF NAMIBIA

- (a) REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS COUNCIL FOR NAMIBIA (A/43/24)
- (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/43/23 (Part V), A/AC.109/960)
- (c) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/43/724)
- (d) REPORT OF THE FOURTH COMMITTEE (A/43/780)
- (e) DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/43/24 (Part II), chapter I)
- (f) REPORT OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE (A/43/818)

The PRESIDENT: The Assembly has before it five draft resolutions recommended by the United Nations Council for Namibia contained in chapter I of the report of the Council, document A/43/24 (Part II).

I shall now call on those representatives who wish to introduce the draft resolutions.

Mr. DAMODARAN (India): It is an honour to introduce to the General Assembly the draft resolution prepared by the United Nations Council for Namibia on the situation resulting from the illegal occupation of the Territory by South Africa. It is a particular privilege to do so, Sir, under the presidency of yourself whom the Council for Namibia is proud to claim as one of its own.

The thrust of the draft resolution is not new. We have attempted to draft it with care and realism. On many occasions when it has been considered in the past there has been a sense of the possible. It has at moments been argued that the draft resolution is not congruent with our times. We ourselves, when drafting these resolutions, have never lost hope that positive developments would render them out of date.



(Mr. Damodaran, India)

We have lived through these moments on this occasion as well. Deadlines have been defined; deadlines have been defeated. Developments within the chronological space of the current debate have given a fresh lease of hope - fresh, yes, but not altogether unfamiliar.

The United Nations Council for Namibia hopes, as this draft resolution states, that the Security Council will be enabled to act decisively and without further delay to take appropriate action to ensure that Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and the United Nations plan approved within it is not undermined or modified in any way and that it is fully respected and implemented.

The draft resolution would call for redoubling and intensification of efforts reflected in measures taken by some States, international organizations, parliamentarians, institutions and non-governmental organizations to put pressure on the racist régime of South Africa.

It would declare that all foreign economic interests operating in Namibia are liable to pay damages to the future legitimate Government of an independent Namibia. Those foreign economic, financial and other interests operating in Namibia constitute a major obstacle to its independence.

We would reiterate approval of initiation of legal proceedings in the domestic courts of States against corporations or individuals involved in exploitation, transport, processing or purchase of Namibia's natural resources. These proceedings would be initiated by the United Nations Council for Namibia as part of its efforts to give effect to its Decree for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia.

The draft resolution would request the United Nations Council for Namibia to continue to monitor the boycott of South Africa and to submit to the Assembly at its next regular session a comprehensive report on all contacts between Member

(Mr. Damodaran, India)

States and South Africa containing an analysis of information received from Member States and other sources on the continuing political, financial and other relations of States as well as their economic and other interest groups with South Africa, and of measures taken by those States to terminate all dealings with the racist régime. It would request all States which have not already done so to take legislative, administrative and other measures, individually as well as collectively, pending the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions, to isolate the racist régime politically, economically, militarily and culturally.

It would call upon the Security Council to tighten the arms embargo imposed against South Africa and to ensure its application to illegally occupied Namibia.

It would reaffirm that the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the national liberation movement of Namibia, is the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people and that only with its direct and full participation can the genuine independence of Namibia be achieved. It would reiterate that there are only two parties to the conflict in Namibia: the Namibian people represented by SWAPO, and the racist régime of South Africa. It would express appreciation to the front-line States and SWAPO for their statesmanlike and constructive attitude in efforts to implement Security Council resolution 435 (1978). It would call upon Member States, specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system to render sustained and increased support and assistance to SWAPO to enable it to intensify its struggle for the liberation of Namibia.

(Mr. Damodaran, India)

I have attempted very briefly to highlight some salient features of the draft resolution before us. We have endeavoured to make it briefer and more concise than similar resolutions in the past. We have tried to sharpen its thrust. On behalf of all my colleagues in the Drafting Committee of the United Nations Council for Namibia I should like to express our deepest thanks and appreciation to all who contributed to this effort and, on behalf of the Council itself, to commend it to this Assembly for adoption. The United Nations Council for Namibia throughout its history has seen many lights at the end of the tunnel. Almost always these have been the lights of an oncoming train threatening to derail our efforts. The support and trust reposed in us by this Assembly of nations have ensured that that threat, whenever it materialized, was squelched.

The draft resolution would reaffirm the mandate of the United Nations Council for Namibia as the legal Administering Authority for Namibia until its independence. It would reaffirm the decision of this Assembly that the United Nations Council for Namibia should proceed to establish its administration in Namibia to terminate racist South Africa's illegal occupation of the Territory. The United Nations Council for Namibia is conscious of the overwhelming responsibility these decisions place upon it. As protector of the only Territory for which the United Nations bears direct responsibility, it has done and will continue to do its utmost to fulfil that mandate. With the will and the strength given to it by the resolve of this Assembly, the people of Namibia, whose steadfast courage we salute, shall be given the right to be their own masters. No longer shall there be strangers in their place.

The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Guyana, to introduce draft resolution B.

Mr. INSANALLY (Guyana): I have the honour, on behalf of the United Nations Council for Namibia, to introduce for the consideration of the Assembly

(Mr. Insanally, Guyana)

draft resolution B, entitled "Implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978)", contained in document A/43/24 (Part II).

As has been noted by many speakers in this debate, recent developments, more specifically the quadripartite talks between Angola, Cuba and South Africa, with the United States as mediator, have brought the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia into new focus. There now appears to be cautious optimism that these talks will bring peace to south-western Africa and create conditions which can bring about the independence of Namibia. In question, however, is the bona fides of South Africa, which has in the past repeatedly deceived the international community in the matter of Namibia's independence.

In the face of uncertainty, therefore, the international community would do well to remember that the only internationally accepted basis for Namibia's transition to independence is the United Nations plan endorsed by Security Council resolution 435 (1978). In this context, we may recall that, when the Security Council adopted resolution 435 (1978) approving the report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of a proposal for a definitive settlement of the Namibian question, in 1978, the provisions of the resolution were accepted by both South Africa and the South West Africa People's Organisation (SWAPO), the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people. After difficult and protracted negotiations all the necessary conditions for the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) were deemed to have been fulfilled. However, because of South Africa's intransigence and duplicity, that resolution remains to this day unimplemented.

As seen from the most recent reports of the Secretary-General covering the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), South Africa continues to frustrate the diplomatic efforts which have been made to secure its compliance. Ten years have now elapsed since the adoption of the plan for independence, and the Namibian people are still without their freedom. It is certainly not just that

(Mr. Insanally, Guyana)

they be made to wait indefinitely for the attainment of their fundamental human rights. The international community must, therefore, continue to insist on the need for South Africa to honour resolution 435 (1978).

In accordance with Security Council resolution 601 (1987), of 30 October 1987, the Secretary-General has proceeded to arrange a cease-fire between South Africa and SWAPO in order to undertake the administrative and other practical steps necessary for the emplacement of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group. That resolution represented a clear and unambiguous affirmation by the international community of the imperative need to proceed with the implementation of the United Nations plan without further delay. The way should now be clear for South Africa's prompt withdrawal from Namibia and the swift transfer of power to the people of that Territory.

The draft resolution before the Assembly takes note of these realities and reiterates the cardinal principles which inform the position of the United Nations on the question of Namibia's independence. It thus reaffirms Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978) as the only internationally accepted basis for a peaceful settlement and demands their full and unconditional implementation.

The text also places particular emphasis on the fact that the only parties to the conflict in Namibia are on the one hand the Namibian people represented by SWAPO, their sole and authentic representative, and on the other the racist régime of South Africa, which illegally occupies the Territory. It firmly rejects and condemns the persistent attempts to establish a linkage or parallelism between the independence of Namibia and any extraneous and irrelevant issues, in particular the presence of Cuban forces in Angola. It declares unequivocally that all such attempts are designed to delay further the decolonization of Namibia and, moreover, constitute gross and unwarranted interference in the internal affairs of Angola.

(Mr. Insanally, Guyana)

South Africa is, therefore, strongly condemned for obstructing the implementation of all relevant Security Council resolutions on the question of Namibia and for installing a so-called interim government in Namibia on 17 June 1985. This last measure has already been declared null and void, and consequently the international community is urged once again to refrain from according recognition or extending co-operation to any régime imposed by the illegal South African administration upon the Namibian people in violation of United Nations resolutions.

The draft resolution further underlines the responsibility of the Security Council for the implementation of its resolutions on Namibia in view of the threat which South Africa's intransigence poses to regional and international peace and security.

It notes with satisfaction the statement made by the Council on the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the adoption of resolution 435 (1978), in which South Africa is strongly urged to comply forthwith with all relevant resolutions and decisions.

Finally, in recognition of the personal commitment of the Secretary-General to the cause of Namibia's independence, the text conveys to him the appreciation of Member States and asks that he continue his valiant endeavours to secure the fulfilment of all United Nations resolutions relating to the future of Namibia.

These, then, are the main elements of draft resolution B, on the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). They combine to provide a forward thrust to the ongoing campaign of the United Nations to liberate Namibia from apartheid's cruel rule. Therefore I am pleased to commend it to the General Assembly for unanimous support.

The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Turkey, who will introduce draft resolution C.

Mr. SAVUT (Turkey): I have the honour to introduce for the consideration of the General Assembly draft resolution C, on the programme of work of the United Nations Council for Namibia.

The draft resolution seeks to articulate and elaborate the practical measures by which the United Nations Council for Namibia, in the discharge of its responsibilities as the legal Administering Authority for Namibia until independence, could advance the cause of Namibia.

In this tenth year since the adoption of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, the people of the Territory once again find themselves in a situation where the independence of their country has become the subject of much talk and speculation. In this regard, the United Nations Council for Namibia has on more than one occasion expressed hope for the success of the quadripartite talks between Angola, Cuba and South Africa, with the United States as mediator, because it believes that would facilitate the implementation of the United Nations plan endorsed by Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

However, it must be emphasized once again that responsibility for Namibia remains with the United Nations until the Territory achieves its independence. This responsibility was delegated by the General Assembly to the United Nations Council for Namibia more than two decades ago when it created the Council for Namibia as the legal Administering Authority for the Territory. Consequently, the programme of work of the Council for Namibia contained in the draft resolution before the Assembly, seeks to elaborate practical ways by which the Council could exercise its mandate effectively. More specifically, it defines the modalities by which the Council for Namibia would represent Namibia, protect the resources and

(Mr. Savut, Turkey)

interests of the Territory and its people, and prepare Namibians for independence. This task is as challenging today as it has ever been.

The activities of the Council for Namibia fall into the following four broad categories: the promotion of the independence of Namibia, mobilization of international support for the cause of Namibia, protection of the resources of the Territory and the interests of its people; and the preparation of Namibians for the challenges and responsibilities of independence.

First and foremost, by draft resolution C, the Assembly requests the United Nations Council for Namibia to consult with the South West Africa People's Organization in the formulation and implementation of its programme of work, as well as on all matters of interest to the Namibian people. It decides that, among other things, the Council shall send missions of consultation to Governments, to co-ordinate efforts in support of the implementation of the United Nations resolutions on the question of Namibia, review the compliance of Member States with United Nations decisions and resolutions, prepare periodic reports on the political, economic, military, legal and social situation in and relating to Namibia, and review the progress of the liberation struggle in all its aspects.

The draft resolution calls on the Council for Namibia to organize international and regional activities to obtain relevant information on all aspects of the situation in and relating to Namibia, in particular the exploitation of the people and the resources of the Territory by South African and other foreign economic interests. The Council for Namibia is also called upon to secure the territorial integrity of Namibia as a unitary State, including Walvis Bay, the Penguin and other offshore islands. The Council for Namibia is further called upon to continue to take measures to ensure the full implementation of Decree No. 1 for



(Mr. Savut, Turkey)

the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia, including legal proceedings in the domestic courts of States.

Addressing itself to an important responsibility of the Council for Namibia, the draft resolution states that the Council for Namibia shall represent Namibia in United Nations conferences and intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations, bodies and conferences, in order to ensure that the rights and interests of Namibia shall be adequately protected. In this connection, the draft resolution reiterates its request to all specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system to grant full membership to Namibia, represented by the United Nations Council for Namibia, so that the Council may participate as the legal Administering Authority for Namibia, in the work of those agencies and organizations; and to grant a waiver for the assessment of Namibia during the period in which it is represented by the United Nations Council for Namibia.

The programme of work envisages that the Council for Namibia shall continue to promote the independence of Namibia as the single most important aspect of its mandate. To that end, the draft resolution calls upon the Council for Namibia to continue to mobilize international support to press for the speedy withdrawal of the illegal South African administration from Namibia and to continue to seek the rejection and non-recognition by all States of all kinds of schemes through which South Africa attempts to perpetuate its illegal presence in Namibia.

The struggle of the Namibian people for self-determination and national independence, under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), and the efforts of the United Nations to bring about Namibia's independence, must be backed by decisive action if they are to be successful. The

(Mr. Savut, Turkey)

draft resolution before the Assembly provides a framework for achieving that cardinal objective. It is, therefore, my delegation's sincere hope that draft resolution C on the programme of work of the United Nations Council for Namibia will enjoy the unanimous support of the General Assembly.

The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Bulgaria, who will introduce draft resolution D.

Mr. KULOV (Bulgaria): It is my pleasure and privilege to introduce to the General Assembly for its positive consideration draft resolution D, on 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 black-out of news on Namibia imposed by the illegal South African régime and the campaign of slander and disinformation which that régime continues to carry out against the United Nations and the liberation struggle of the Namibian people.

(Mr. Kulov, Bulgaria)

In pursuance of the objective of intensifying the international campaign in favour of Namibia's cause, the draft resolution requests the United Nations Council for Namibia, 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 the world public to the current situation in 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 United Nations Council for Namibia 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

(Mr. Kulov, Bulgaria)

of silence on Namibia on the part of the media in certain countries. The draft resolution requests the United Nations Council for Namibia to organize media encounters on developments relating to Namibia, particularly prior to major activities organized by the Council for Namibia during 1989, in order to counteract such problems.

The draft resolution calls on Member States to broadcast programmes on their national radio and television networks and to publish material in their official news media about the situation in and around Namibia and the obligation of Governments and peoples to assist in every possible way in the struggle of the Namibian people for independence.

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 would be a means of bringing pressure on Pretoria and its allies to comply with the 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 draft resolution the General Assembly would decide to allocate resources to be used by the United Nations Council for Namibia for its programme

(Mr. Kulov, Bulgaria)

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 United Nations Council for Namibia 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, 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 public 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.

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

The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Venezuela, to introduce draft resolution E.

Mr. CARNEVALI (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 United Nations Fund for Namibia was established by the General Assembly in 1971 in recognition of the fact that, once South Africa's Mandate over Namibia was terminated, the United Nations, having assumed direct responsibility for the

(Mr. Carnevali, Venezuela)

Territory until its independence, had thereby assumed the solemn obligation to help the people of Namibia in its struggle for independence and to provide it with material assistance to that end.

The assistance programmes of the Council for Namibia have been growing in both quantitative and qualitative terms since the beginning of the 1970s. In the period between 1 January 1987 and 30 June 1988 the total expenditure of the Fund for Namibia was some \$US 14 million - a sum made up basically of voluntary contributions from the international community.

In recent years the various programmes have been organized through three different accounts. The first is the general account, which provides for educational, social and medical assistance to Namibians. The most important activity charged to this account is a fellowship programme which at the present time is sponsoring 266 Namibian students in 17 countries.

Secondly, there is the Nationhood Programme for Namibia account, which provides for an extensive programme of assistance directed towards development encompassing both the period before independence and the first few years of independence. The programme provides for research, training and educational activities. Over the years a large number of socio-economic studies on Namibia have been prepared under the auspices of the Nationhood Programme for Namibia, but training and education are being given increasing attention at present. There are several hundred Namibians currently benefiting from this type of assistance.

(Mr. Carnevali, Venezuela)

Thirdly, there is the United Nations Institute for Namibia account, which provides the financial base for the training and research activities of the United Nations Institute for Namibia, in Lusaka, Zambia, in which 562 students are currently enrolled.

I am glad to say that the implementation of the assistance programmes is proceeding satisfactorily. The implementation rate of the various projects continues to be high and an increasing number of Namibians are benefiting from the various activities carried out through the three accounts. There can be little doubt that all these activities will have important long-term effects and help prepare Namibians to govern their country efficiently and effectively after independence. In this regard it is important to bear in mind that the majority of the activities involve multi-annual programmes that will gradually be terminated in an orderly manner once Namibia has achieved independence. Therefore, even after the settlement of the question, it will be necessary to draw on large sums of money during a transitional period to keep to a minimum any disruption of the programmes under way, in particular in education and training.

Bearing in mind all these facts, the present draft resolution proposes allocation to the United Nations Fund for Namibia of the sum of \$1.5 million from the regular budget of the United Nations for 1989. In the draft resolution the Secretary-General and the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia are requested to intensify appeals to Governments, intergovernmental organizations and non-governmental organizations and individuals for more generous voluntary contributions to the three Fund accounts.

In conclusion, I should like to point out that after independence Namibia's need for development assistance will increase considerably. After years of colonial rule the Namibians will take over the reins of their own destiny and one

(Mr. Carnevali, Venezuela)

can assume that they will embark upon an extensive programme of social and economic development and national reconstruction for the benefit of the entire Namibian people. This will be a monumental endeavour, which will require a vast financial input from both bilateral and multilateral sources. Bearing in mind that the United Nations has been directly responsible for Namibia for more than 22 years, I am confident that the Organization, within the proper institutional framework, will continue to contribute to the implementation of broad, development-oriented programmes even in the period following independence.

After this brief introduction I commend draft resolution E, on the question of Namibia, to the Assembly for unanimous adoption.

The PRESIDENT: I now call on those representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote before the voting on any or all of the five draft resolutions contained in chapter I of document A/43/24 (Part II).

May I remind delegations that in accordance with General Assembly decision 34/401, such statements are limited to 10 minutes and should be made by delegations from their places. Representatives will also have an opportunity to explain their vote after all the votes have been taken.

Mrs. DITLEABI-OLIPHANT (Botswana): My delegation will vote in favour of draft resolutions A and B, even though circumstances beyond our control constrain us to declare our incapacity to implement paragraphs in these draft resolutions which call for economic sanctions against South Africa. We will not, however, stand in the way of those that can impose and implement economic sanctions against South Africa and decide to do so.

Mr. NZERITIS (Greece): I have the honour to make the following statement on behalf of the 12 member States of the European Community on the draft resolutions now before the General Assembly.



(Mr. Nazeritis, Greece)

The international community's goal is common and clear: Namibia's independence at the earliest possible date. The Twelve wish to stress once again our full, constant and unequivocal support for the settlement plan endorsed by Security Council resolution 435 (1978). We have called on South Africa to implement the settlement plan immediately and without pre-conditions.

Against this background it is unfortunate that a number of controversial elements remain in the draft resolutions. We recognize the efforts made to shorten them substantially and the fact that some of the language that has caused problems in recent years has been omitted, in particular in draft resolution 1.

Let me now briefly revert to some of the well-known reservations the Twelve have on the draft resolutions.

Even though we share the impatience and frustration of the Namibian people at South Africa's continuing occupation of their country, we cannot support armed struggle as a means of bringing Namibia to independence. We remain convinced that 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. For this reason we cannot endorse calls for military assistance to the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO).

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 these groups, therefore, should be designated in advance as the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people.

Owing to a 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. In our

(Mr. Nezeritis, Greece)

view, the total isolation of South Africa could only hinder efforts to secure implementation of the United Nations settlement plan.

The Twelve reject any arbitrary and selective singling out of individual countries or groups of countries. Unchanged also remains our respect for the division of competence among the main bodies of the Organization. The Security Council alone is authorized to take decisions that are binding upon Member States.

I must also register our concern at the financial implications of some of the draft resolutions before us. We have particularly in mind, inter alia, the proposal that the United Nations Council for Namibia should hold extraordinary plenary meetings away from its headquarters contrary to the provisions of resolution 40/243 of the General Assembly. As with any new expenditure in the current financial situation, the position will need to be carefully monitored in the light of developments.

Furthermore, we note the failure to take into account in the draft resolutions the fact that the prospects for Namibian independence have improved since last year, notably owing to ongoing negotiations between Angola, Cuba and South Africa, with the mediation of the United States of America.

The Twelve remain firmly and unequivocally committed to the independence of Namibia in accordance with Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978) without delay or pre-conditions.

(Mr. Nezeritis, Greece)

We welcome the understandings reached recently in Geneva and hope they will lead to the implementation of the United Nations settlement plan at an early date. The Secretary-General will, of course, have a crucial role to play in the settlement plan and its implementation.

We hope that in the near future Namibia will at last be able to take its place in the United Nations as a full and sovereign Member of our international community.

Mr. MUDENGE (Zimbabwe): The voting on this item is taking place in the aftermath of the recent Geneva quadripartite talks on south-western Africa. We do not know what was agreed to in Geneva. The four delegations are now reporting to their respective Governments. We would be ill-advised to be euphoric at this stage.

The apartheid Foreign Minister's initial reaction enjoins us to be cautious.

"We will have to study", says Mr. Botha, "what this round of talks has produced in detail to see whether there is a possibility of agreement. There are serious and complicated implications at this stage. At this stage, no conclusion can be made as to whether what has happened in Geneva will be acceptable to the South African Government."

We therefore hold our peace on this, but while we wait we should not relent in our pressure to force Pretoria to end its illegal occupation of Namibia, because the Namibian problem remains unresolved so long as apartheid South Africa persists in its colonial and illegal occupation of Namibia.

Strenuous diplomatic efforts were exerted here in New York and in various capitals across the globe to block the present debate on Namibia in the Assembly. The reason given was that the tone of the debate might jeopardize the negotiations on south-western Africa quite accidentally - so we were asked to believe - coinciding with the renewed quadripartite negotiations. "We are on the home

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

stretch", we were informed. "The negotiations have reached a delicate stage; do not upset the applecart", we were warned.

Fortunately, we had heard that one once too often; as Aesop admonishes us in his famous fable, one can cry wolf only once. So we went ahead with the debate, but the effect on the delicate negotiations was in no way negative. If anything, the demonstration of the international community's resolve to bring Namibia to independence could only have had a salutary effect on the interlocutors in Geneva.

Namibia is first and foremost a responsibility of the United Nations. We, collectively, have a duty to bring self-determination and independence to that Territory. It is our obligation and our right to involve ourselves in the process of bringing Namibia to independence. This is a responsibility we dare not shirk, delegate or allow to be hijacked. It is a mandated trust of honour that we must fulfil. It compels all of us to speak out.

For over a year now the United Nations has stood by largely as an observer as efforts have been exerted, at times surreptitiously, to smuggle issues extraneous to Namibian independence into the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). That could not be allowed to continue without a challenge. This debate has served as a warning to those intending to hold Namibian independence hostage to extraneous issues that the international community will not tolerate it.

In the early days many used to assume that the so-called linkage meant the removal of Cuban troops from Angola in exchange for South African withdrawal from Namibia and independence for that Territory. Now we are all better informed. Linkage includes, among other things, some political engineering within Angola. It involves attempts to change the political coloration of the Angolan Government as a pre-condition of Namibian independence. Unless Savimbi's UNITA is accommodated

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

within the Angolan political system, we now find out, the people of Namibia will not be allowed to be free. Their independence is conditional - yes, dependent - upon what is called an acceptable internal political solution emerging in Angola.

To describe such a stage in these negotiations as delicate is an abuse of the English language. This is an outrageous proposition, and we must speak out and say loudly and urgently that Namibian independence should not be made a prisoner to such extraneous issues. The issues involving purely Angolan, Cuban, United States and South African relations are matters among those four sovereign States. This Assembly has no role in that. But Namibian independence is its business and those Members that involve themselves with that issue must respect the views of this body; and the position of the United Nations is that no Member or group of Members has a right to embroil the decolonization process of Namibia in quarrels that are extraneous to Namibian independence. Zimbabwe is aware of and hails the valiant sacrifices and important contributions made by Angola and Cuba in order to bring a peaceful settlement to the conflict in south-western Africa. However, Zimbabwe will never accept that Namibian independence be delayed until a solution is found concerning the role of Savimbi and his UNITA bands in Angola.

We may be entering one of those phases in which Pretoria appears to be willing to get out of Namibia, but let us not forget that in the past the Pretoria mule has come to the well only to refuse to drink. Will it drink this time? If so, how messy will the process be?

Before answering those questions let us first examine why resolution 435 (1978) has not so far been implemented. What have been the stumbling-blocks to its implementation? We have already mentioned and rejected the so-called linkages and conditionalities concerning Namibian independence, but those have usually only

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

provided camouflage for the true reasons, which can be simply summed up as Pretoria's reluctance to relinquish its control over Namibia.

But why has Pretoria been so reluctant - and is still so reluctant - to get out of Namibia? And if it agrees to do so now, why is that so and how does it hope to safeguard its interests?

Pretoria has powerful internal and regional considerations that have militated against Namibian independence and that will continue to be factors in its considerations. The so-called Caprivi Strip in Namibia is like a dagger that South Africa holds against the southern African region. From its air base in the Caprivi Strip, Pretoria casts an ominous shadow over the whole region. It is hard for the military establishment of the aggressive apartheid régime to let go of this strategic advantage without some compensation. In the defence of apartheid the Caprivi Strip has been a major asset.

Secondly, according to the 1987 report of Standing Committee II of the United Nations Council for Namibia,

"One of the major reasons for South Africa's continued illegal occupation of Namibia and the support that it receives from its Western allies has been the interest both have in perpetuating their unimpeded access to, and exploitation of, the Territory's key base metals."

Namibia's mineral wealth bolsters South Africa's image as a key supplier of strategic minerals to the Western world. Considering that the image of South Africa as a storehouse of strategic metals needed by the Western countries is largely overstated, it is not surprising that the apartheid régime has been clinging to mineral-rich Namibia and will find it difficult to let go.

Furthermore the Botha régime has had internal political reasons for remaining in Namibia. It has been frightened by the extreme Afrikaner right wing. The right

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

wing fears that if Botha can give in on Namibia he will sooner or later give in over apartheid as the blacks in South Africa, inspired by the independence of Namibia, increase the pressure for justice and equity in South Africa.

In recent days South Africa has strengthened and enlarged its military bases in Windhoek and the Caprivi Strip. Large-scale troop movements have been observed as Pretoria has poured massive numbers of men and huge quantities of equipment into Namibia since August this year. In Namibia itself repression and activities against the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) are reaching new heights. SWAPO supporters are being arrested or physically eliminated.

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

The régime's present anti-SWAPO campaign has now reached epidemic proportions. Are these actions part of Pretoria's swan song or are they meant to entrench its control irrespective of what happens in Namibia? Pretoria's so-called internal settlement in Namibia was meant to leave its puppets in the driving seat in that Territory. Is the international community about to be used to achieve this dastardly objective?

Let us now go back to the question of whether or not Pretoria is finally ready to leave Namibia. In view of its history of deceit and treachery when it comes to the Namibian independence process, Pretoria must do a great deal more before we can accept its bona fides. Its actions to date leave us unimpressed. They do not show evidence of a sudden conversion to accepting genuine independence for Namibia. They appear to us to be reluctant and calculated responses to pressures and threats from the outside. Pretoria retreated from southern Angola, not because it suddenly discovered the illegality of its aggression against Angola. No, it was chased out of Angola with a bloodied nose after being defeated at Cuito Cuanavale. It is now building heavy troop concentrations south of the Angolan border in Namibia in readiness for its next move. But what is that move to be? Is it the decimation of SWAPO and entrenchment of the puppets? Some have seen Botha's recent forays into the African interior, with all the dangers of being bitten by Gabon vipers and other tropical serpents, not to mention the risks of the political quicksands, as evidence that the apartheid régime is changing and is now ready to give Namibia its independence. Unfortunately, the truth is somewhat less edifying than that. What Botha is doing is to fight isolation and international sanctions by appearing to make his peace with Africa. Sanctions, especially the reluctance of the international banking community and other financial institutions to grant his



(Mr. Muḡenge, Zimbabwe)

régime desperately needed loans, is beginning to hurt his economy badly. Botha reasons that if he can appear to be making his peace with Africa then his world-wide isolation will be broken and he will get the much needed infusion of new capital into his ailing economy.

What moves Pretoria? The régime moved out of southern Angola because of the increasing cost of aggression in military, economic and political terms. Militarily, South Africa was defeated in southern Angola. The death rate of young white South African military conscripts in Angola became politically unacceptable. Economically, Pretoria was spending about R 1 billion a year providing support for UNITA as well as a R 700 million allocation in Namibia itself.

It was military defeat and the fear of sanctions and isolation that finally drove a desperate Pretoria into the interior of Africa. It was not dialogue or constructive engagement that did it. And if Namibia were to become free, it will not be because of those reasons either.

Finally, this debate has been important in refocusing pressure on Pretoria and rejecting the introduction of extraneous issues to, or the modification of, the Namibian independence plan, as well as in reminding all of us that bringing Namibia to independence is a responsibility of the United Nations. The Assembly will not tolerate clandestine efforts to load the Namibian plan with extraneous issues or any attempts to modify that plan in any way whatsoever, no matter whence they originate.

The pressure exerted by SWAPO in the fighting in Namibia has raised the cost of occupation. It is now, more than ever, vital that the international community should increase its support, both diplomatic and material, to the struggling people of Namibia, led by SWAPO, their sole and authentic representative. We hail the combatants of the People's Liberation Army of Namibia (PLAN). We salute all the

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

patriotic forces of Namibia. Namibia shall be free. A luta continua! Next year, in Windhoek!

In order to send a strong message to Pretoria to get out of Namibia forthwith, Zimbabwe will vote in favour of all the draft resolutions before us today, and urges others to do the same.

Mr. PHIRI (Malawi): In introducing the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia to the Assembly, its President, Mr. P. D. Zuze, expressed the hope that this would be the last time the Assembly would be called upon to deliberate on the question of Namibia, and that by the time the forty-fourth session convened, the people of Namibia would have attained their independence and national sovereignty. My delegation would like to echo that hope. Indeed, the developments of the past few months would seem to give cause for such optimism, even if guarded. How we would like to believe that the actions which the Assembly will be taking on the draft resolutions now before us will help to contribute to the fulfilment of that hope!

My delegation will be voting for the draft resolutions now before us, including draft resolutions A and B, as a mark of our support for the aspirations of the Namibian people, as well as a manifestation of our non-acceptance of South Africa's continued occupation and control of Namibia in defiance of United Nations resolutions.

However, I should like to state that, in doing so, my delegation will not consider itself as being bound by, or in any way lending its support for, certain aspects of those draft resolutions that are contrary to the principles on which Malawi's external relations are based. We have enunciated these before on numerous occasions: they are well known to members of the Assembly, and therefore we shall

(Mr. Phiri, Malawi)

not enumerate them here. However, my delegation would like to state that it will reserve its position on the relevant paragraphs to which they apply.

Mr. SERVAIS (Belgium) (interpretation from French): Once again the General Assembly has held a long debate to the question of Namibia. This afforded the international community an opportunity to reiterate its dedication to independence for that Territory.

My country deeply regrets that Namibia should still be illegally occupied by South Africa, whereas for almost a quarter of a century now that country has been placed under the direct responsibility of our Organization.

As a member of the United Nations Council for Namibia, Belgium already had occasion to express its satisfaction with the effort undertaken to abbreviate the texts of the draft resolutions submitted to us. We hope that that effort will continue. Moreover, we note with pleasure that in one of the draft resolutions, account was taken of some of our objections.

However, if my delegation did not oppose the consensus whereby the Council for Namibia put its report and draft resolutions before the General Assembly, it was essentially in order to reaffirm yet again our unshakeable support of the right of the people of Namibia to self-determination and independence.

In fact, despite the improvements made in some of them, the draft resolutions still pose certain difficulties, which the Permanent Representative of Greece has already mentioned on behalf of the 12 member countries of the European Community.

A certain number of consistent principles in our international policy lead my country to maintain our earlier reservations.

My delegation will abstain in the votes on draft resolutions A, B and D, which concern respectively the situation in Namibia, the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) and the dissemination of information. The reasons for this threefold abstention have already been repeatedly explained.

(Mr. Servais, Belgium)

In draft resolution A, for instance, my country maintains its reservations concerning the status attributed to the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO). We regret that certain paragraphs do not fully take into account the particular functions of the Security Council. These two remarks, incidentally, also apply to draft resolution B.

Still with respect to draft resolution A, Belgium has reservations concerning support for armed struggle, the selective mention of countries, the breaking of all relations with South Africa, the appeal to sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter and the criticism levelled against Western countries members of the Security Council.

(Mr. Servais, Belgium)

Finally, my delegation could have voted in favour of paragraph 59 had it been voted on separately.

With respect to draft resolution D, my delegation, while recognizing the need to inform public opinion on the question of Namibia, regrets that the mobilization campaign should be used too often for channelling concepts with which Belgium cannot identify.

My country will vote in favour of draft resolution C, on the programme of work of the Council for Namibia, but would recall the reservations expressed by the representative of Greece on behalf of the Twelve member States of the European Community during consideration of financial implications in the Fifth Committee. Similarly, we shall vote in favour of draft resolution E, on the United Nations Fund for Namibia.

Belgium shares the feelings of frustration of the people of Namibia. We hope that the recent agreement reached in Geneva will allow for the rapid implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). In that connection we fully support the efforts of the Secretary-General. We hope that Namibia will thus, in the near future, accede to independence.

Mr. CORR (Ireland): Ireland fully shares the views expressed by Greece on behalf of the Twelve member States of the European Community.

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

Ireland has consistently supported the right of the Namibian people to independence. We have repeatedly condemned the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa. This occupation has been an affront to this Organization, to the international community and to the people of Namibia, who have experienced so much hardship and suffering. Ireland believes that the people of Namibia must be given

(Mr. Corr, Ireland)

the freedom to exercise their fundamental and inalienable right to self-determination in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

Ireland welcomes the understandings reached in Geneva earlier this week. We share the hope expressed by many delegations that the transition period to full Namibian independence under United Nations control will commence in the near future. We believe that the role of the Secretary-General will be of the greatest importance in the implementation of the settlement plan and pledge our full support for his endeavours.

I should now like to explain, against this background, our position on the five draft resolutions. We shall vote in favour of three of the draft resolutions and abstain on two.

We support many of the provisions contained in draft resolution A, on the situation in Namibia, but unfortunately there are a number of formulations which we are unable to accept. Several paragraphs of the draft give explicit support to armed struggle. We have made clear in the past our opposition to any endorsement of violence by this Assembly, even if we can fully understand the anger and frustration which drives Namibians to take up arms to secure independence. I should also say that we do not believe that the selective singling out for criticism and condemnation of certain groups of countries in this and other draft resolutions can promote our common objective in this Assembly. My delegation will therefore abstain on draft resolution A.

My delegation will support draft resolution B, on the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). We believe that this draft resolution is the only basis for a settlement and we fully support the objectives and goals set out in it. 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

(Mr. Corr, Ireland)

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.

Ireland will also 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 the illegal occupation of Namibia. Nevertheless, we continue to have 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 support many of the provisions of the draft and would have wished to be able to vote in favour of it. However, we do not regard it as helpful to appeal to non-governmental organizations and others to expose and campaign against political and economic collaboration of certain Western Governments with South Africa. Such a campaign, in our view, could well be damaging to the common objectives we all share.

Finally, I wish to mention draft resolution E, on the United Nations Fund for Namibia. My delegation will continue to vote in favour of this draft resolution. We believe the Fund 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. WALTERS (United States of America): It is clear that the question of Namibia is one which continues to concern a large number of countries and which arouses considerable passion. The lengthy list of speakers in the debate over the past three days bears proof of that.

(Mr. Walters, United States)

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 and no right to control the internal and external policies of that country. This debate bears witness to the international community's firm resolve to end South African administration of Namibia and bring Namibia to independence in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

It appears that long, painstaking and difficult negotiations aimed at achieving independence for Namibia on the basis of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) reached an important dénouement on Tuesday in Geneva. It has been agreed among delegations from South Africa, Angola and Cuba that a final round of negotiations will be held shortly in Brazzaville. This meeting in Brazzaville should mark the end of the negotiations and set in train the independence process envisaged under Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

There is peace along the Cunene River. The parties to the negotiations have not only worked hard to bring independence to Namibia but have sought to create a framework for enduring peace and stability in South West Africa. The calendar for redeployment and withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola, which was discussed in Geneva this past week, is but one of the interlocking elements of an effort aimed at fulfilling the objectives of the Charter in that troubled region of the world. In that context I wish to emphasize the continuing commitment of the United States to national reconciliation in Angola.

It has been the practice of my Government and other members of the Contact Group to abstain on the annual series of draft resolutions about Namibia. The United States will abstain again this year. We do not do so out of any



(Mr. Walters, United States)

indifference to the fate of Namibia or the Namibian people and far less from any particular affinity for the positions and policies of the Government of South Africa, which has been illegally administering the Territory. In fact our concerted decision to abstain on these draft resolutions stems from our concern with the situation in Namibia and our desire that Namibia should achieve a solid and lasting independence in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which we helped to create over 10 years ago. Abstention is a means of demonstrating to all parties that we remain impartial in the conflict, concentrating our energies on the search for peace. We wish to do nothing to endanger that outcome.

It is unfortunate that the positive developments emerging from the hard work of the parties to the negotiations are given no expression in the draft resolutions before this Assembly. We take exception to repeated reference in the resolutions to the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) as the "sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people". Only the free and democratic elections which will be held under the procedures established in Security Council resolution 435 (1978) will provide the Namibian people themselves the opportunity to choose whom they want as their representatives.

Once again the draft resolutions condemn and reject the policy of "constructive engagement". We would simply observe that it is as a result of our continued engagement that the negotiations have reached their present promising stage.

(Mr. Walters, United States)

Finally, these draft resolutions again call for the imposition of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa for its failure to grant independence to Namibia. The position of the United States on such sanctions is well known to this body.

In conclusion, I should like to reiterate my Government's firm and active commitment to the search for peace in southwestern Africa and the prompt independence of Namibia, under Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

Mr. BLANC (France) (interpretation from French): The French delegation subscribes entirely to the statement just made by the representative of Greece on behalf of the twelve States members of the European Community on the five draft resolutions dealing with Namibia on which the General Assembly will vote today.

France, which was actively involved in the preparation of the United Nations plan for Namibia, contained in Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978), continues to be firmly dedicated to the rapid implementation of this plan.

My country is therefore gratified that, by virtue of the progress made in the current negotiations, a settlement of the Namibian question is at last taking shape. France is pleased that the intransigence and the pre-conditions that had stood in the way of implementation of resolution 435 (1978) have ceased to be insurmountable obstacles to Namibia's accession to independence. We hope that the process for which provision is made will commence as soon as possible.

France has stated repeatedly that it is willing to contribute to the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia. Quite recently my Government restated its willingness to provide such assistance, within the framework of the special responsibilities conferred on it by the Charter.

(Mr. Blanc, France)

That is the spirit in which the French delegation, in accordance with the stand it has taken at previous sessions, will refrain from taking a position on the five draft resolutions before the General Assembly.

Mr. DA COSTA FERREIRA (Portugal): Portugal shares the reservations held in common by the twelve States members of the European Community, as expressed by the representative of Greece. I should like now to explain my delegation's position on the draft resolutions before the Assembly.

Portugal's position on the question of Namibia has been clearly stated on previous occasions in the General Assembly. My Government is firmly and unequivocally committed to the independence of Namibia and considers that the only acceptable basis for a peaceful and lasting solution to the problem is the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). In this respect, the Portuguese delegation reiterates its full and wholehearted support for the Secretary-General's action.

We should like also to express our satisfaction at the recent agreement, ad referendum, reached in Geneva between Angola, Cuba and South Africa, with United States mediation; their negotiations have always had our strong support. It is our wish that these developments will speed up the momentum towards the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). In that regard, Portugal is in principle ready to contribute to the implementation of the United Nations settlement plan.

That is our general approach to the question of Namibia. We took that background into account in examining the five draft resolutions before us. We decided to vote in favour of two of them and to abstain on three.

Our main reservations concern the leading role assumed by one political group, as reflected in draft resolutions A, B and D. In addition, we cannot go so far as to endorse calls for increased military assistance for the South West Africa

(Mr. Da Costa Pereira, Portugal)

People's Organization (SWAPO). We reject also any arbitrary and selective singling out of individual countries or groups of countries.

Portugal considers the provisions of the United Nations settlement plan to be the only internationally agreed framework for Namibia's independence. We expect, therefore, that it will ensure that the people of Namibia will be able to choose their own representatives freely, through free and fair elections, held under United Nations auspices and supervision.

Mr. VERGAU (Federal Republic of Germany):

"We have come a good deal closer to Namibia's independence. Security Council resolution 435 (1978) has always been and remains the only viable route to this goal. As a member of the contact group, my Government offers its good offices in seeking the implementation of that resolution." (A/43/PV.8, p. 22)

Those words were spoken by Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher before the General Assembly on 28 September 1988.

In accordance with the statements made by the representative of Greece before the Assembly on behalf of the twelve States members of the European Community, my Government remains committed to Namibia's independence in conformity with resolution 435 (1978) and will continue its full, constant and unequivocal support for the implementation of the settlement plan without further delay or conditions.

As a member of the contact group, the Federal Republic of Germany will be further involved in efforts to achieve that implementation. In order not to prejudge the outcome of these efforts in any way, my Government has to refrain from associating itself in either a positive or a negative manner with the draft resolutions before the General Assembly. For that reason the Federal Republic of Germany will abstain on all the draft resolutions before us concerning the question of Namibia. That abstention is motivated by purely procedural reasons.

(Mr. Vergau, Federal Republic of  
Germany)

Since we shall abstain for reasons of principle and procedure, my delegation would not wish to comment on the substantive contents of the draft resolutions before us.

With regard to my delegation's firm objections to name-calling in General Assembly resolutions, and in particular in draft resolution A before us, I refer the Assembly to our statement in explanation of vote last year; it continues to express our unaltered position on this matter.

Today we look with hopeful expectations to the ongoing process of negotiations between Angola, Cuba and South Africa, mediated by the United States. My Government supports these negotiations and welcomes the progress that has so far been achieved. The international community is now called upon to muster all its strength in order to bring us nearer to the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) and to ensure that all the assistance required for the concrete transition of Namibia to independence will be available.

Mr. DLAMINI (Swaziland): The delegation of the Kingdom of Swaziland will support all the draft resolutions contained in document A/43/24 (Part II). However, we wish to point out that Swaziland is not in a position to implement comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa.

The PRESIDENT: Before we proceed to the vote on the draft resolutions contained in chapter I of document A/43/24 (Part II), I wish to draw the Assembly's attention 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 the item "Question of Namibia" at the current session.

(The President)

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 decisions on draft resolutions A to E in chapter I of document A/43/24 (Part II).

The report of the Fifth Committee on the programme budget implications of the draft resolutions has been issued as document A/43/818.

The General Assembly will now begin the voting process and take a decision on 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, 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, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, 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, Mali, Malta, 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, 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 130 votes to none, with 23 abstentions (resolution 43/26 A).\***

**The PRESIDENT:** The General Assembly will next take a decision on 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, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, 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, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, 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, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, 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, 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

---

\*Subsequently the delegation of Costa Rica and Mauritania advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.

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

Draft resolution B was adopted by 140 votes to none, with 13 abstentions (resolution 43/26 B).\*

The PRESIDENT: We now turn to 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, 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, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, 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, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, 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

\*Subsequently the delegation of Costa Rica and Mauritania advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.



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 147 votes to none, with 6 abstentions (resolution 43/26 C).\*

The PRESIDENT: Next we turn 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, 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, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, 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, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, 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

---

\*Subsequently the delegation of Costa Rica and Mauritania advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.

**Abstaining:** Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Lesotho, 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 129 votes to none, with 23 abstentions (resolution 43/26 D).\***

**The PRESIDENT:** 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, 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, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, 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, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, 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

---

\*Subsequently the delegation of Costa Rica and Mauritania advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.

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 148 votes to none, with 5 abstentions (resolution 43/26 E).\*

The PRESIDENT: I now call on those representative who wish to explain their votes on the resolutions just adopted.

Mr. MORTENSEN (Denmark): On behalf of the five Nordic countries, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden, I have the honour to make the following explanation of vote with regard to the five resolutions on the question of Namibia just adopted.

The Nordic countries have consistently rejected South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia, which is in flagrant defiance of international law and decisions of the Security Council. Our policy is clear and well established. We remain committed to Namibia's independence in accordance with the United Nations settlement plan as endorsed by Security Council resolution 435 (1978). This plan constitutes the only internationally accepted framework for approaches leading to an independent Namibia through free and fair elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations.

The Nordic countries are encouraged by the progress achieved so far during the talks between Angola, Cuba, South Africa and the United States aimed at ending the conflict situation in south-western Africa and securing independence for Namibia in

---

\*Subsequently the delegation of Costa Rica and Mauritania advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.

(Mr. Mortensen, Denmark)

accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978). The Nordic countries welcome the understandings reached during the recent round of talks in Geneva and sincerely hope that these will result in the early implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

(Mr. Mortensen, Denmark)

The Nordic countries agree with the main thrust of the draft resolution just adopted. We note with satisfaction that several of this year's resolutions have improved, in terms of both format and substance, as compared to the ones adopted last year. As a result we were able this year to support draft resolution B, on the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), although I should like to state for the record that our support does not extend to paragraph 4 of that draft resolution, which, in our view, would prejudice the outcome of free and fair elections in Namibia. However, regrettably, we have not been able to vote in favour of all the draft resolutions, since some of them continue to contain elements which cause 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 to such a struggle. One of the basic principles of this Organization enshrined in the Charter is to promote peaceful solutions for conflicts.

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

Thirdly, we generally reserve our position with regard to formulations which fail to take into account that only the Security Council can adopt decisions binding on 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. SWAPO, in our opinion, is to be regarded as such a party, and it is

(Mr. Mortensen, Denmark)

fundamental that SWAPO be made part of any solution for the Namibia question. As mentioned earlier, however, we have reservations concerning formulations which could prejudice the result of the future electoral process in Namibia.

We also wish to underline that all United Nations activities, including those of the United Nations Council for Namibia, particularly in the current strained financial situation, should be carefully scrutinized in order to secure efficient and appropriate utilization of resources. In this regard, the general rule that meetings should not be held outside Headquarters should be adhered to.

Finally, we note that the resolutions do not take account of the fact that the prospects for Namibia's independence seem to have improved recently as a result of the quadripartite talks.

In conclusion, the Nordic countries wish to express the hope that the combined efforts of the parties involved will finally enable the people of Namibia to achieve their independence, which is so long overdue.

Dame Ann HERCUS (New Zealand): New Zealand has always contended that the question of Namibia is a straightforward matter of decolonization and self-determination. The people of Namibia have been denied their right to determine their own future by the South African régime, which illegally occupies their country in direct defiance of the rulings of the world Court, resolutions of the Security Council and the will of the international community as expressed in successive General Assembly resolutions.

The activities of the South African régime in Namibia - its suppression of the political, social, economic and human rights of the Namibian people - continue to be a matter of the greatest concern to my Government. For many years now we have joined with other delegations in condemning the South African régime's obstinacy in the face of international calls for a peaceful settlement that will enable the

(Dame Ann Hercus, New Zealand)

people of Namibia to choose their own Government and their own future. Therefore we are hopeful that following the most recent round of quadripartite talks in Geneva a complete and lasting settlement is at hand. The only measure of success acceptable to the international community will be independence for the people of Namibia.

New Zealand's approach to the question of Namibia throughout the long period of South African occupation has been guided by Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and the principles of decolonization laid down in General Assembly resolutions 1514 (XV) and 1541 (XV). It has always been my Government's belief that the key element in the decolonization process has been the right to self-determination. It is in that context that I must note here that, while my delegation has supported resolution 43/24 B, we have reservations about aspects of that text. In particular, in accordance with our concern not to prejudge the outcome of the political process leading to the independence of Namibia and the establishment of an elected Government, we are obliged to record our strong reservations against the prejudgement made in paragraph 4 of that resolution. My Government is unable to accept that there exists a "sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people" until the people of Namibia have made that choice themselves at the ballot box in free and fair elections.

Ms. WICKES (Australia): Australia's continuing and valued membership of the United Nations Council for Namibia gives us a particular commitment to Namibia's right to self-determination and independence. Our national position in support of the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) as the only universally accepted plan for Namibia's independence was set out in our statement in the debate yesterday, as was our belief that the international community should maintain its pressure until resolution 435 (1978) is implemented and Namibian

(Ms. Wickes, Australia)

independence achieved. Given the universal support for the United Nations plan, it is disappointing that the draft resolution the General Assembly continues to consider year after year cannot command unanimous support.

My delegation supports the main thrust of the texts that the Assembly has just considered. We voted in favour of draft resolutions B, C, D and E. We have noted the considerable improvement in the texts over those submitted last year, improvement made by shortening the texts and removing in some cases the more polemical and contentious language on side issues that have detracted from the main purpose of such resolutions in the past.

That is particularly the case with regard to draft resolution B. For this reason, my delegation has changed its vote as compared with some of the resolutions in the past. Instead of abstaining, we have voted in favour of draft resolution B. While it contains imperfections, the removal of a considerable amount of extraneous material and the consequent improved focus on Security Council resolution 435 (1978) have enabled my delegation to cast a positive vote.

Draft resolution C reflects continuing efforts by the Council for Namibia to exhibit some financial restraint without substantially affecting delivery of its programme. While we have just voted in favour of the draft resolution, we wish to place on record that there are a number of items which continue to trouble us as being more costly than is necessary for their successful implementation.

As for draft resolution A, my delegation remains unable to support it fully, despite some improvements in the text. It continues to contain language that we regard as inappropriate and directed against certain States, even when they are not directly named.

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



(Ms. Wickes, Australia)

the status of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) as the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people. My delegation believes that we should not prejudge the outcome of the elections in Namibia. Especially with an election so tantalizingly close, it seems to us all the more important to let the electoral outcome be determined by its sole arbiters, the people of Namibia.

It is my delegation's fervent hope that the General Assembly will have no reason to have before it next year the same set of draft resolutions on Namibia but that instead we shall be welcoming an independent Namibia into the United Nations.

Mr. SAVUT (Turkey): The Turkish Government supports all efforts in favour of the swift attainment of Namibia's complete independence, in accordance with the relevant United Nations resolutions, particularly Security Council resolution 435 (1978). We are also encouraged by the positive developments that have been registered recently in this area. My Government's view on this matter was expressed in the general debate.

In accordance with the firm support we have committed ourselves to providing for the independence of Namibia, my delegation voted in favour of all the the draft resolutions in document A/43/24 (part II).

We are convinced that the resolutions just adopted will contribute to solving this urgent problem. We are also glad to see that these resolutions are shorter and more concise than those adopted in past years. Nevertheless, my delegation regrets that, because of a number of controversial elements, the draft resolutions were unable to marshal unanimous approval.

My delegation has reservations with respect to some derogatory references in the resolutions. In principle, Turkey does not approve the designation of third-party States or groups of States on the basis of geographical, political or other criteria, for the purpose of criticizing them, when it is difficult to determine their respective responsibilities.

Mr. KIRSCH (Canada): Again this year Canada has chosen not to enter into the substance of debates on draft resolutions on Namibia in the General Assembly and to underline this by abstaining in principle in the votes on all five draft resolutions. As the Assembly well knows, Canada's absentions on these draft resolutions is a procedure that was developed by the Contact Group. It must not be taken to imply in any way how we might have voted on their substance. While we have reservations in some areas, there is also much in these resolutions which Canada can support, and our positions in both respects are already widely known.

(Mr. Kirsch, Canada)

Having supported last year the suggestion of a simpler approach to drafting resolutions on Namibia, however, we have noted the visible efforts made by the Council for Namibia in this regard.

The reported developments at the quadripartite talks in Geneva this week are most encouraging. Canada commends the parties and the mediator on completing a difficult negotiating process and hopes that the outcome will soon be confirmed. We look forward to the early, full and definitive implementation of the long-delayed Security Council resolution 435 (1978). Canada stands ready to contribute, as may be appropriate, in all aspects. The United Nations, under Security Council resolution 435 (1978), will, it is to be hoped, soon be conducting elections in Namibia. These must not only be genuinely free and fair, but also universally seen to be so. This is the surest and shortest way to our long-cherished aim of welcoming a delegation from independent Namibia in the Assembly.

Mr. HAJNOCZI (Austria): Austria is on record for having consistently supported the right of the Namibian people to self-determination, which we regard as a matter of highest priority. Being firmly committed to the immediate independence of Namibia, we welcome the enhanced prospects for early implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). We believe that all efforts should be undertaken to follow strictly the path designed by that resolution.

Austria strongly supports the main thrust of the texts submitted to the General Assembly under the item. We have noted with satisfaction that in particular the text of draft resolution B has been changed in a very successful way in order to focus in a streamlined manner on the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). Therefore, my delegation cast for the first time a positive vote on this draft resolution. We also voted in favour of draft resolutions C and E, thereby expressing our support for the United Nations Council for Namibia and

(Mr. Hajnoczi, Austria)

the United Nations Fund for Namibia, to which Austria has contributed for many years on a regular basis.

However, we regret that we were not able to vote in the affirmative on draft resolutions A and D since they contain some provisions Austria does not support. In particular, let me recall the following: Austria believes that endorsement of armed struggle and calls for military assistance are in contradiction to the guiding principles of the Charter, as well as to our conviction that conflicts should be resolved exclusively by peaceful means. Furthermore, we must generally reserve our position with regard to formulations which would prejudice the deliberations and decisions of the Security Council. Neither 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) in the various draft resolutions should not be read as prejudging the right of the Namibian people to choose its representatives in an independent Namibia through free and fair elections under United Nations supervision.

In conclusion, let me express the sincere hope of my country that this will have been the last debate on the question of Namibia before the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

Mr. BORG OLIVIER (Malta): Malta voted in favour of all the draft 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 just adopted, our positive vote should not be taken as an unqualified endorsement of all provisions contained in the texts.

We understand and share the deep feelings of disappointment and frustration of the Namibian people at the endless delays and procrastinations which have up to now prevented implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of

(Mr. Borg Olivier, Malta)

Namibia. The reported results of the negotiations in Geneva between Angola, Cuba and South Africa, with the mediation of the United States, are very encouraging and we welcome the positive outcome. We congratulate the negotiators. It is our hope that the Governments concerned will now approve the agreement reached so that implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) can be initiated immediately.

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

Finally, I should like to add that my delegation regrets that certain countries have been selectively singled out for criticism in the draft resolutions. We do not support this practice.

Mr. BIRCH (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland): My delegation strongly supports the view, expressed by the representative of Greece in his statement on the draft resolutions on behalf of the 12 member States of the European Community, that Namibia must be brought to internationally recognized independence at the earliest possible time. We very much welcome the understandings reached in Geneva earlier this week and hope that they will soon enable us to welcome Namibia to the United Nations family.

Our interest, which we hold in common with all who took part in the debate, lies in the implementation of the United Nations settlement plan. As the General Assembly will know, Britain was one of the authors of the settlement plan. In order to sustain our impartiality we have traditionally declined to take a position on the substance of the draft resolutions on Namibia presented to the General Assembly. We therefore abstained in the votes that have just been taken. We continue to have serious misgivings about several paragraphs of the draft resolutions.

Mr. ESSY (Côte d'Ivoire) (interpretation from French): The Côte d'Ivoire voted this year in favour of the draft resolution entitled "The situation in Namibia resulting from the illegal occupation of the Territory by South Africa" because of its objective, which is to have Security Council resolution 435 (1978) implemented. In other words, it seeks the independence of Namibia - a cause that we have fully supported since 1978.

But the Côte d'Ivoire wants to be consistent, and so it is not able to support paragraphs 62 and 63 of this resolution because it cannot comply with the directives in these paragraphs, which do not conform to its foreign policy.

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

Mr. ANGULA (South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO)): The last four days of our work in this Assembly have been most encouraging to the oppressed but fighting people of Namibia. The impressive number of 87 delegations participating in the debate, and the clear, firm and reassuring statements they have made, eloquently attest to the unfettered commitment by the international community to the unconditional liberation of Namibia. We are heartened by this solid show of solidarity with our just struggle for national liberation.

Many statements have reaffirmed the inalienable right of the Namibian people to self-determination and national independence and unequivocal support for the legitimate struggle of our people, by all means at our disposal, including the armed struggle under the leadership of SWAPO, their sole and authentic representative, to end racist South Africa's illegal occupation, colonialism, brutal repression and exploitation.

In their renewed appeals for the immediate and unconditional implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) members have highlighted the urgent international demand and, indeed, the demands of our people that Namibia's independence must take effect without further delay.

On Tuesday, 15 November, while the Assembly was busily deliberating on the question of Namibia, it came to our knowledge that an agreement had been reached in Geneva at the quadripartite talks. We are still waiting for the details of that agreement. It was obvious from the Geneva announcement that the ball was now squarely in the court of the Pretoria régime to proceed with the provisions of the New York quadripartite principles ratified by the Governments of Angola, Cuba and South Africa.

The attention of the world is thus now focused on the Pretoria régime for it to honour its side of the bargain by accepting the immediate implementation of

(Mr. Angula, SWAPO)

Security Council resolution 435 (1978) so that the coming year may see the birth of the new independent State of Namibia. Even without waiting to study the details of the agreement reached in Geneva, Pretoria has already made known its intention. The comment by Pik Botha, the racist Foreign Minister of South Africa, on the outcome of the Geneva informal discussion is quite telling. In Pretoria's view the outcome of the talks is not agreements but proposals put forward by Angola and Cuba, which the Government of South Africa will study carefully before making any pronouncement. Such a cynical utterance by the racist Minister, who, in our view, should have been the one to sell the accord to his colleagues in the Cabinet, gives reason for doubt as to whether the said agreement will indeed receive the approval of the apartheid régime. As the representative of India put it the other day when addressing this Assembly, South Africa must be judged not by our hope but by our experience.

Nevertheless, SWAPO for its part is ready immediately to translate the existing truce between our liberation forces and South African occupation troops into a formal cease-fire. SWAPO is ready to sign a cease-fire with South Africa in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978) provided Pretoria is prepared to do likewise.

In the light of what I have said, the adoption of five important draft resolutions by the General Assembly and its approval of the programme of work of the United Nations Council for Namibia must be seen as a reminder to apartheid South Africa that the United Nations will remain seized of the Namibian question until genuine independence is achieved.

It must be said that this debate took place against the background of firm opposition by South Africa and its allies, who, after failing to have the debate postponed, sought, on flimsy ground, to obstruct in the voting. To be sure, they



(Mr. Angula, SWAPO)

have not given up their sinister activities. They will seek, as in the past, to frustrate the programme of work of the Council by undermining its implementation, ostensibly to uphold the spirit of impartiality, even though no enabling resolution has yet been adopted by the Security Council.

It is with this in mind that we urge the United Nations Council for Namibia immediately to consult with the Secretary-General with a view to testing the impartiality of the South African régime in the implementation process - a régime which we realize is known more for its victimization of the Namibian people than for democratic principles or impartiality. Once again the racist régime in Pretoria was strongly condemned for its blatant contempt, defiance and outright violation of decisions and resolutions of the United Nations and for preventing Namibia's independence.

Certainly we are not indifferent to those delegations who for all these years have seen fit to object to the concept of armed struggle when it is applied to national liberation movements fighting against colonialism, racism and white supremacists in Africa, yet stop at nothing in giving the most sophisticated arms in their military arsenals to the counter-revolutionaries in Asia, Africa and Latin America fighting against progressive Governments.

(Mr. Angula, SWAPO)

In the same vein, it is incomprehensible and sheer hypocrisy to object to the designation of SWAPO as the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people when it is common knowledge that those same States recognized a host of Governments-in-exile opposed to fascist occupation during the Second World War and that very often leaders of those same countries have received counter-revolutionary leaders at a high level.

On a happy note let me whole-heartedly thank those delegations which voted in favour of the draft resolutions recommended by the United Nations Council for Namibia. Our thanks go to the Council for Namibia, in particular its President, Ambassador Peter Zuze, for remaining steadfast and true to the original aims and objectives of the Council. We go away from here fortified by the knowledge that the international community remains solidly behind us in our struggle until final victory is achieved.

We endorse the recommendation of the Secretary-General that the General Assembly appoint Mr. Bernt Carlsson United Nations Commissioner for Namibia for an additional period of one year.

Finally we should like to assure delegations that we shall do all that is necessary to ensure the total liberation of our land and our people. While still challenging the Pretoria régime to agree to sign a cease-fire for the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), we remain equally ready, in the event that racist South Africa continues to reject this offer, to take on and intensify our struggle until that day when Namibia joins the community of nations as a sovereign and independent State.

Until then, the struggle continues. Victory is certain.

The PRESIDENT: This concludes our consideration of agenda item 29.

AGENDA ITEM 17 (j)

APPOINTMENTS TO FILL VACANCIES IN SUBSIDIARY ORGANS AND OTHER APPOINTMENTS

(j) APPOINTMENT OF THE UNITED NATIONS COMMISSIONER FOR NAMIBIA; NOTE BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/43/807)

The PRESIDENT: In this connection, the Secretary-General proposes the extension of the appointment of Mr. Bernt Carlsson as United Nations Commissioner for Namibia for a one-year term beginning on 1 January 1989. May I take it that the General Assembly approves this proposal?

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: The Assembly has concluded its consideration of sub-item (j) of agenda item 17.

The meeting rose at 7 p.m.