

United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

FOURTEENTH SPECIAL SESSION

Official Records



7th
PLENARY MEETING

Saturday, 20 September 1986,
at 10.50 a.m.

NEW YORK

President: Mr. Humayun Rasheed
CHOUDHURY (Bangladesh).

AGENDA ITEM 6

Question of Namibia (*concluded*)

1. The PRESIDENT: I hereby remind representatives that the debate on agenda item 6 was concluded at the sixth meeting. In connection with the item, the General Assembly has before it a draft resolution, contained in document A/S-14/L.1. I call on the representative of Zambia to introduce the draft resolution.

2. Mr. MWANANSHIKU (Zambia): It is a great honour and privilege for me, a representative of one of the front-line States, to introduce the draft resolution which is before the Assembly and contained in document A/S-14/L.1.

3. Over the years, the international community has been frustrated in its efforts to implement the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia as agreed upon by the Security Council. South Africa's intransigence remains the only obstacle in the way of Namibia's independence.

4. In June 1985 the Security Council considered the question of Namibia, in particular the question of the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). On that occasion the Council adopted resolution 566 (1985), by which it once again expressed its indignation at South Africa's refusal to comply with resolution 435 (1978) and, in particular, at Pretoria's insistence on the irrelevant and extraneous issue of linkage, which had obstructed the implementation of the resolution.

5. In his statement a few days ago [*1st meeting*] the Secretary-General informed this body that there had been no change in the position of South Africa in regard to the issue of linkage. This has made it impossible for the United Nations plan for Namibia to be implemented.

6. It is a matter of grave concern that 20 years after the General Assembly terminated the Mandate of South Africa over Namibia [*resolution 2145 (XXI)*], Namibia not only remains illegally occupied by South Africa, but also continues to be subjected to increasing militarization by the aggressive forces of occupation.

7. The draft resolution before the General Assembly begins by laying down the basic principles

reiterated by the Assembly and proceeds to reaffirm the inalienable right of the people of Namibia to self-determination, freedom and national independence in a united Namibia, including Walvis Bay, the Penguin Islands and all the adjacent offshore islands, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) as well as the subsequent relevant resolutions and decisions of the Assembly and the Security Council.

8. The draft resolution further reaffirms that the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia is the only internationally acceptable basis for a peaceful settlement of the question of Namibia and demands its immediate implementation without preconditions or modifications.

9. The draft resolution also recognizes that the policies of "constructive engagement" and "linkage" have hindered the realization of Namibia's independence and appeals to the United States to abandon them.

10. In paragraph 15 of the draft resolution the Security Council is urged to exercise its authority with regard to the implementation of its resolutions 385 (1976), 435 (1978), 532 (1983), 539 (1983) and 566 (1985) and to act decisively against any dilatory manoeuvres and fraudulent schemes of South Africa against Namibia.

11. In paragraph 19 of the draft resolution the Security Council is called upon to convene urgently to take action for the immediate and unconditional implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia.

12. Finally, in the draft resolution the Secretary-General is requested to report to the General Assembly as appropriate, but not later than 31 December 1986, on its implementation.

13. A fair reading of the draft resolution should make it clear that it is purely and simply an attempt to implement the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia embodied in Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

14. On behalf of the United Nations Council for Namibia, I appeal to all members to adopt the draft resolution as a whole by acclamation. I submit the draft resolution in the firm hope that it will receive the broadest possible support from the Assembly.

15. The draft resolution is sponsored by the following Member States: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bangladesh, Benin, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, German Democratic

Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran, Islamic Republic of, Iraq, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

16. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes before the voting on the draft resolution. I remind the Assembly that under rule 8 of the rules of procedure, "the President shall not permit the proposer of a proposal or of an amendment to explain his vote on his own proposal or amendment." I also remind representatives that explanations of vote are limited to 10 minutes and should be made by representatives from their seats.

17. Sir John THOMSON (United Kingdom): I have the honour to speak about the draft resolution on behalf of the twelve States members of the European Community. We regret that once again it has not been possible to reach consensus, because of certain elements that make unanimous approval by the General Assembly impossible.

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

19. The Twelve cannot endorse the call in the draft resolution for Member States to render increased military assistance to the South West Africa People's Organization [SWAPO], as a means of bringing Namibia to independence. Similarly, they cannot agree to lend their support to armed struggle as a means to that end, in spite of the impatience and frustration felt by the Namibian people owing to South Africa's continuing and illegal occupation of the Territory. In the view of the Twelve, the general and primary duty of the United Nations is to promote peaceful solutions in conformity with the Charter, thus avoiding any encouragement of the use of force.

20. The Twelve also reject any arbitrary and selective attack against States Members of the United Nations or groups of countries.

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

22. This special session testifies to the importance accorded by the international community to the question of Namibia. It is therefore all the more regrettable that those and other controversial elements have been introduced into the draft resolution. That practice risks dividing the membership of the United Nations at a time when there is a need more than ever to mobilize the international community in pursuit of the common goal of internationally recognized independence for Namibia.

23. Earlier in the debate [*3rd meeting*] I set out the position of the Twelve on the question of Namibia. The illegal occupation of the Territory by South Africa must be brought to an end. The only acceptable basis for a peaceful and lasting solution to the problem is the implementation, without pre-conditions or pretext, of Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978). The settlement plan endorsed by the second of those resolutions—which has been accepted by the Government of South Africa and by SWAPO—embodies the only universally accepted framework for a peaceful transition to independence in a manner that is guaranteed by the Organization to be fair and free. We wish to see the plan implemented in its entirety so that the people of Namibia can move forward to the internationally recognized independence that is their due. We cannot accept any further delay in that process or accept that the implementation of the settlement plan should be held up because of extraneous considerations.

24. Mr. KOUASSI (Togo) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, in a more authorized voice than my own, we will at the appropriate time convey to you the warmest congratulations of the Togolese delegation on your unanimous election to the presidency of the forty-first session of the General Assembly. In the meantime, rest assured that we shall give you our full support and that we shall at all times co-operate with you in order to ensure the smooth running and the success of our work.

25. My country strongly condemns, without reservation and without any nuance, the retrograde and heinous policies pursued by the South African régime, and its continued defiance of the international community. It is obvious that the arrogance, intransigence, and scorn shown by Pretoria with regard to the relevant United Nations resolutions have been encouraged by the collusion of certain major Powers. Furthermore, my country believes that the imposition of comprehensive mandatory economic sanctions against South Africa is the only effective way of ensuring that that régime will put an end to its illegal occupation of the international Territory of Namibia.

26. For this reason my delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/S-14/L.1. However, my delegation will have to abstain in the separate votes on paragraphs 13 and 14 of the draft resolution. Our abstention on these paragraphs is in keeping with our position of principle, which is well-known, namely that we object to any condemnation or reference to specific countries in a draft resolution. In the case in point our attitude is well founded because many other countries also co-operate with the racist régime of South Africa or give their support to its policies, and even maintain many forms of co-operation with that régime. But our abstention does not in any way diminish our commitment to the people of Namibia and their authentic representative, SWAPO, as has been testified to by the position which we have maintained at all times.

27. Mr. MANGWAZU (Malawi): I wish to explain my vote before voting on behalf of my delegation. I want to make it clear to the members of the Assembly that we strongly support the idea of a free Namibia. I think this must be made very clear. We wish to make

it clear also that we do not support the idea of linkage. And I wish also to make it clear that, like Togo, Malawi does not support the condemnation or the naming of specific countries as perpetrators or as causing the delay of the independence of Namibia. Our wish is to get everybody's support for the draft resolution, and for the thrust of the resolution, which is basically the freedom of Namibia. In addition, let me make it clear to the members of the Assembly that Malawi is reluctant to support paragraphs 15, 16 and 17, which mention mandatory sanctions.

28. Having said this, I want to make it clear that we shall not vote in favour of these paragraphs, to which we object, but we shall vote for the freedom and independence of Namibia, which is long overdue.

29. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Peru has asked to speak on a point of order. I call on him.

30. Mr. WAGNER TIZON (Peru) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Yesterday, in the course of my statement [6th meeting], I said that this special session of the General Assembly should lead to a clear statement by the international community with regard to its decision to act in the face of the intransigent attitude of the Government of Pretoria, which has violated all the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations and which illegally occupies the Territory of Namibia and is thus denying the Namibian people their independence, freedom and justice to which they have a right. In this regard this is not a time for hesitation or doubt. We are convinced—and this has been recognized by the General Assembly and by the Peruvian Government in particular—that SWAPO is the legitimate representative of the people of Namibia and there can be no doubt in this regard. Furthermore, in our opinion, the draft resolution before us reveals a very determined desire to act, and that is what we are looking for at this session of the Assembly. Although any document can always be improved upon, we believe that the draft resolution does reflect the position of Peru on the question of Namibia. We would like to request, therefore, that Peru be included amongst the sponsors, and of course we would vote in favour of the draft resolution in its entirety.

31. The PRESIDENT: I have to inform members that the Syrian Arab Republic and Vanuatu also wish to become sponsors of draft resolution A/S-14/L.1.

32. The Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolution A/S-14/L.1. In this connection, I should like to inform members that the Secretary-General is not in a position at this time to determine the programme budget implications of the draft resolution. Should it be determined, after consultation with the United Nations Council for Namibia, that the implementation of the resolution would give rise to expenditures over and above those already approved for the activities of the Council for the biennium 1986-1987, the Secretary-General would submit a report to the General Assembly at its forty-first session on the estimated additional requirements for the implementation of the resolution.

33. The Assembly will now begin the voting process. Separate votes have been requested on portions

of paragraphs 13 and 14 of the draft resolution. Is there any objection to those requests?

34. Mr. MWANANSHIKU (Zambia): I should like to raise an objection to the motion made by some of our colleagues to vote on parts of the draft resolution before us. I submit that since the draft resolution represents the broad views of most of the Member States, it should be voted on as a whole.

35. The PRESIDENT: Objection has been made to the request for a vote by division. In accordance with rule 89 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, "if objection is made to the request for division, the motion for division shall be voted upon. Permission to speak on the motion for division shall be given only to two speakers in favour and two speakers against." Do any other members wish to speak on the request for division?

36. Mr. SVOBODA (Canada): As the President has pointed out, the rules of procedure allow for two speakers to support and two to oppose a motion such as the one placed before us, namely, to have separate votes on portions of the draft resolution we are now considering. My delegation wishes to support the motion to have separate votes on portions of paragraphs 13 and 14 of the draft resolution. It would be unprecedented in the recent history of the General Assembly to deny a vote on parts of a draft resolution to any delegation requesting such a vote. To do so would, in our view, set an unfortunate precedent for the conduct of this forum's business and we are of the firm belief that our proceedings should not be circumscribed in this way. I emphasize that this does not bear on the substance of the matter before us. In this instance, we simply wish to support the motion to allow a separate vote on particular parts of the draft resolution before us. We wish to avoid limiting the rights of delegations to make their views known in the Assembly.

37. Mr. LAUTENSCHLAGER (Federal Republic of Germany): My delegation wishes to support the request for a separate vote. Indeed, it would be unprecedented in the recent history of the General Assembly to deny a vote on parts of a draft resolution to any delegation that wanted it. To do so would set a dangerous precedent for the conduct of the Assembly's business and we cannot accept that our discussion should be curtailed in this way. This has nothing to do with the substance of the matter that we are discussing. We simply are opposed to limiting the rights of delegations to make their views known in this Assembly.

38. The PRESIDENT: Are there any other speakers on the request for division? One representative has spoken against and two representatives have spoken in favour of the request for division. In accordance with rule 89, I shall now put to the vote the motion for division. The decision we are about to take is a procedural one and has to be taken by a simple majority. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Belize, Brunei Darussalam, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Co-

lombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Denmark, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Philippines, Portugal, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

Against: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Maldives, Mauritania, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Poland, Qatar, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Seychelles, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining: Barbados, Iraq, Kenya, Lesotho, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Senegal, Somalia, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Zaire.

The motion was adopted by 62 votes to 55, with 20 abstentions.¹

39. The PRESIDENT: I shall therefore put the portion of paragraph 13 on which a separate vote has been requested to the vote first. A separate, recorded vote has been requested on retention of the phrase "the United States Administration and".

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Bhutan, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Seychelles, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Denmark, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Grenada,

Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malta, Mauritius, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Philippines, Portugal, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Senegal, Spain, Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Egypt, Gabon, Haiti, Lesotho, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Swaziland, Sweden, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zaire.

There were 65 votes in favour, 48 against and 27 abstentions. Having failed to obtain the required two-thirds majority, the phrase was not retained.²

40. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Ghana on a point of order.

41. Mr. ASAMOAH (Ghana): I apologize for intervening at this stage of the proceedings, but my delegation would like some guidance from the President with regard to the number of votes required on this question.

42. Special rule F of annex III to the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, which I believe governs decisions on this draft resolution, reads as follows:

"Decisions of the General Assembly on questions relating to reports and petitions concerning the Territory of South West Africa shall be regarded as important questions within the meaning of Article 18, paragraph 2, of the Charter of the United Nations."

My question is, are we taking decisions relating to reports and petitions?

43. The PRESIDENT: I call on the Legal Counsel to provide clarification.

44. Mr. FLEISCHHAUER (Legal Counsel): With respect to the request for clarification by the delegation of Ghana, I would like to state that the words in special rule F have been regarded in the practice of the General Assembly—most recently at the last two sessions—as referring to all decisions to be taken with respect to Namibia, including resolutions and portions of resolutions.

45. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Ghana on a point of order.

46. Mr. ASAMOAH (Ghana): I wish to thank the Legal Counsel for that opinion. However, it seems to my delegation that past practice did not involve any special session. I remember that the interpretation given by the Legal Counsel last year was accepted by the Assembly. But that was in respect of a report on the Territory of South West Africa or Namibia to the Assembly at a regular session. This, however, is a special session of the Assembly at which there is no report or petition before us. Therefore my delegation has considerable difficulty understanding the appli-

cation of the Legal Counsel's opinion to the present proceedings.

47. I should like to know if indeed the practice to which the Legal Counsel referred involved a special session of the Assembly.

48. The PRESIDENT: The point raised by the representative of Ghana is an important one on which, I think, we need a legal opinion. I therefore call on the Legal Counsel to provide clarification.

49. Mr. FLEISCHHAUER (Legal Counsel): In response to the additional question asked by the representative of Ghana, no distinction is made between precedents set by the General Assembly at a regular session, a special session or an emergency special session in matters of procedure of the the Assembly.

50. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Ghana.

51. Mr. ASAMOAH (Ghana): I am sorry to have to drag this matter out, but I think I made two points in my last intervention, one relating to the fact that this is a special session and the other to the fact that there are no petitions or reports before us. I am quite sure that many of us would be happy to hear what the Legal Counsel says in respect to the second point.

52. The PRESIDENT: I call on the Legal Counsel to provide clarification on the second point.

53. Mr. FLEISCHHAUER (Legal Counsel): In my reply to the first question I pointed out that the practice of the General Assembly has been to make no distinction in the application of special rule F of annex III in dealing with reports or petitions or resolutions, and that it has come to interpret special rule F as applying to all decisions on Namibia. I cannot recall any case in which the General Assembly had determined that the existence of a report or a petition was a prerequisite for the application of the two-thirds majority provided for in special rule F.

54. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Nigeria has asked to speak on a point of order. I call upon him.

55. Mr. ONONAIYE (Nigeria): I apologize for appearing to want to hold up the proceedings. Far be it from an unlearned person to attempt to lock horns with learned and honourable men when they give opinions on matters that are very, very important to a considerable number of delegations.

56. I confess that I myself am a little ignorant since the area of discussion touches on law, and I do not know whether in your own wisdom, Mr. President, there is not a basis here for wanting to seek a neutral interpretation as to the position of the delegation of Ghana, with which we very much sympathize and which we support, and the opinion given to us by the Legal Counsel, especially since he has said that he cannot cite a precedent. It looks as though the Assembly would just have to be at the mercy of an assertion by the Legal Counsel. Perhaps there is no precedent for this, and it looks like the International

Court of Justice will be a useful arbiter on this matter.

57. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Ghana.

58. Mr. ASAMOAH (Ghana): My delegation has difficulty in accepting the validity of the opinion given by the Legal Counsel. If I am not out of order, I would ask that, in order that we do not establish bad precedents, a vote be taken on this issue. It is quite clear to me that this rule relates to reports and petitions and that the practice in the past has related to reports that have been submitted to the Assembly in respect of the Territory. There is no precedent that a vote by a two-thirds majority present and voting is required when no report is submitted to the Assembly. I think this is very important. Even if any such precedents existed, they would be bad ones, and we should really not clog the work of the Assembly with precedents that could not stand up to critical examination. Therefore, if this is not too much to ask, I would request that we all express our opinions on this issue.

59. Mr. VRAALSEN (Norway): Let me say that I deeply regret that we have ended up in the procedural wrangle in which we now find ourselves. At the outset I really did not believe that this would happen. Thanks to past experience and the practice of past years, the situation appears very, very clear, at least to my delegation. We went through the same thing last year and the year before that, and we had opinions from Legal Counsel. I would have expected the situation to be equally clear to other delegations.

60. The Legal Counsel has given us his opinion on three occasions here. In my delegation's view his opinion is consistent. My delegation does not see any difference between regular sessions, special sessions and emergency special sessions as far as the rules of procedure are concerned. They are equally applicable to all three kinds of sessions. We use the same rules, the same procedures. I do not really think any attempt should be made to construe a difference. So first of all I should like to express my whole-hearted support for the opinion that has been given.

61. The representative of Ghana has just suggested, if I heard him correctly, that the Assembly should vote on the opinion of the Legal Counsel. That, if I may say so, would be very unusual indeed. I cannot in my many years in the Assembly remember any occasion when we have voted on the opinion of the Legal Counsel. I would ask you, Mr. President, to give us your guidance. That would be the normal practice. In view of what has been said and in view of the opinion of the Legal Counsel, you should give us your guidance and then the Assembly would abide by it. I would first say that to vote on the opinion of the Legal Counsel would certainly be very unusual and would be unacceptable to my delegation, and I would seek your guidance in this matter, Sir.

62. Mr. SCHRICKE (France) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation of course endorses the comments just made by the representative of Norway and I would add that my delegation is rather surprised at the request for a vote made by the representative of Ghana. You, Sir, had already taken a decision. After

the vote you stated that the two-thirds majority had not been achieved and that therefore the phrase should not be retained; and you had banged the gavel before the representative of Ghana requested clarification. My delegation naturally did not oppose that request for clarification, considering that your decision had already been taken. Therefore, were there to be a vote, that would be a challenge of your decision.

63. The PRESIDENT: I wish the matter had been put before the International Court of Justice, as the representative of Nigeria has said. The practice on previous occasions has been that on important questions, in application of rule F and in accordance with Article 18, paragraph 2 of the Charter, decisions of the General Assembly were taken by a two-thirds majority of the members present and voting, and in view of the fact that the question was raised after the gavel had been struck I would rule that since no formal proposal had been made for changing the practice so far followed, a two-thirds majority shall be required for a decision of this nature.

It was so decided.

64. The PRESIDENT: I shall now put to the vote the portion of paragraph 14 of the draft resolution on which a separate, recorded vote has been requested, that is, the phrase "pursued by the present United States Administration".

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Bhutan, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Denmark, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Mauritius, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Philippines, Portugal, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Central African Republic, Egypt, Gabon, Gambia, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Lesotho, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Nepal, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sudan,

Swaziland, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zaire.

There were 60 votes in favour, 48 against and 30 abstentions. Having failed to obtain the required two-thirds majority, the phrase was not retained.²

65. The PRESIDENT: I shall now put to the vote the draft resolution as a whole, as amended. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, 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, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

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

The draft resolution as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 126 votes to none, with 24 abstentions (resolution S-14/1).³

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

67. Mr. HELGASON (Iceland): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the five Nordic countries—Denmark, Finland, Norway, Sweden and Iceland.

68. The Nordic countries view this special session of the General Assembly as a unique opportunity to unite the international community and demonstrate to South Africa that there is a general consensus

among Member States on the fundamental issues concerning the question of Namibia.

69. We all agree that Security Council resolution 435 (1978) is the only internationally acceptable basis for a peaceful and lasting solution, and unanimously support the determined efforts of the Secretary-General to bring about its speedy implementation. The Namibian people must be permitted without delay to determine its own future through free and fair elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations, in accordance with this resolution. All attempts to introduce extraneous issues or other delaying tactics have been and must be condemned, including the establishment of the so-called interim administration in Namibia. The installation of that administration must be rejected as illegal, null and void.

70. The Nordic countries regard South Africa's continuing illegal occupation of Namibia as a threat to international peace and security. The international community should increase its pressure on South Africa in order to speed up the implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia and the Security Council should consider without further delay effective measures to that end, including mandatory sanctions.

71. Meanwhile, there is an urgent need for generous and increased economic and humanitarian assistance to the people of Namibia.

72. The Nordic countries are dismayed that despite active efforts to reach a general consensus this has not proved possible. The resolution just adopted contains a number of elements that cause us difficulties of principle. I shall outline those well-known difficulties in general terms.

73. We cannot accept formulations that imply endorsement by the United Nations of the use of armed struggle or call for material or military assistance to such struggle. One of the basic principles of this Organization, enshrined in the Charter, is to promote peaceful solutions of conflicts.

74. We deplore the inappropriate singling out of individual countries or groups of countries and their policies as responsible for South Africa's actions.

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

76. Finally, the Nordic countries share the view that all parties enjoying support in Namibia should be allowed to take part in the political process leading to the independence of Namibia and to the establishment of a Government through free and fair elections. SWAPO is such a party, and it is fundamental that SWAPO be made part of any solution to the question of Namibia. However, we have reservations concerning formulations which could prejudice the outcome of the political process I have mentioned.

77. Mr. AL-ANSI (Oman) (*interpretation from Arabic*): My delegation followed with interest this morning the results of the important meetings held

recently to prepare the ground for the formulation of the draft resolution submitted to the General Assembly today on the question of Namibia. We had hoped that the draft resolution would be submitted in the positive form originally perused by us, which was in keeping with the agreement reached in the United Nations Council for Namibia.

78. However, we were surprised to find new developments, linking one country—the United States of America—and no other, with the abhorrent policies of the Government of South Africa, and holding that one country responsible for all the consequences of the delay in implementation of United Nations resolutions, particularly Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978).

79. As both those resolutions were adopted unanimously, with the positive participation of the United States of America, and as there was a general tendency to adopt draft resolution A/S-14/L.1 by consensus if we all agreed to delete the reference to the United States of America from paragraphs 13 and 14, this, in our view, would have been a positive thing to do in the real interest of Namibia and its people.

80. As we believe that the United States of America is not the only State that has ties with and interests in South Africa or the only country capable of influencing the present situation in southern Africa and Namibia, my delegation was compelled, regrettably, to abstain from voting on the matter of mentioning by name a country that has diplomatic and friendly relations of co-operation with my country, namely, the United States of America, the country singled out in the paragraphs, particularly in paragraph 14.

81. Although we abstained in the vote on paragraphs 13 and 14 because of the naming of the United States and because of the strong language of paragraph 14 in particular, we have none the less expressed our full support for Namibia by voting in favour of the resolution as a whole. Having done this, we wish to call upon all members of the General Assembly to co-operate fully in making possible the independence of Namibia and to refrain from linking it to any bilateral interest or to any special, regional or international relationships, whatever the justification for such linkage may be. This we can all do by supporting the efforts of the Secretary-General towards the early accession by Namibia to independence and freedom.

82. Mr. WOOLCOTT (Australia): Australia has abstained on the draft resolution which has just been submitted to the Assembly. It did so with considerable regret, because of our conviction that the States Members of the United Nations should form a solid front on the Namibian problem, which would send a very clear message to South Africa. The division evident in the membership over the contents of that draft resolution is unfortunately likely to be a source of consolation to South Africa.

83. As a member of the United Nations Council for Namibia, the Australian delegation worked hard to forge a draft resolution that would have provided a basis for the consensus that this important question deserves. In four meetings, the Council produced a

draft resolution which might well have attracted widespread support, including an affirmative vote from the Australian delegation. It is in our view unfortunate that this draft resolution was not proceeded with and that new elements were introduced that were known to be unacceptable, in varying degrees, to a number of countries.

84. My delegation was not a party to the consensus on that text in the Council, because of those additions and changes. For similar reasons, we felt obliged to abstain on draft resolution A/S-14/L.1. Our reasons for so doing are not new, and there is no need to go into them in detail. We had hoped to move forward on the question of Namibia at this special session and regret that in the end we could not do so.

85. I shall briefly mention our reservations about references to the legitimacy of the armed struggle. While we can appreciate the desperation which many Namibians and SWAPO must feel in the face of continuing South African obstruction, Australia has always believed that peaceful means should be used in the settlement of disputes, as is made clear in the Charter of the United Nations itself.

86. In addition, while we can understand the reasons that led to the concepts expressed in paragraphs 13 and 14 of the text, and while we do understand the frustration that African States and SWAPO feel, we had problems with the tone and language in which those paragraphs were couched. Statements of fact are one thing; pejorative references to a sovereign State are another. Australia, as is well known, is opposed to the concept of linking the independence of Namibia to the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola.

87. Mr. MOYA-PALENCIA (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The Mexican delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/S-14/L.1. Our vote is consistent with the position that we have adopted in the past on the question of Namibia. However, we are firmly convinced that it would have been preferable to stick to the text that was agreed upon last Monday, 15 September, in the United Nations Council for Namibia—a text which, for reasons difficult to understand, was subsequently changed by a group of delegations and then submitted under the symbol A/S-14/L.1.

88. If we compare the original text drawn up by the United Nations Council for Namibia with the text we have adopted today, we arrive at the conclusion that the differences between those two texts boil down to changes in editing and tone which do not in any way affect questions of substance. But those changes in tone have compelled the Assembly to take a separate decision on certain paragraphs of the draft resolution—a procedure which has eroded the virtual unanimity that existed in this Hall in respect to the question of Namibia. That is why my delegation abstained on the separate votes on parts of paragraphs 13 and 14.

89. I should add that we abstained not because we disagreed with the substance of the issues contained therein, but because we could not agree to the form in which draft resolution A/S-14/L.1 was drawn up.

90. It is not necessary to reiterate our solidarity with the cause of the Namibian people. Those who have read the statement we made last Thursday in the general debate [3rd meeting] are already aware of our position. That is also true of the members of the United Nations Council for Namibia, the participants in the International Conference for the Immediate Independence of Namibia, held at Vienna, and those who are familiar with our voting on this matter in past years.

91. As Mexico is a member of the United Nations Council for Namibia, my delegation took an active part in drawing up a draft resolution to accord with the guidelines agreed upon at the Council's meeting at the end of July under the chairmanship of Mr. Paul Lusaka. On Monday, 15 September, after lengthy negotiations, the members of the Council had the clear impression that agreement had been reached on a broadly acceptable text. However, at the request of some delegations, certain changes were introduced into the text, and included in draft resolution A/S-14/L.1, which was originally sponsored by only 13 of the Council's 31 members. As I said, those changes did not affect the substance of the draft resolution, but the consequence has been that a substantial number of delegations are no longer prepared to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

92. We have thus lost a great opportunity for the General Assembly to reflect faithfully what is undoubtedly the position of virtually the whole international community on the question of Namibia and on the policy Pretoria is carrying out in that Territory in open defiance of world public opinion.

93. Lastly, the Mexican delegation would like to place on record its disagreement with the procedure that has been followed on this occasion, a procedure that must inevitably adversely affect the cause of the Namibian people.

94. Mr. FISCHER (Austria): It is with great regret that my delegation had to abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/S-14/L.1. My delegation, together with others who have a proud record of supporting the just cause of Namibia's independence, would have preferred this year's special session of the General Assembly to adopt a resolution that would have put Namibia on the road to independence in accordance with the provisions of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

95. My country has consistently regretted the practice of name-calling in this forum and has voiced its reservations about the principle of armed struggle. Austria, furthermore, cannot accept the provision relating to military assistance, even if it is to achieve the noble aim of freedom and independence. Calls for armed struggle and military assistance do not behove an Organization which is built on principles of non-use of force and the peaceful settlements of disputes.

96. Although my country has always supported the just cause of the Namibian people and has had, twice in 13 months, the privilege of being the host to important conferences on this vital issue, and while it understands the impatience of the Namibian people, 20 years after the termination of South Africa's

Mandate over the Territory, to gain immediate independence, Austria would have preferred a wording reflecting the full participation of all parties involved in the process to bring independence to Namibia.

97. Austria maintains that solutions should be found solely by peaceful means, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter of the United Nations. It is for that reason that my delegation had to abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/S-14/L.1 as a whole, and cast a negative vote on paragraphs 13 and 14.

98. Mr. ARMSTRONG (New Zealand): The final version of this draft resolution was not supported by my delegation. We regret this, because we have had for many years firm views on the inadmissibility of Pretoria's illegal occupation of Namibia. We are of the view that it is through continued and united pressure from a resolute world community that the final liberation of the people of Namibia will most surely be achieved. This resolution will not make possible such a display of unity.

99. We have several difficulties with the text. For example, my delegation cannot agree with the endorsement of armed struggle by the General Assembly. Our negative vote on parts of paragraphs 13 and 14 reflected our objection to the singling out of one Member country in the text. This has not proved a productive course in the past.

100. We have rejected in the past, and do so again today, the linkage theory in relation to the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), but we were not prepared to endorse the naming of one country in this context when another major Power might well, for example, have been named in the context of paragraph 18, which condemns the plunder by South Africa and other foreign economic interests of the natural resources of Namibia. This situation illustrates that to embark on name-calling in such resolutions is to embark upon a slippery slope. It was for these reasons, among others, that we voted against paragraphs 13 and 14 of the draft resolution and abstained in the voting on the resolution as a whole.

101. Mr. WALTERS (United States of America): My delegation has listened carefully to the debate these past days on Namibia. Much that has been said conforms to United States views on this important issue. For example, we support fully peaceful and rapid implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). We are convinced that the presence of foreign troops in the area is an impediment to peace. We condemn cross-border actions on the part of the South African Defence Force.

102. The United States has been engaged in extended negotiations with involved parties for the purpose of expediting implementation of resolution 435 (1978) in a manner that takes the interests of all into careful consideration. Unfortunately, since the suspension of diplomatic efforts, the war has intensified. Various factions are poised for combat, both in Namibia and in neighbouring Angola, with the inevitable result that peace is forced to take a seat on the sidelines.

103. My Government rejects, however, all accusations that hold the United States responsible for lack of progress. The Government at Luanda failed to use the opportunity of the proposed 1 August date certain to commence implementation of resolution 435 (1978). The South Africans continue to violate Angola's border. The civil war inside Angola rages on. I have listened to a number of delegations accusing my Government of linking the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola to the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), but I recall that the Government of Angola itself, in its platform contained in a letter dated 17 November 1984 from the President of the People's Republic of Angola to the Secretary-General,⁴ implicitly accepted the principle that Namibian independence could only be achieved in the context of Cuban troop withdrawal from Angola.

104. Furthermore, I would note in this same context that Cuban President Fidel Castro, addressing the Eighth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, recently held at Harare, pledged that his troops are prepared to remain in Angola "for as long as *apartheid* exists in South Africa". We do not accept that Cuba can unilaterally determine the conditions for the removal of its troops from Africa.

105. My Government does not believe that the resolution voted on today will advance Namibian independence in any way. It seems to reject by inference a peaceful resolution of the question of Namibia. But my Government does not believe the peace process is over. Nor do we expect any involved participant to act against his perceived interests. The basic outlines for a regional agreement are known to all parties. The conflicts cannot be resolved militarily. The United States does not have an American solution for Angola's internal problems. We saw 1 August of this year as an opportunity, not a deadline, and remain committed to reaching a timely agreement on the entire Namibian independence package. To this end we stand ready to meet with all those whose concurrence is a *sine qua non* to any final agreement.

106. My Government abstained on the resolution under consideration here today despite the numerous flaws contained therein. We did so based on our membership in the Western contact group and the role our good offices have played in advancing independence for Namibia under Security Council resolution 435 (1978). We earnestly hope that the coming weeks will see a recommencement of the dialogue that is so essential for a peaceful solution to the problem of Namibian independence.

107. Mrs. BETHEL-DALY (Bahamas): The Bahamian delegation voted in favour of retaining paragraphs 13 and 14 as they exist in the text, for two principal reasons. First, there is an almost universal feeling that the concepts of linkage and constructive engagement mentioned in those paragraphs are major obstacles to the freedom and independence of Namibia. Secondly, my delegation feels bound to lend this form of support to a people who have been struggling for so many years to achieve personal dignity and to preserve the integrity of their Territory.

108. Having said that, my delegation wishes to reiterate its opposition to name-calling or the selective singling out of any country. While we shall continue to espouse that position in future, we do not consider our position as just taken to be contrary to that view, since we feel that the paragraphs in question pinpoint the principal controversy or conflict surrounding the question of Namibia's independence.

109. My delegation also wishes to reiterate its reluctance to support concepts of armed struggle and military assistance, and would have wished to see a resolution unencumbered by divisiveness. But we are also aware that if these causes were not present there would be others to delay the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). We seem always to be in a no-win situation on these delicate matters; while we fiddle, the people of Namibia continue to suffer.

110. We can only hope that Member States will endeavour to put the United Nations first and not allow our differences to blind us to our responsibilities. This in large part prompted my delegation to take the position it just took.

111. Mr. LEGWAILA (Botswana): I wish simply to state that, although we supported the resolution and continue to support it totally, we wish to place on record our inability to implement any sanctions against South Africa as called for in paragraphs 15, 16 and 17.

112. Mr. DELPECH (Argentina) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Argentina supported the retention in their original form of paragraphs 13 and 14 of the resolution we have just adopted. We did this for two reasons.

113. My Government agrees with the substance of those paragraphs. Moreover, we believe that it is urgently necessary for all members of the international community—in particular those with the greatest ability to influence Pretoria—effectively to increase their pressure speedily to bring about the independence of Namibia.

114. We wish, however, to reiterate our doubts as to the advisability of making critical reference to countries by name in resolutions on this or other issues. The fact is that such reference militates against attracting the full support of the Assembly for such issues and, in the final analysis, could even be harmful to the cause of the Namibian people, whose just struggle would benefit at this crucial stage from the active, united support of the entire international community.

115. Finally, my delegation voted in favour of taking separate votes on proposals or amendments, as provided for in rule 89 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. We understand this to be the undeniable right of Member States, the exercise of which should not be curtailed.

116. Mr. SVOBODA (Canada): My delegation wishes to explain its abstention on the resolution just adopted and its non-participation in the debate during the special session thus far. The latter should

in no way be taken as a lack of interest in the plight of Namibia and the Namibian people. We very much continue to be grieved that the people of Namibia are still denied their internationally recognized independence after more than a century of colonial rule. The community of nations must, therefore, press South Africa to change its offensive policies towards the Territory.

117. Nor does our abstention on the resolution as a whole indicate in any way what would be the Canadian position were we not a member of the Western contact group established pursuant to Security Council resolution 435 (1978). We believe, however, that the contact group may still have a role to play during the actual implementation of that resolution as well as in bringing about an agreement to set a meaningful date to implement the United Nations settlement plan.

118. Thus, our abstention on the entire resolution was for technical and procedural reasons connected with our membership of that group. It flows from what I said that we strongly support the immediate and long-overdue independence of Namibia and appropriate measures and resources both to prepare the Namibians for the self-management of their country and to campaign internationally for such independence.

119. While it shares some of the reservations expressed, for example, by the European Community and Australia earlier, Canada is nevertheless ready to concede that there are many positive elements in the resolution just adopted, and we are grateful to those who attempted to achieve a fully satisfactory resolution.

120. As to the votes on separate phrases of paragraphs 13 and 14, we were constrained to oppose those parts of the paragraphs as originally proposed due to our consistent opposition to unnecessary, and indeed unhelpful, instances of name-calling.

121. Mr. MAKEKA (Lesotho): My delegation abstained on paragraphs 13 and 14 inasmuch as we had not received voting instructions. We voted in favour of the resolution as a whole because we fully share and support its purport in general. Suffice it to say that my delegation, as I stated before, has difficulties with paragraphs 15, 16 and 17, in that we are not in a position to impose any form of sanctions against South Africa.

122. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Angola, who has asked to exercise his right of reply.

123. Mr. DE FIGUEIREDO (Angola): In reply to the accusations launched by the representative of the United States, first of all I wish to inform the States Members of the United Nations that there is no civil war in Angola. There is a war of aggression being perpetrated by the racist régime of South Africa, with the help, in fact, of the United States. Linkage, a concept created and perpetrated by the United States in 1981, is the only obstacle to implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). Bear in mind that the Council has condemned the concept of linkage.

124. The presence of the Cuban forces in Angola is a matter of bilateral agreement between two sovereign Governments. We would not permit any other Government to dictate the policy of our own Government. South Africa continues to invade and attack Angola, a country with which South Africa has no borders.

125. We regret the accusations perpetrated by the United States representative. I am certainly sorry to have brought this to your attention at this stage.

126. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Cuba, who has asked to exercise his right of reply.

127. Mr. MALMIERCA PEOLI (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The United States has repeatedly proclaimed its alliance with the racist *apartheid* régime of Pretoria, which it has described as a policy of "constructive engagement". This alliance is a decisive element in South Africa's unwillingness to accept Security Council and other United Nations decisions calling for the independence of Namibia.

128. Moreover, on the pretext of linking the start of the independence process with withdrawal of Cuban internationalist forces from Angola, the United States has by its delaying tactics been obstructing the Namibian independence process. Interestingly enough, the Pretoria racist régime has adopted the same tactics.

129. Nevertheless, at this special session of the General Assembly on the question of Namibia, the United States has objected to having the draft resolution make mention of the United States in connection with those two particular questions. If that opposition is a sign of shame, it is a positive factor.

130. The representative of the United States has referred to the statement made by President Fidel Castro at the recently held Eighth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries. We believe it useful for us to repeat the words of President Fidel Castro on that occasion when he said:

"Both the Yankee imperialists and the South African racists are doing everything in their power to see the Cuban internationalist troops withdrawn from Angola on the pretext that this is a pre-condition for the independence of Namibia. By common agreement the Governments of Cuba and Angola have responded: 'First implement Security Council resolution 435 (1978); let there be no more threats of aggression against Angola; call a halt to the dirty war; stop supporting the mercenary bands. Only then can a gradual, phased withdrawal of the 20,000 Cuban troops which are defending strategic lines in southern Angola commence. The remaining Cuban military personnel will be withdrawn only when the sovereign Governments of Cuba and Angola deem it appropriate—and without any pre-conditions.'"

131. On that occasion President Fidel Castro also reiterated Cuba's well-known position that the presence of internationalist Cuban troops in Angola is based on a decision of the Government and people of

Angola and that Cuba will always fully respect all decisions by Angola on the subject.

132. I reiterate that Cuba is ready to maintain its presence in Angola in compliance with its international obligations as long as is necessary—that is to say, as long as there is a threat to Angola's territorial integrity, independence and sovereignty, that is, until *apartheid* disappears and Namibia is independent.

133. The PRESIDENT: The observer of SWAPO has requested to make a statement. I call on him in accordance with General Assembly resolution 31/152.

134. Mr. GURIRAB (South West Africa People's Organization): That the special session on the question of Namibia has been held and has seen the participation of a large number of Foreign Ministers in the debate is a victory for us. We thank those States which, out of genuine concern for Namibia's independence, have, over the years, without fear or favour, supported our struggle and remained unswerving in their solidarity with our cause.

135. We are victims of occupation—victims of aggression, humiliation and degradation. We are a struggling people. We therefore need the support and assistance of the whole world.

136. But we are also realists. The struggle has taught us to be so. We are therefore not impressed by the fallacious preoccupation with consensus in our situation. If consensus means that we should not point a finger at, or name, those countries that are directly responsible for our suffering and the reprehensible delaying of our independence, then we do not need consensus: we need the honest and sincere votes of our true friends—and we have got their votes.

137. We know our friends; and we also know Pretoria's friends, who for selfish reasons and by their own actions have made themselves enemies of our people. I promise here that SWAPO will continue to mention the United States of America by name as long as the United States of America continues to insist on linking our independence to the extraneous issue of the presence of the Cuban internationalist forces in the People's Republic of Angola. That is the pre-condition which is today primarily responsible for the delaying of Namibia's independence.

138. Before I conclude, may I say this: All of us are against violence. We are a small population. We would have liked to achieve our freedom and independence by peaceful means. So we say to those who profess abhorrence of violence and the intensification of the armed struggle that they should show the courage of their convictions by removing the South African occupation army—more than 100,000 strong—from Namibian soil. So long as that occupation army remains in our country, so long as the illegal occupation of our country continues, so long as military aggression persists in our country, we have no qualms about calling for support to intensify the armed struggle for the liberation of our country.

139. If that 100,000-strong occupation army is removed from our country, by people who profess to

be against violence and armed struggle, there will be no need for debates of the General Assembly on Namibia's independence; there will be no need for special sessions. Instead, as I hope, we will be discussing the question of Namibia, as a sovereign, independent country, in the context of international co-operation. Until that happens, we appeal to our friends to render all assistance and support to SWAPO to continue the heroic and patriotic struggle.

140. The PRESIDENT: We have thus concluded our consideration of agenda item 6 and have come to the end of the fourteenth special session of the General Assembly. I extend my heartfelt appreciation to all delegations for their co-operation with me throughout this very important special session.

AGENDA ITEM 2

Minute of silent prayer or meditation

141. The PRESIDENT: I invite representatives to stand and observe one minute of silent prayer or meditation.

The members of the Assembly observed a minute of silence.

Closure of the session

142. The PRESIDENT: I declare closed the fourteenth special session of the General Assembly.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.

NOTES

¹The delegation of Solomon Islands subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour of the motion; the delegations of Antigua and Barbuda, Bolivia and Saudi Arabia subsequently informed the Secretariat that they had intended to abstain.

²The delegations of Antigua and Barbuda and Solomon Islands subsequently informed the Secretariat that they had intended to abstain in the voting on the paragraph.

³The delegations of Antigua and Barbuda, Saint Christopher and Nevis and Solomon Islands subsequently informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

⁴*Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-ninth Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1984, document S/16838.*