



CONTENTS

Agenda item 19:
Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples:
(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
Report of the Fourth Committee (Parts I and II)

Agenda item 92:
Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73 *e* of the Charter of the United Nations:
(a) Report of the Secretary-General;
(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
Report of the Fourth Committee

Agenda item 93:
Question of East Timor:
(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
Report of the Fourth Committee

Agenda item 94:
Activities of foreign economic and other interests which are impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in Namibia and in all other Territories under colonial domination and efforts to eliminate colonialism, *apartheid* and racial discrimination in southern Africa: 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
Report of the Fourth Committee

Agenda items 95 and 12:
Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples by the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations:
(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
Report of the Economic and Social Council
Report of the Fourth Committee

Agenda item 96:
United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa: report of the Secretary-General
Report of the Fourth Committee

Agenda item 97:
Offers by Member States of study and training facilities for inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories: report of the Secretary-General
Report of the Fourth Committee

Page

Agenda item 36:
Question of Namibia (*continued*):
(a) Report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples;
(b) Report of the United Nations Council for Namibia ... 1169

President: Mr. Ismat T. KITTANI (Iraq).

AGENDA ITEM 19

Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples:
(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**

REPORT OF THE FOURTH COMMITTEE (PARTS I AND II) (A/36/677 AND ADD.1)

AGENDA ITEM 92

Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73 *e* of the Charter of the United Nations:
(a) **Report of the Secretary-General;**
(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**

REPORT OF THE FOURTH COMMITTEE (A/36/678)

AGENDA ITEM 93

Question of East Timor:
(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**

REPORT OF THE FOURTH COMMITTEE (A/36/679)

AGENDA ITEM 94

Activities of foreign economic and other interests which are impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in Namibia and in all other Territories under colonial domination and efforts to eliminate colonialism, *apartheid* and racial discrimination in southern Africa: report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the

1159

Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples

REPORT OF THE FOURTH COMMITTEE (A/36/680)

AGENDA ITEMS 95 AND 12

Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples by the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations:

- (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
Report of the Economic and Social Council**

REPORT OF THE FOURTH COMMITTEE (A/36/681)

AGENDA ITEM 96

United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa: report of the Secretary-General

REPORT OF THE FOURTH COMMITTEE (A/36/682)

AGENDA ITEM 97

Offers by Member States of study and training facilities for inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories: report of the Secretary-General

REPORT OF THE FOURTH COMMITTEE (A/36/683)

1. Mr. ADDABASHI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), Rapporteur of the Fourth Committee (*interpretation from Arabic*): I have the honour to present to the General Assembly for its consideration seven reports of the Fourth Committee relating to agenda items 19, 92, 93, 94, 95 and 12, 96 and 97. These reports are self-explanatory, but I shall make some preliminary observations to give a general idea of the various recommendations made by the Fourth Committee.

2. The first report, which consists of parts I and II [A/36/677 and Add.1], relates to those Territories which were not covered by other items of the agenda and which the Committee considered under agenda item 19. Paragraphs 20 and 21 of part I of the report contain a draft resolution and a draft decision which the Fourth Committee recommends for adoption by the General Assembly. The draft resolution was adopted by the Committee by a recorded vote of 73 to 7, with 54 abstentions. The draft decision was adopted without objection. Paragraphs 16 and 17 of part II of the Committee's report contain two draft resolutions and four draft consensuses which the Fourth Committee recommends for adoption by the General Assembly. In the order of their adoption by the Committee, the draft resolutions and consensuses relate to Tokelau, American Samoa, the Cocos (Keeling) Islands, St. Helena, the United States Virgin Islands and Gibraltar.

3. As regards these Territories, the majority of the members expressed the view that, notwithstanding the specific problems they face as a result of their small size and population, geographic isolation and frequently limited resources, the General Assembly should not delay their accession to independence and should reaffirm the

full applicability of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples to their peoples, as well as the inalienable right of those peoples to decide for themselves their future status. In the same context, many members reaffirmed the right of the peoples of those Territories to full sovereignty over their natural resources and recommended the dispatch of United Nations visiting missions to those small Territories so as to enable the United Nations to be fully informed of the conditions obtaining therein and the aspirations of the peoples of those Territories with regard to their future.

4. The second report [A/36/678] relates to agenda item 92. In the draft resolution contained in paragraph 9, the Fourth Committee recommends, *inter alia*, that the Assembly reaffirm that, in the absence of a decision by the General Assembly itself that a Non-Self-Governing Territory has attained a full measure of self-government in terms of Chapter XI of the Charter, the administering Power concerned should continue to transmit information with respect to that Territory.

5. The third report [A/36/679] relates to agenda item 93. The Committee recommends, in paragraph 11 of the report, a draft resolution in which the General Assembly would call upon all interested parties to co-operate fully with the United Nations with a view to guaranteeing the full exercise of the right to self-determination by the people of East Timor, and request the specialized agencies to assist the people of the Territory.

6. The fourth report [A/36/680] relates to agenda item 94. The draft resolution recommended in paragraph 9 provides that the General Assembly would, among other things, condemn the continued activities of those foreign economic, financial and other interests which exploit the natural and human resources of the colonial Territories; condemn those Governments which continue to co-operate with those who exploit the natural resources of the colonial Territories; call on all Governments to take the necessary steps to put an end to such activities, which are detrimental to the interests of the inhabitants of those Territories; condemn the military activities in Namibia and other colonial Territories; call upon South Africa and the colonial Powers concerned to end their military activities in Namibia and other colonial Territories; and request the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations to prepare a report on the profits which transnational corporations derive from their activities in the Territories concerned, to be submitted to the General Assembly at its next session.

7. The fifth report [A/36/681] relates to agenda items 95 and 12. The draft resolution recommended in paragraph 8 provides that the General Assembly would, among other things, request the international organizations concerned to render or continue to render, as a matter of urgency, all possible moral and material assistance to the colonial peoples struggling for liberation from colonial rule, express regret that the World Bank and the IMF continue to maintain links with the authorities in South Africa and request the IMF to end its co-operation with South Africa.

8. The sixth report [A/36/682] relates to agenda item 96. The draft resolution recommended in paragraph 7 provides that, in expressing its appreciation to all those that have supported the United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa by providing contributions, scholarships or places in their educational institutions, the Assembly would once again appeal to all States, organizations and individuals to offer greater fi-

nancial and other support to the Programme to ensure its continuation, effectiveness and expansion.

9. The seventh report [A/36/683] relates to agenda item 97. Under the provisions of the draft resolution recommended in paragraph 7, the Assembly would invite all States to make or continue to make further generous offers of scholarships and training facilities to the peoples of colonial Territories.

10. I have made only preliminary and general observations; it was not my purpose to set out all the Committee's recommendations. The adoption of the recommendations contained in the reports that I have presented would strengthen the process of decolonization and the aspirations of the peoples of the colonial Territories to independence and self-determination.

11. On behalf of the Fourth Committee, I commend these reports and the recommendations in them to the General Assembly for adoption.

Pursuant to rule 66 of the rules of procedure, it was decided not to discuss the reports of the Fourth Committee.

12. The PRESIDENT: Statements will be limited to explanations of vote. The positions of delegations regarding the various recommendations of the Fourth Committee have been made clear in the Committee and are reflected in the relevant summary records.

13. May I remind members that under decision 34/401 the General Assembly agreed that when the same draft resolution is considered in a Main Committee and in plenary meeting, a delegation should, as far as possible, explain its vote only once—that is, either in the Committee or in plenary meeting—unless that delegation's vote in plenary meeting is different from its vote in the Committee.

14. May I also remind members that, in accordance with the same decision, explanations of vote should not exceed 10 minutes and should be made by delegations from their seats.

15. We shall first consider parts I and II of the report of the Fourth Committee on agenda item 19 [A/36/677 and Add.1].

16. I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their vote before the voting on any or all of the recommendations of the Fourth Committee in its report on this item.

17. Mr. SARRÉ (Senegal) (*interpretation from French*): As the Assembly takes up the draft resolution and the draft decision contained in part I of the report, I wish to make the following statement in explanation of vote before the voting.

18. First of all, as the General Assembly once again considers the question of Western Sahara, I would reaffirm the devotion of my country to the purposes and principles set forth in the Charter of the United Nations and in the charter of the Organization of African Unity [OAU]. We also subscribe to the provisions of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 14, December 1960, containing the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. Senegal has on

many occasions demonstrated this commitment by putting it into practice. I shall not dwell on that.

19. In June this year, Kenya, known for its positive, historic contribution to the decolonization process in Africa, acted as host to the eighteenth ordinary session of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity, at which Africa's supreme body considered the question of Western Sahara. For good reason the world focused its attention on Nairobi, and once again Nairobi proved to be the site of an historic event.

20. Demonstrating their traditional wisdom and realism and proving the virtues of dialogue, the heads of State of the OAU set forth an approach that could put an end to this conflict and serve the true interests of the African continent and of the international community. Essentially, that approach is to organize a referendum of self-determination for Western Sahara as a whole. To that end, the Implementation Committee on Western Sahara was established to ensure implementation of the decision, with the mandate of determining conditions for a cease-fire and the procedures for organizing and carrying out that referendum with assistance from the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

21. That historic decision aroused great hopes, and great hopes are still placed in it. Indeed, during this thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly, the heads of State or Government, foreign ministers and other statesmen who have done us the honour of participating in our debates have all welcomed the agreement reached at Nairobi. The Secretary-General of the United Nations, whom I congratulate on his report and on the laudable efforts that he has constantly made on this issue, has also emphasized the positive nature of the Nairobi decision. For all those reasons, some delegations, including my own, had drawn up a draft resolution reflecting the spirit and letter of the Nairobi decision.

22. Responding to the appeal made by Mr. Daniel Arap Moi, President of the Republic of Kenya and current Chairman of the OAU Assembly, the sponsors of that draft resolution withdrew it. In so doing they demonstrated a spirit of understanding and their desire to cooperate. What is more, they whole-heartedly supported the draft decision in the aforementioned document that was introduced by the delegation of Kenya in its capacity as current Chairman of the OAU Assembly. In the view of my delegation, that draft decision is along the lines of the new approach set forth by the heads of State and Government of the OAU.

23. However, other delegations felt it necessary to submit the draft resolution on Western Sahara which we are considering today. In my delegation's view, that text introduces elements which had been set aside by the heads of State and Government of the OAU. Its adoption would be a major obstacle to the attainment of peace and stability in the region of Africa concerned—indeed, in all of Africa.

24. The General Assembly, which has welcomed and hailed the historic decision adopted at Nairobi; the General Assembly, which has always been concerned with the maintenance of international peace and stability; the General Assembly, the major objective of which is to promote peace, thus has the duty and responsibility to respond positively to Africa's appeal. It must help Africa in its quest for unity, fraternity and co-operation.

25. I am pleased to recall here what was said by one of the sons of Africa, the Head of State of Senegal, Mr. Abdou Diouf, who, on behalf of his peers, replied as follows to the welcoming speech of Mr. Daniel Arap Moi:

“With our determination, supported by militant faith, Africa will emerge from these meetings more united, more in solidarity with itself and greater. Neither the complexity of the political issues now before us nor the rather discouraging international situation can dissuade us from proceeding along this path, because our work will be crowned with success.”

That prophecy did come true in Nairobi, and we would praise God for it.

26. Senegal, faithful to the Charter of the United Nations and that of the OAU and anxious to ensure the maintenance of peace and stability in Africa, cannot vote in favour of the draft resolution, which, to say the least, introduces a discordant note into the peace process worked out by the wise men of Africa. However, we shall vote in favour of the draft decision I referred to, which has the advantage and merit of making a positive contribution by helping the Implementation Committee on Western Sahara in the search for a just, comprehensive and honorable solution of the question.

27. Mr. TARUA (Papua New Guinea): Papua New Guinea has supported self-determination for the people of Western Sahara and will continue to do so. Therefore, we were pleased to note that the Implementation Committee on Western Sahara of the OAU achieved unity among African countries, in August 1981 at Nairobi, on resolving the issue of self-determination for Western Sahara. Accordingly Papua New Guinea supports the draft decision, which was introduced in the Fourth Committee by Kenya, the current Chairman of the OAU Assembly. Even though we support the principles outlined in the draft resolution, we feel that regional unity on this issue should be encouraged. Accordingly, Papua New Guinea has decided not to participate in the vote on this particular draft resolution.

28. Mr. KAMANDA wa KAMANDA (Zaire) (*interpretation from French*): As is well known, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter, the United Nations has always encouraged and supported the efforts of regional organizations to resolve problems that might endanger peace and stability in a region.

29. The efforts made by the OAU in this particular case, that is, the case of Western Sahara, as well as in other similar situations that we have faced in the past, have been and are consistent with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

30. It was in that spirit that the Zairian delegation, in co-operation with other delegations, submitted, in connection with the question of Western Sahara, a draft resolution the intention of which is to encourage and strengthen the efforts of the OAU in the interest of peace on our continent and relations of trust among our States in the OAU and between the States Members of the United Nations.

31. The draft resolution we submitted was based on the appeal made by the current Chairman of the OAU Assembly, who wanted the United Nations to do nothing, at this crucial stage, that might compromise the peace efforts of that organization. Therefore, in order to respond to his

appeal for the creation of conditions conducive to the success of the efforts of the OAU Implementation Committee and, above all, in accordance with our traditions in that organization, we withdrew the draft resolution.

32. It will be recalled that the essence of the draft resolution that certain delegations, including Zaire, submitted was in keeping with the essence of the draft resolution submitted by the delegation of Kenya, which was fortunately adopted by consensus, as stated in the report submitted to us. In that way the United Nations should be able to make its contribution to the efforts of the OAU.

33. We reject any steps that might increase dissent in the continent and any steps that might create unnecessary obstacles, when all the members of the OAU are agreed that we have reached the point where it may be possible to find a peaceful political solution to the problem of Western Sahara in the interests of all concerned. Therefore, in view of the fact that the draft resolution under consideration includes elements of discord, precisely at a time when we should be uniting our efforts to help resolve the problem, we shall not be able to support it and we shall vote against it.

34. Mr. M'RANI ZENTAR (Morocco) (*interpretation from French*): The draft resolution which the General Assembly is about to consider was submitted by the Algerian delegation and a number of others despite the decisions on Western Sahara taken at Nairobi, which provided for no further debate on the substance and for no further political resolutions on the question of Western Sahara within the United Nations. Moreover, this draft resolution has been maintained despite the appeal made by President Daniel Arap Moi of Kenya, the current Chairman of the OAU Assembly and of the Implementation Committee on Western Sahara, who quite correctly considered that the Implementation Committee and its chairman were the only persons empowered, because of the authority vested in them, to take the necessary initiatives in the United Nations to obtain the assistance required to ensure the fulfillment of their mandate.

35. The Moroccan delegation and some other delegations had also introduced a draft resolution, which was in complete harmony with the decisions of the OAU, but, in agreement with the sponsors, my delegation responded without hesitation to the appeal made by the OAU and withdrew the text we had submitted in order to leave the path clear for the Implementation Committee, which wished to fulfil its own responsibilities.

36. The chairman of the Implementation Committee then acted within the context of subparagraph (d) of the decision taken by the Committee at its first regular session, held at Nairobi from 24 to 26 August 1981, by which the current Chairman of the OAU Assembly was called upon to enter into consultations with the United Nations in order to determine to what extent the United Nations would co-operate in the implementation of the African decisions [*see A/36/512, annex*]. The representative of the current Chairman of the OAU Assembly, the representative of Kenya, thus introduced a draft decision empowering the Secretary-General of the United Nations to take certain steps, and he quite rightly requested a consensus vote in support of that decision.

37. The Fourth Committee, at its 21st meeting, responded to his appeal and adopted by consensus what was already an African consensus adopted at Nairobi. The Committee took note of the African decisions on the

question of Western Sahara [*ibid.*; see also A/36/534, annex II, resolution AHG/Res.103 (XVIII)], calling on the Secretary-General to assist the Implementation Committee in the discharge of its mandate and report to the General Assembly and the Security Council as appropriate.

38. Thus, the decision asking the Secretary-General to do those things—the only decision required by the OAU and the only one we would accept as a reference in the implementation of the African decisions—was adopted by the Fourth Committee by consensus. Any other decision or resolution could only be superfluous and, indeed, quite damaging in the circumstances, because it would contradict the decisions and the very principles accepted by consensus at Nairobi.

39. Indeed, there can be no question of asking for the organization of a referendum on self-determination which would offer the populations the choice between maintaining the present integration with Morocco and separation, and would dictate in advance a particular attitude on the part of the populations, before they had expressed their will. That would be anti-democratic and contrary to the very principles of the United Nations in respect to referendums, because those principles imply above all respect for the freely expressed will of the populations, without any outside interference.

40. The draft resolution submitted by Algeria and the other sponsors sins by excess in taking a position in the place of the populations concerned, and it is thus in fact a challenge to the OAU decisions and to the very principles of the United Nations and an infringement of the freedom and dignity of the populations consulted. Accordingly, that text should receive no encouragement at all from the Members of the United Nations, whose first duty it is to observe complete neutrality in a matter which is of interest strictly to the populations involved in the referendum, and they alone.

41. The Moroccan delegation will vote against this draft resolution to demonstrate once again its trust in the OAU and the efforts exerted by the Chairman of the OAU Assembly, President Daniel Arap Moi, who deserves our full respect, and to reaffirm our strict devotion to the Nairobi decisions, taken on the initiative of His Majesty King Hassan II.

42. In voting against the draft resolution, the Moroccan delegation will thus be clearly demonstrating its firm opposition to provisions that are the basis of the draft resolution and the real motivation of its main sponsors. My delegation cannot agree to this draft resolution being referred to in any way in the implementation of the decisions taken at Nairobi on this question.

43. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now proceed to take decisions on the recommendations of the Fourth Committee.

44. First, we have the draft resolution entitled "Question of Western Sahara", recommended by the Fourth Committee in paragraph 20 of part I of its report, and the draft decision with the same title, recommended by the Committee in paragraph 21 of part I of its report. The report of the Fifth Committee on the administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution and the draft decision appears in document A/36/709. A recorded vote has been requested on the draft resolution.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chad, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Fiji, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Iran, Jamaica, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius,¹ Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, Poland, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Seychelles, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Central African Republic, Chile, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Morocco, Senegal, United States of America, Zaire.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Belgium, Bolivia, Burma, Canada, Colombia, Comoros, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Finland, France, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Guinea, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, Uruguay.

The draft resolution was adopted by 76 votes to 9, with 57 abstentions (resolution 36/46).

45. The PRESIDENT: We turn next to the draft decision just mentioned, which the Fourth Committee adopted without objection. May I take it that the General Assembly also wishes to do so?

The draft decision was adopted (decision 36/406).

46. The PRESIDENT: We now come to the two draft resolutions recommended by the Fourth Committee in paragraph 16 of part II of its report. I have been informed that the expenditures relating to the implementation of those draft resolutions have already been incorporated in the budget for the activities 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 for 1982—1983.

47. Draft resolution I is entitled "Question of the United States Virgin Islands". The Fourth Committee adopted that draft resolution without objection. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 36/47).

48. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution II is entitled "Question of American Samoa". The Fourth Committee adopted that draft resolution also without objection. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to follow suit?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 36/48).

49. The PRESIDENT: I now invite representatives to turn to the draft consensuses recommended by the Fourth Committee in paragraph 17 of part II of its report.

50. Draft consensus I is entitled "Question of the Cocos (Keeling) Islands". The Fourth Committee adopted that draft consensus without objection. May I take it that the General Assembly also wishes to do so?

Draft consensus I was adopted (decision 36/407).

51. The PRESIDENT: Draft consensus II is entitled "Question of St. Helena". The Fourth Committee adopted that draft consensus also without objection. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft consensus II was adopted (decision 36/408).

52. The PRESIDENT: Draft consensus III is entitled "Question of Gibraltar". The Fourth Committee adopted it without objection. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do so also?

Draft consensus III was adopted (decision 36/409).

53. The PRESIDENT: Draft consensus IV is entitled "Question of Tokelau". The Fourth Committee adopted that draft consensus without objection. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft consensus IV was adopted (decision 36/410).

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

55. Mr. MONSALVE (Chile) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Chile voted against the draft resolution on the question of Western Sahara as we believe that the text digresses from the appeal with respect to this question made by the OAU to the parties concerned. Chile maintains its firm commitment to the principle of the self-determination of peoples and hopes that that principle will be respected in accordance with the commitments of the OAU.

56. Mr. SYED SHAH (Bangladesh): The delegation of Bangladesh voted in favour of the draft resolution on the question of Western Sahara since we believe in the inalienable right of all peoples to self-determination and national independence, and that principle is applicable in the case of Western Sahara.

57. We have noted with satisfaction the initiative taken within the framework of the OAU as reflected in the unanimous adoption of the decision contained in part I of the Fourth Committee's report. Consequently, in the spirit of that consensus decision, which envisages mutual acceptance and accommodation, avoidance of any specific reference in the text of the resolution to any party or parties concerned would have been preferred by us.

58. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now consider the report of the Fourth Committee on agenda item 92 [A/36/678] and vote on the draft resolution entitled "Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73 *e* of the Charter of the United Nations", recommended by the Fourth Committee in paragraph 9 of that report. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

Against: None.

Abstaining: France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

The draft resolution was adopted by 149 votes to none, with 3 abstentions (resolution 36/49).

59. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now turn to the report of the Fourth Committee on agenda item 93 [A/36/679] and take action on the draft resolution entitled "Question of East Timor" recommended by the Committee in paragraph 11 of its report.

60. I call on the representative of Thailand, who wishes to explain his vote before the vote.

61. Mr. CHAVANAVIRAJ (Thailand): Thailand fully supports the right of self-determination for peoples under colonial rule, foreign occupation and alien domination. In the case of East Timor, the Thai delegation holds the view that the people of East Timor have exercised their right to self-determination. The people of that former Territory have made a clear decision to end their dependent status through integration with Indonesia. Also, that decision has been legally accepted by both the Indonesian National Assembly and the Indonesian Government, which on 17 July 1976 integrated East Timor into the Republic of Indonesia as the twenty-seventh province of that country. The process of decolonization in East Timor was therefore terminated in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) and other relevant resolutions.

62. The draft resolution before us clearly constitutes interference in the internal affairs of Indonesia, a sovereign State Member of the United Nations. My delegation will therefore vote against that draft resolution.

63. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the Fourth Committee. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Iceland, Iran, Kenya, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mexico, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Portugal, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Sao Tome and Principe, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Swaziland, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Argentina, Australia, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bolivia, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Democratic Kampuchea, Dominican Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, Gambia, Guatemala, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Malaysia, Maldives, New Zealand, Oman, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United States of America, Uruguay.

Abstaining: Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Bhutan, Burma, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Hungary, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mauritania, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Poland, Romania, Samoa, Senegal, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

The draft resolution was adopted by 54 votes to 42, with 46 abstentions (resolution 36/50).²

64. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Indonesia to explain his vote.

65. Mr. DJALAL (Indonesia): The General Assembly has just concluded its consideration of the so-called question of East Timor. As in previous years, my delegation, supported by many other delegations, has strongly opposed inclusion in the agenda of the session and any discussion of the so-called question of East Timor by the General Assembly. It is clear that my delegation must categorically reject the resolution which has just been adopted.

66. The reasons are obvious. First, there is no question of East Timor, as the people of East Timor themselves, in the exercise of their right to self-determination, decided as long ago as 1976 to become independent through integration with the Republic of Indonesia. Secondly, the resolution constitutes interference in the internal affairs of a sovereign Member State, thus violating Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter. Thirdly, this resolution serves no purpose as it has nothing to do with the realities and actual conditions in that province. It refers, for instance, to a new outbreak of famine in East Timor, which even the sponsors should know is a complete fabrication.

Fourthly, the resolution mentions the so-called FRETILIN³ as a liberation movement. The fact is that the so-called FRETILIN has entirely lost whatever little support it had among the people of the territory. There is no so-called FRETILIN in East Timor. Fifthly, the only legal authority in East Timor, following integration in July 1976, is the Government of Indonesia, represented in the territory by the Provincial Government.

67. Furthermore, continuing to refer to Portugal as the administering Power is tantamount to reintroducing colonialism in that territory. That is clearly unacceptable and should be so to all anti-colonial forces. Portugal deliberately and definitively abdicated its responsibilities by running away from the territory in December 1975, abandoning the East Timorese people in their hour of need.

68. Indonesia therefore categorically rejects the resolution on the non-existent question of East Timor.

69. The PRESIDENT: We turn next to the Fourth Committee report on agenda item 94 [A/36/680] and will take action on the draft resolution entitled "Activities of foreign economic and other interests which are impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in Namibia and in all other Territories under colonial domination and efforts to eliminate colonialism, *apartheid* and racial discrimination in southern Africa", recommended by the Committee for adoption in paragraph 9 of its report.

70. I call upon the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany for an explanation of vote.

71. Mr. van WELL (Federal Republic of Germany): It is necessary for my Government to go on record once more to say that the Federal Republic of Germany rejects in the strongest terms the accusations of collusion in the nuclear field and of military co-operation with South Africa contained in operative paragraphs 9 and 10 of the draft resolution which is to be voted upon.

72. The position of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany was made clear in my statement on this item at the 22nd meeting of the Fourth Committee and I do not want to repeat it in detail. I simply wish to make clear once more that such co-operation with South Africa does not exist. My Government regards the allegation levelled against it as unjustified, unacceptable and harmful to friendly co-operation. My delegation will vote against this draft resolution.

73. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the Fourth Committee. The report of the Fifth Committee on the administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution is to be found in document A/36/710.

74. We have requests for separate votes on operative paragraphs 9 and 10. If I hear no objection, we shall proceed accordingly.

75. Mr. SERAO (Angola) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation expresses its opposition to separate votes on those paragraphs.

76. The PRESIDENT: There is an objection from the representative of Angola to separate votes on paragraphs 9 and 10. In accordance with rule 89 of the rules of procedure, I shall put to the vote the motion for a separate

vote on operative paragraph 9 of the draft resolution. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Bolivia, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica,⁴ Japan, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Zaire.

Against: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Benin, Botswana, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chad, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Seychelles, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining: Argentina, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Colombia, Ecuador, France, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Mauritania, Mexico, Pakistan, Panama, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Togo, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Yugoslavia.

The motion was adopted by 57 votes to 50, with 26 abstentions.

77. The PRESIDENT: We shall now vote on the motion for a separate vote on paragraph 10 of the draft resolution. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Bolivia, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Zaire.

Against: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Benin, Botswana, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chad, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Grenada, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's

Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Seychelles, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining: Argentina, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Colombia, Ecuador, France, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Ivory Coast, Malawi, Mauritania, Mexico, Nepal, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Yugoslavia.

The motion was adopted by 57 votes to 48, with 28 abstentions.⁴

78. The PRESIDENT: We shall therefore have separate votes on operative paragraphs 9 and 10 of the draft resolution.

79. I call on the representative of the United States to explain his vote before the vote.

80. Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America): Many representatives here realize that, despite inequities and the sometimes irregular patterns of foreign investment, foreign participation in their countries' economies has benefited their peoples greatly. It seems inconsistent, therefore, to declare in the General Assembly that those same activities are automatically harmful to the people of a dependent Territory. This profound inconsistency raises serious questions as to the effectiveness of the radical measures proposed in the draft resolution on foreign economic interests in dependent Territories.

81. The PRESIDENT: We shall now vote on operative paragraph 9 of the draft resolution. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Barbados, Benin, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chad, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, Denmark, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica,⁵ Japan, Luxembourg, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Portugal, Senegal, Somalia, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

Abstaining: Argentina, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burma, Burundi,

Colombia, Comoros, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Fiji, Guatemala, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Lesotho, Liberia,⁵ Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Nepal, Niger, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Upper Volta, Zaire.

Operative paragraph 9 was adopted by 59 votes to 36, with 47 abstentions.

82. The PRESIDENT: We shall now vote on operative paragraph 10 of the draft resolution. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Barbados, Benin, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chad, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Grenada, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Portugal, Somalia, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

Abstaining: Argentina, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burma, Colombia, Comoros, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Indonesia, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Lesotho, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Morocco, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, United Republic of Cameroon, Upper Volta, Zaire.

Operative paragraph 10 was adopted by 63 votes to 30, with 49 abstentions.

83. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote on the draft resolution as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gambia, German Democratic

Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

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

Abstaining: Austria, Bolivia, Central African Republic, Chile, Denmark, Finland, Gabon, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Lesotho, Liberia,⁶ Malawi, Norway, Paraguay, Rwanda, Singapore, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, Turkey.

The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 110 votes to 16, with 23 abstentions (resolution 36/51).

84. The PRESIDENT: We turn now to the report of the Fourth Committee on agenda items 95 and 12 [A/36/681] and will take action on the draft resolution entitled "Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples by the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations" recommended by the Committee in paragraph 8 of its report.

85. I shall call first upon those delegations that wish to speak in explanation of vote before the vote.

86. Mr. THOMSON (Canada): I should like to make the following observations about the draft resolution.

87. My Government is deeply concerned by the language in operative paragraph 20 of the draft resolution, which is a clear misrepresentation of article 11 of the agreement between the United Nations and the IMF. My Government is also disturbed by the references to the IMF and the World Bank contained in operative paragraphs 6 and 7 of the draft resolution before us. These organizations are concerned with technical matters and are functional in nature. Accordingly, we consider the politicization of these two bodies, as implied in this draft resolution, to be unacceptable. For these reasons, my Government regrets that it is not in a position to join in support of the draft resolution and will abstain in the vote.

88. Mr. TANÇ (Turkey): My delegation's explanation of vote in the Fourth Committee has not been reflected in the Committee's report. I shall therefore repeat it.

89. My delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution in accordance with the firm commitment of the Turkish Government to all the efforts that are being made

to eliminate colonialism, *apartheid* and racial discrimination from southern Africa.

90. However, I wish to express the reservation of my Government with regard to the sixth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution, in which reference is made by name to a certain region and certain States in that region.

91. The PRESIDENT: A request has been made for separate votes on operative paragraphs 6 and 7 of the draft resolution. If I hear no objection, we shall proceed accordingly.

It was so decided.

92. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will vote first on operative paragraph 6 of the draft resolution. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chad, China, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Niger, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

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

Abstaining: Argentina, Belize, Bolivia, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Fiji, Gabon, Guatemala, Ivory Coast, Jamaica,⁷ Jordan, Lesotho, Malawi, Mali, Mexico, Papua New Guinea, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Zaire.

Operative paragraph 6 was adopted by 82 to 25, with 30 abstentions.⁷

93. The PRESIDENT: We shall now vote on operative paragraph 7 of the draft resolution. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bahrain, Bhutan, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet

Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chad, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jamaica, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mauritius, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

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

Abstaining: Argentina, Belize, Bolivia, Central African Republic, Chile, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Fiji, Gabon, Guatemala, Honduras, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Lesotho, Malawi, Mali, Mexico, Papua New Guinea, Portugal, Samoa, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Zaire.

Operative paragraph 7 was adopted by 84 to 22, with 29 abstentions.⁸

94. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote on the draft resolution as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

Against: Belgium, Germany, Federal Republic of, Israel, Luxembourg, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Gabon, Greece, Guatemala, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica,⁹ Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Portugal, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden.

The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 124 to 6, with 23 abstentions (resolution 36/52).

95. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Chile, who wishes to explain his vote.

96. Mr. MONSALVE (Chile) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The Chilean delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution. None the less, we want to record our reservations on paragraphs 6, 7 and 20 in connection with the World Bank and the IMF. In our view, the World Bank and the IMF should be governed strictly by their constitutions, since that would be the best guarantee for Member States that the tasks set for them from the outset will be properly carried out and their objectives achieved. The same applies to the other specialized agencies of the United Nations family.

97. It is striking that several of the sponsors of the draft resolution are not even members of the organizations mentioned. If there should be some change in the statutes or the constitutions of the World Bank and the IMF, that would be the exclusive responsibility of the member States, not of the General Assembly.

98. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now consider the report of the Fourth Committee on agenda item 96 [A/36/682] and take action on the draft resolution entitled "United Nations Education and Training Programme for Southern Africa" recommended by the Committee in paragraph 8 of its report.

99. The Committee adopted the draft resolution without objection. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 36/53).

100. The PRESIDENT: We turn now to the report of the Fourth Committee on agenda item 97 [A/36/683].

101. The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution entitled "Offers by Member States of study and training facilities for inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories" recommended by the Fourth Committee in paragraph 7 of that report. The Committee adopted that draft resolution without objection. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 36/54).

AGENDA ITEM 36

Question of Namibia (*continued*):*

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

102. Mr. BEDJAOUI (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): Namibia remains subjugated, oppressed, its natural resources plundered, its national existence shattered, its territorial integrity destroyed, its soil used for massive and frequent acts of aggression against neighbouring countries.

Mr. Tarua (Papua New Guinea), Vice-President, took the Chair.

103. Decisions are reached and always unimplemented; a deadline is set but always extended; dates are established and never respected; sanctions are demanded and never imposed; an international administration is designated but never set up; negotiations are always resumed but always fail. That is the grim balance-sheet and the sad fate of the Namibian issue. History, which renders a faithful account of mankind's acts, imposes upon us its cruel lesson: South Africa's disdainful defiance of the international community did not begin a couple of years ago; it does not date from the adoption of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and the settlement plan.

104. South Africa's persistent humiliation of the United Nations is not unprecedented. The defunct ancestor of the United Nations, the League of Nations, had been repeatedly sidestepped by the then Mandatory Power. Already Member States, although it was the era of triumphant colonialism of the 1920s and 1930s, were saying no to South Africa, which had been defiantly evading all its international responsibilities concerning Namibia.

105. During that period and following it, the territorial and ethnic vivisection of Namibia continued, with the methodical and scientific determination of the imperial destroyer. *Apartheid* is South Africa's fragmentation bomb. The Namibian people is split up, its national conscience torn to shreds and its various sectors isolated from each other. Entire tribes are transplanted as though they were cattle. Better care is given to cattle, which constitute capital, than to human beings, who are deprived of their possessions by the plundering of their land. Triumphant, the policy of *apartheid*, with its offshoot the homelands policy, is directly responsible for uprooting sections of the population and for the territorial disintegration of Namibia, making possible the continued political enslavement and economic exploitation of the country. Not even in the evil of nazism can a parallel situation be found.

106. Never has a decolonization problem had such a frustrated time-table. The General Assembly revoked South Africa's Mandate and called for independence for Namibia without delay, but after 15 years that has still not been achieved. General Assembly resolution 2248 (SV) of 19 May 1967 set June 1968 as the date for independence, but of course that date was not kept to. The Security Council, in turn, confirmed the end of the Mandate and set 4 October 1969 as the deadline for the occupying Power to withdraw. Of course that met only with additional defiance. The date of 30 April 1970, subsequently set by the Council for the imposition of effective sanctions in case South Africa did not withdraw, was treated with indifference by South Africa. Following the meetings held at Addis Ababa from 28 January to 4 February 1972, the Council extended the deadline for sanctions to 31 July 1972, pursuant to Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations. Once again its efforts were in vain.

107. We could recite a truly endless list of deadlines thus far set and disregarded. This has a name: it is what is called the constant humiliation of the international com-

* Resumed from the 68th meeting.

munity. It also constitutes harsh and perhaps fatal tests of the credibility of international institutions. Lastly, it means that those who still accuse us of a lack of patience with South Africa are suffering from loss of memory.

108. For several decades now South Africa has been called upon in vain to honour its international obligations to Namibia. A comprehensive study of both General Assembly and Security Council resolutions demonstrates only too well that the outright aggression committed against the Namibian people has gone on too long and that international peace and security are seriously endangered in the region because of Pretoria. For too long now, Namibia has been muzzled, reduced to the misery of prisons, to the silence of the grave, to bitter bread drenched in the sweat of forced labour under the whips of the occupiers in the mines, so productive of royalties flowing to international finance institutions.

109. Since 1966 the United Nations has assumed direct responsibility over the Territory of Namibia, through the United Nations Council for Namibia, [resolution 2145 (XXI)] and promised rapidly to complete the liberation process. An international consensus was thus established, confirming the illegality of the occupation, the inalienable right of the Namibian people to independence, the legitimacy of its national liberation struggle and the exclusive representative nature of the South West Africa People's Organization [SWAPO]. Everything led us to believe that within the framework of the United Nations, this problem would find a solution in the genuine independence of the Territory. But, in defiance of the will of the international community, the racist régime of Pretoria, persisting in its illegal occupation of Namibia, has steadily mobilized its political-military apparatus with a view to applying a neo-colonial solution to Namibia.

110. I need hardly recall, in the first place, that the racist South African régime, in its obstinate rejection of all appeals by the international community, has always sought to impose its own so-called internal settlement. Thus creating the illusion of change but actually preserving its grip on Namibia, that régime is intensifying its repression of the Namibian people, as well as its acts of aggression against neighbouring countries.

111. I need hardly recall either that South Africa bears sole responsibility for the total failure of the pre-implementation meeting held at Geneva from 7 to 14 January 1981 to define the means of implementing the settlement plan sponsored by the five Western Powers members of the contact group, and endorsed by the Security Council in its resolution 435 (1978). In that plan, which had obvious shortcomings in its substance as well as in its means of implementation, both the United Nations and the contact group went a long way to meet South Africa's demands. But while SWAPO showed responsible open-mindedness and a high sense of national and international duty, the South African régime, for its part, through its customary delaying tactics, gave further irrefutable proof of its refusal to grant the Namibian people genuine self-determination with a view to independence.

112. In fact, it became clear from that meeting that South Africa had several objectives: first of all, to diminish SWAPO's status as the sole, legitimate representative of the Namibian people, as recognized by the United Nations and the entire international community; then, under the cover of the Organization, to enshrine internationally the so-called representatives of the internal parties, particularly the Democratic Turnhalle Alliance puppets; and,

lastly, in Machiavellian fashion, to evade its own responsibilities by going as far as to deny the very existence of a decolonization problem in Namibia and by putting the Alliance in the scene.

113. Thus the first lesson to be drawn from the failure of that meeting concerns the clear lack of political will on the part of South Africa to accept implementation of the settlement plan, and its persistent attempts to impose a neo-colonial solution through a group of puppets in its service.

114. The second lesson was and remains the fact that the five Western Powers have not brought sufficient pressure to bear on South Africa to induce it to comply with the demands of the international community. This must be admitted.

115. This responsibility of South Africa for the failure of the Geneva meeting gave reason to believe that the Security Council would at last take firm action to fulfil its primary duty—to ensure international peace and security. It also gave reason to believe that the Council, which as early as 1963 had described South Africa's actions as a serious threat to international peace and security, would at least impel the Pretoria régime to comply with international law and respect United Nations decisions, failure, which the enforcement measures provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter would be applied. But once again the use of the veto prevented that.

116. All the conditions of a genuine threat to international peace and security exist in southern Africa: the continued illegal occupation of Namibia, the odious system of *apartheid* imposed on the Namibian people, the repeated, unpunished acts of aggression against neighbouring countries. It was in the light of the Security Council's inability to react properly to that obvious state of crisis that Africa requested the convening of the eighth emergency special session. That session made it possible to express the ever growing solidarity with the Namibian people in their legitimate national liberation struggle and to call solemnly on the Security Council to organize the world's collective resources to South Africa's defiance and to implement comprehensive mandatory sanctions in the event of non-implementation of the settlement plan.

117. Today we are witnessing new initiatives aimed, we are told, at strengthening resolution 435 (1978), which, however, for the entire international community is the only acceptable basis for the settlement of the question of Namibia.

118. What is at issue? Let us be sure, first of all, that this is not a new plan aimed at imposing upon the Namibian people a political régime that it has not itself chosen. Let us be sure that it is not merely a formula to conceal South Africa's new demands, demands that would be met by mortgaging the sovereignty of the Namibian people over its own territory and by curtailing its independence. Lastly, let us be sure that it is not just one pattern fitting into the broader design of imperialism in southern Africa which would involve the cynical crowning of *apartheid* by the granting of sham independence in the framework of homelands.

119. How would it be possible to claim compliance with the commitment to assure genuine independence for Namibia if we attempted to change resolution 435 (1978)? After all, straying from the course chartered by the United Nations for the decolonization of the Territory of

Namibia would be tantamount to denying the very principle of the right of each people freely to choose its own form of government and its own economic and political system, a right that stems from the right of peoples to self-determination.

120. This is why Africa has constantly called for the faithful and sincere implementation of the United Nations plan. Today once again Africa expects the United Nations, which has the primary responsibility for the decolonization of Namibia, to play its major role in the attainment of genuine independence for Namibia.

121. Mr. BWAKIRA (Burundi) (*interpretation from French*): This is a year in which the international community has dealt with rare intensity with the tragedy and bloodshed engulfing the southern part of Africa as a whole and Namibia in particular.

122. None of the meetings held this year—here, at New Delhi at the Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries or at Nairobi at the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity—has failed to condemn South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia.

123. South Africa's persistent denial of the Namibian people's right to self-determination and independence and Pretoria's contempt for the resolutions of the United Nations and the OAU on the subject, its ruthless oppression of the peoples of the Territory and the threat to international peace and security which is a natural corollary of all this oblige us to take up today once again the question of Namibia and to take to task all those who, through their co-operation of various kinds with South Africa, bear the responsibility for blocking the normal process of Namibian decolonization.

124. Yet, just before the meeting held at Geneva on Namibia, everything seemed to suggest that Namibia by the end of this very year would join the community of free and independent nations. Good faith, good will, moderation and a high sense of responsibility are characteristics of both SWAPO and the United Nations and they constituted the best guarantee of success.

125. So the Geneva meeting had simply to work out the modalities for the cease-fire and for the implementation of the peace plan set out in Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

126. Pretoria transformed the peace meeting into a meeting of dupes. Its major concern was to get the international community to recognize the representativity of its accomplices in the Democratic Turnhalle Alliance, thereby destroying SWAPO's position, which is universally recognized.

127. Wrongly accusing the United Nations of bias, refusing to negotiate with SWAPO, the sole representative of the Namibian people, and advancing further new arguments that were just as groundless as all the others, such as the establishment of a so-called climate of confidence, Pretoria brought into the open its bad faith, its political ill will and thus its rejection of any peaceful settlement of the Namibian crisis.

128. The inaction of the members of the contact group of Western countries, or at the least their lack of enthusiasm about putting the necessary pressure on Pretoria, which everyone was entitled to expect of them, and the

growing scepticism of some members of the contact group concerning resolution 435 (1978)—all this was a comfort to Pretoria as it maintained its arrogant stand. It interpreted the lack of pressure on the part of the contact group as thinly veiled complicity that would later ensure its impunity when it carried out its barbarous attacks on Angola. The paralysis that engulfed the Security Council during its consideration of the South African aggression against Angola confirms that view. Moreover, Pretoria felt that implicitly it was responsible for looking after the region and for looking after the interests of what it calls the Western world, thus distorting the decolonization process in Namibia and turning it into a struggle for influence between the East and West.

129. Once the Geneva meeting on Namibia had failed, and despite the bitterness and frustration that that engendered, the international community as a whole turned to the Security Council, the organ with primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. It intended thus to exhaust all the means of achieving a peaceful settlement of the Namibian question. So it was doing what the Council itself had requested in resolution 439 (1978) when it warned South Africa that if it did not co-operate in the implementation of resolutions 385 (1976), 431 (1978) and 435 (1978), it would be compelled "to meet forthwith to initiate appropriate actions under the Charter of the United Nations, including Chapter VII thereof, so as to ensure South Africa's compliance with the aforementioned resolutions".

130. Everyone supported that objective. The front-line countries met at Lusaka on 17 February 1981, just a few days after the wrecking of the Geneva meeting on Namibia, and they in turn reconfirmed their conviction that the South African racist régime could not be led to the negotiating table for a peaceful settlement of the Namibian question unless economic and political pressure were exerted on it by the contact group of the five Western countries and the international community as a whole.

131. The Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity confirmed that analysis at its thirty-sixth ordinary session held at Addis Ababa from 23 February to 1 March 1981.¹⁰ That approach met the concerns of those who constantly advocated realism and the benefits of dialogue and negotiation, even though Pretoria had used the negotiations to strip away all substance from the United Nations settlement plan, to strengthen its hold on the Territory of Namibia and to destabilize the front-line countries.

132. South Africa having decided to sabotage the peace negotiations on Namibia, the international community had no option but to resort to the political and economic isolation of the Pretoria régime, as recommended in such circumstances by the relevant provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

133. The Security Council, in refusing to apply mandatory sanctions against South Africa, not only refused to shoulder its responsibilities and went against the universal consensus but also and above all, by its inaction, implicitly accepted the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa.

134. The arguments that were used at the time—that economic sanctions were not an effective means of influencing policy—contradict paragraph 6 of resolution 439 (1978).

135. Since South Africa has rejected dialogue, SWAPO has now every reason to envisage the most appropriate methods for re-establishing its rights that have been violated and putting an end to the plundering of its resources.

136. The front-line countries, in their Lusaka communiqué, said that, after the failure of the Geneva meeting, SWAPO had no option but to intensify the liberation war in Namibia, and in this respect they reconfirmed their unwavering support for SWAPO. They also appealed to all countries loving freedom and peace to support SWAPO in all spheres, including economic, diplomatic and military assistance.

137. Appeals for one-sided patience and moderation really have no bases any more, because four decades of negotiations with South Africa have served only to strengthen further Pretoria's intransigence and aloof attitude.

138. Before concluding, I would simply restate our consistent position on this matter. It was stated clearly by our Minister for Foreign Affairs in the general debate. He said:

“ . . . we reiterate our support for the South West Africa People's Organization [SWAPO], the sole representative of the Namibian people. The Namibian question is, in the last analysis, a question of decolonization under the full and sole responsibility of the United Nations. We therefore reject any attempt to distort its nature or deflect its course.

“We believe that no country or group of countries has any right to link the independence of Namibia to events or situations that take place or might take place outside its borders.

“The decolonization plan for Namibia, as approved by the Security Council in resolution 435 (1978), must be fully implemented. We see no reason to dilute its substance or to delay its implementation.

“Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia, enacted by the United Nations Council for Namibia on 27 September 1974, must be strictly respected. Those who indulge directly or indirectly in the exploitation of Namibian resources, regardless of their origin, must immediately put an end to that outrageous pillage.

“We ask the five Western Countries, members of the contact group, no longer to tolerate Pretoria's sabotaging the decolonization plan for Namibia, which is provided for in resolution 435 (1978) and of which they claim to be the authors.” [19th meeting, paras, 20 to 24.]

139. Those are the main ideas that determine our position on the question of Namibia. Accordingly, my delegation will associate itself with any draft resolution which takes account of the premises that I have stated here.

140. Mr. HABTE-YIMER (Ethiopia): It is with a deep sense of disappointment and indignation that the Ethiopian delegation once again takes part in the general debate on the question of Namibia. Namibia, a Territory for which the United Nations has a unique, legal and moral responsibility, should have been independent long ago. Regrettably, however, the adamant refusal of South Africa to withdraw from the Territory and the acquies-

cence of certain Western Powers in this have frustrated all hopes for early independence for that Territory.

141. The question of Namibia is a case of decolonization and, hence, South Africa should end its colonial occupation of that Territory immediately and without any condition. The United Nations plan, endorsed by Security Council resolution 435 (1978), remains to this day the sole basis for the achievement of the goal of independence for Namibia through peaceful means.

142. Regrettably, it must be noted in this regard that in recent months we have witnessed an ill-advised and ill-conceived attempt to alter the United Nations plan through the injection of new ideas which, if accepted, would shift the concern of the international community from the inalienable right of the totality of the Namibian people to the preservation of the entrenched rights of the few. To show concern for a few white settlers while the overwhelming majority of Africans in Namibia are systematically denied their basic rights and fundamental freedoms is, to say the least, both unjust and illogical.

143. The whole world, except South Africa, recognizes the inalienable right of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence. A corollary of this right is the sovereignty of that people to choose the type of constitution and the kind of social and political system that fits its particular needs and aspirations. No one, least of all those that have benefited from the colonial occupation of Namibia, should therefore attempt to impose constitutional principles and political structures on the Namibian people. Ethiopia cannot be a party to any move to deprive Namibia's independence of much of its substance and meaning. Justice demands that the Namibians be allowed to choose freely and democratically their genuine representatives in accordance with the expressed provisions of the United Nations plan. Then, and only then, can we speak about the constitutional future of Namibia, and only those that have the mandate of the people can determine the type of constitution they want for the Namibian people.

144. The history of the relations between the United Nations and the South African régime clearly shows that at no time has Pretoria negotiated in good faith. Indeed, bad faith and prevarication have all along characterized the diplomatic conduct of that racist régime. We are, therefore, of the firm conviction that any future attempt to continue negotiating with the South African régime can have no more success than those aborted attempts of the past. We have time and again said that the process of negotiation is a means and not an end in itself to be pursued irrespective of its real or potential outcome. South Africa has forfeited its right as a partner in international negotiations by its arrogance and intransigence. Consequently, it should be forced, and not entreated, to end its illegal occupation of Namibia.

145. Inasmuch as the Security Council has so far failed to shoulder its responsibility under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, there seems to be no alternative but to intensify the armed struggle waged by SWAPO, the sole and authentic representative of the people of Namibia. The Western Powers have not only obstructed enforcement measures by the Security Council, but have overtly and covertly provided racist Pretoria with the requisite sustenance. In this regard, we are obliged to caution all Members that the contact group of the five Western countries, whatever they might publicly declare or promise, cannot be expected to act against their own

interests. Those five States have so far benefited and will continue to benefit from the illegal occupation of Namibia and from the continuation of the policies of *apartheid* in South Africa. Reason dictates that we cannot expect much from them. Misplaced hope and expectation can only result in disappointment and frustration.

146. Africa and the entire peace-loving community of nations should henceforth increase their assistance, both material and financial, to SWAPO and the front-line States. In the absence of mandatory economic sanctions, only the intensified prosecution of the legitimate liberation struggle could force racist South Africa to end its occupation of Namibia.

147. Finally, I should like to commend the United Nations Council for Namibia for its positive contribution to the eventual and inevitable attainment of independence by Namibia. The Ethiopian delegation endorses the recommendations of the Council contained in its report [A/36/24, para. 708], and as a result will give them its support when they are put to the vote.

148. Mr. NISIBORI (Japan): The Territory of Namibia has been a matter of international concern for far too many years. In fact, ever since the United Nations was established 36 years ago it has been dealing with the question of Namibia. During this period many countries on the African continent have achieved independence. Namibia, however, has regrettably not yet gained that status, in spite of all the efforts which States Members of the United Nations have made over many years.

149. Few delegations represented here today would deny that the process of seeking solutions to international problems is complex and laborious. In establishing a basis for a genuine, peaceful and lasting solution to the question of Namibia, perseverance is required, as is a spirit of co-operation, understanding and negotiation in good faith. Those are qualities which the front-line States and other African countries, as well as the five Western countries, have exhibited in dealing with this question. SWAPO, for its part, has also demonstrated good faith by expressing its readiness to sign a cease-fire agreement with South Africa. This spirit of co-operation, however, has unfortunately not always been shared by the Government of South Africa. Reference is made, for example, to its intransigent attitude at the pre-implementation meeting at Geneva from 7 to 14 January 1981.

150. In numerous debates, including those conducted at the resumed thirty-fifth session, the Security Council meetings in April, and the eighth emergency special session, many delegations, including my own, have repeatedly expressed their profound disappointment over South Africa's uncompromising attitude. Time and again we expressed the hope that the South African Government would correctly understand the present situation and the growing indignation of the world community, and that it would not obstruct efforts to find a peaceful solution to this problem. In his statement last September the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Japan reaffirmed Japan's view that "the question of Namibia should be solved on the basis of Security Council resolution 435 (1978)" [8th meeting, para. 145] and expressed Japan's hope that "the countries concerned will make further efforts towards an early solution of that problem" [*ibid.*].

151. My delegation would like once again to urge the South African Government to consider the matter sincerely so that Namibia can achieve its independence on

the basis of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) at an early date. We call upon South Africa to respond to the ongoing efforts of the countries concerned and extend its full and sincere co-operation for the implementation of resolution 435 (1978).

152. Another important aspect of efforts in this area is the work of the United Nations Council for Namibia. My delegation attaches importance to the work of the Council, which is the Administering Authority for Namibia until independence is achieved. Its report well describes the Council's persistent efforts, including those in mobilizing world opinion and administering various programmes relating to Namibia. Nevertheless, my delegation has reservations about some parts of the report, such as those related to support for armed struggle as well as its harsh and one-sided accusations directed against the sincere efforts of countries concerned. It is Japan's steadfast conviction that any international conflict or dispute must be resolved by peaceful means, without recourse to the threat or use of force. We cannot support armed struggle, not even in the settlement of the vexing Namibian question. In addition, some parts of the report make sweeping references to Member States, including my own. My delegation hopes that the sincere efforts which the Government and people of Japan have been making will be correctly understood by the Council. Further, my delegation believes that efforts made by all countries concerned towards an early and peaceful settlement are to be commended and encouraged.

153. In this connection, Japan has consistently supported and highly valued the efforts of the contact group of the Western countries in seeking an early and peaceful solution to the problem. Such efforts include their settlement proposal, the adoption of resolution 435 (1978) and their initiatives for conciliation and mediation.

154. After the failure of the Geneva meeting last January, the five Governments affirmed their commitment to "vigorous action in the efforts to bring Namibia to independence at an early date. Thus we welcome the recent visit by a mission of the contact group to southern Africa and regard it as a sign of hope and encouragement. It is reported that the mission submitted the so-called constitutional principles and had consultations with many leaders, including those of South Africa, the front-line States, SWAPO and internal parties of Namibia. These consultations aimed at achieving an early solution of the question and it is our earnest hope that they will prove to be a breakthrough in the impasse that has confronted the process since January.

155. My delegation attaches great value to the continuing role played by the contact group and urges it to intensify its efforts. At the same time, we hope that South Africa, SWAPO, the front-line States and other African States will likewise make further efforts, together with the contact group, towards the early implementation of resolution 435 (1978).

156. I should like to reaffirm Japan's readiness to consider seriously all constructive proposals which may be presented for an early and internationally acceptable solution of the Namibian question. As I indicated in my statement at the 3rd meeting of the eighth emergency special session last September, Japan has taken various concrete measures in connection with the question of Namibia, which have gained the co-operation and understanding of the Japanese people. The Government and people of Japan are clearly committed to co-operating in the effort of the

United Nations to bring about through peaceful means the early independence of Namibia. As part of its commitment Japan has already declared its readiness to participate in UNTAG once it is established. And when Namibia's independence is attained my country will continue to extend co-operation in its nation-building efforts.

157. In conclusion, I should like to express the hope of my delegation that the ongoing efforts of the parties concerned will enable Namibia soon to begin to build for itself a peaceful and prosperous future as an independent and sovereign nation. And I am quite sure that many members of the Assembly will agree that a solution of the question of Namibia will not only benefit the people of that Territory, but will contribute to the peace and stability of the entire region.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.

NOTES

¹ The delegation of Mauritius subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution.

² The delegation of Yemen subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote against the draft resolution.

³ Frente Revolucionária de Timor Leste Independente.

⁴ The delegation of Jamaica subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain in the vote on the motion.

⁵ The delegation of Jamaica subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain in the vote on operative paragraph 9 and the delegation of Liberia informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote against the paragraph.

⁶ The delegation of Liberia subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

⁷ The delegations of Jamaica and Uganda subsequently informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour of operative paragraph 6.

⁸ The delegation of Uganda subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour of operative paragraph 7.

⁹ The delegation of Jamaica subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

¹⁰ *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-sixth Year, Supplement for January, February and March 1981, document S/14390.*