



General Assembly

PROVIS IONAL

A/43/PV.47

16 November 1988

ENGLISH

Forty-third session

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

PROVIS IONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE FORTY-SEVENTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Monday, 14 November 1988, at 10 a.m.

President:

Mr. CAFUTO

(Argentina)

later:

Mr. HJERTA MONTALVO (Vice-President)

(Ecuador)

later:

Mr. CAFUTO

(Argentina)

- Zone of peace and co-operation of the South Atlantic [31]

(a) Report of the Secretary-General

(b) Draft resolution

- Question of Namibia [29]

(a) Report of the United Nations Council for Namibia

(b) Report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples

(c) Report of the Secretary-General

(d) Report of the Fourth Committee

(e) Draft resolutions

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

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

The meeting was called to order at 10.25 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 31

ZONE OF PEACE AND CO-OPERATION OF THE SOUTH ATLANTIC

- (a) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/43/576 and Add.1)
- (b) DRAFT RESOLUTION (A/43/L.25)

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I should like to propose that the list of speakers in the debate on this item be closed this morning at 11 o'clock.

If I hear no objection it will be so decided.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I therefore request representatives wishing to participate in the debate to inscribe themselves as soon as possible.

I call on the representative of Brazil, who will introduce draft resolution A/43/L.25.

Mr. NOGUEIRA-BATISTA (Brazil): At its forty-first session the General Assembly adopted a declaration that translated the ideals and common determination of South Atlantic States to contribute to peace and security, as well as to strengthen existing links of co-operation between countries of Africa and South America.

In that declaration of a zone of peace and co-operation of the South Atlantic, States of the region solemnly affirmed their resolve to preserve their independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity and to develop their relations under conditions of peace and freedom. They voiced also their common understanding of the need to keep the region free from the arms race, the presence of foreign military bases and, above all, nuclear weapons.

(Mr. Nogueira-Batista, Brazil)

In so doing those States clearly indicated their own special responsibility in promoting regional co-operation for economic development and peace. Full effect can be given to those ideals, however, only with the support of the international community, especially through scrupulous respect by all States for the South Atlantic as a zone of peace and co-operation, and by a sincere commitment to the elimination of all sources of tension in the zone.

(Mr. Nogueira-Batista, Brazil)

The States of the zone are conscious that the elimination of apartheid and the independence of Namibia, as well as the cessation of all acts of aggression and subversion against States in the zone, are essential to the fulfilment of the objectives that inspired the establishment of the zone of peace and co-operation of the South Atlantic.

As regards co-operation, the declaration contained in resolution 41/11 encouraged States of the zone to explore fully the vast potential for regional co-operation for social and economic development, the protection of the environment and the conservation of living resources. Acquiring a better knowledge of the common ocean and its interaction with the atmosphere was and still is one of the most formidable quests for the countries in the region.

Reflecting the determination of the States of the zone, last year's resolution 42/16 supported their actions aimed at the fulfilment of the goals of the declaration,

"particularly through the adoption and carrying out of concrete programmes to that end". (resolution 42/16, para. 2)

To start giving true expression to their common determination, representatives of States of the zone of peace and co-operation of the South Atlantic met, for the first time, in Rio de Janeiro from 25 to 29 July 1988. That meeting, which my country had the privilege and honour of hosting, reaffirmed the common perception of the South Atlantic as a region with its own identity, constituted by developing countries sharing similar problems, and decided to join in efforts towards a better future for the benefit of their peoples.

As the Minister of External Relations of Brazil stated at the opening of the Rio meeting,

"the interests of the South Atlantic countries are not merely compatible; they coincide to a large extent".

(Mr. Nogueira-Batista, Brazil)

Building on this convergence of interests, the first meeting of States of the zone of peace and co-operation of the South Atlantic arrived at an important body of conclusions and recommendations, consolidated in its Final Document.

The reading of that Final Document, circulated as an official document of the General Assembly (A/43/512), demonstrates that States of the zone have decided to stimulate and intensify regional co-operation for economic and social development in order to explore fully the existing possibilities. In that context, some guidelines and areas for priority action were identified.

States of the zone further agreed to encourage greater intra-zonal trade, to improve transportation and communications in the region and to enhance the scientific knowledge of the environment and resources of the South Atlantic.

This concern over the ocean that links the countries of the region was translated into a condemnation of the transfer of hazardous wastes from other parts of the world into the region. In this respect States of the zone expressed their willingness to study and adopt measures to prevent and control the dumping of hazardous, toxic and nuclear wastes in the maritime areas of the region and agreed to establish a dump watch to monitor and disseminate information on the movements of ships.

With reference to peace and security in the zone, the Rio meeting made an overall evaluation of the areas and sources of tension that remained obstacles to the fulfilment of the objectives of the declaration.

The meeting reiterated the support of States of the zone for the just struggle of the Namibian people for self-determination and independence, as well as the need to ensure the security and territorial integrity of Angola. The Final Document records in this context the expression of the hope of States of the zone that the quadripartite talks under way will lead to the prompt and peaceful solution of

(Mr. Nogueira-Batista, Brazil)

those problems. The hope was voiced that representatives of an independent Namibia would be welcomed in the near future into the community of South Atlantic States.

In an unequivocal manner the meeting condemned the persistence of the racist régime of apartheid and supported the adoption of effective measures against it. It is expected that in the not too distant future a South Africa free from apartheid might also take part in the zone of peace and co-operation.

The Rio meeting further acknowledged the contribution to the relaxation of tensions in the area that could be brought about by a negotiated settlement of the dispute over the Malvinas Islands.

As the Brazilian Government has stated on several occasions, the declaration of the zone of peace and co-operation is a constructive initiative which reflects the consensus of States of the region and should not be interpreted as being directed against any country or group of countries. The intention of the States of the zone was, and always is, to spur on the progress of our peoples in a safer and sounder environment.

With that objective in mind, I have the honour to introduce draft resolution A/43/L.25 on behalf of 22 member States of the zone: Angola, Argentina, Benin, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, the Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Liberia, Nigeria, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Togo, Uruguay, Zaire and Brazil. This text is the result of joint drafting efforts by the States of the zone. I am also pleased to inform the General Assembly that Nepal and Venezuela have taken the initiative of co-sponsoring the draft resolution, as an indication for their support to the action of the States of the zone.

The draft resolution is simple and straightforward. In its preambular part, besides recalling resolutions 41/11 and 42/16, it affirms that co-operation among all States, in particular those of the region, for peace and development is

(Mr. Nogueira-Batista, Brazil)

essential to promote the objectives of the zone and notes the efforts of States of the zone towards fulfilling the goals of the declaration.

Operative paragraph 1 takes note of the report submitted by the Secretary-General (A/43/576 and Add.1), for the elaboration of which the sponsors are grateful. Operative paragraph 2 refers to the first meeting of the States of the zone and takes note of its Final Document. Operative paragraph 3 commends initiatives by the same States to promote peace and regional co-operation in the South Atlantic. Recognizing the importance of the support at the international community as a whole for the promotion of the objectives of peace and co-operation of the declaration, operative paragraph 4 calls upon all States not only to co-operate in their promotion but also to refrain from any action inconsistent with those objectives, particularly actions which might aggravate or create situations of tension and potential conflict in the region.

The support of the relevant organs and bodies of the United Nations system can also be instrumental in assisting the joint initiatives of States of the zone to implement the declaration, by means of either their technical expertise or existing programmes of co-operation. This is reflected in operative paragraph 5.

(Mr. Nogueira-Batista, Brazil)

The draft resolution now before the General Assembly is, as I said, simple and clear in its purposes. It is therefore the hope of my delegation and that of the other sponsors that the Assembly will once again extend its overwhelming support.

Mr. JOSSE (Nepal): Once again, my delegation has asked to speak on the item entitled "Zone of peace and co-operation of the South Atlantic", although my country, Nepal, is neither a littoral nor a hinterland State of the South Atlantic. We do so for two basic reasons: first, to reaffirm Nepal's long-standing policy of support for initiatives aimed at the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones and zones of peace; and, secondly, to demonstrate our solidarity with and support for the laudable efforts of the States of the South Atlantic region to fulfil the goals of the declaration of the South Atlantic as a zone of peace and co-operation, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 41/11 of 27 October 1986.

Nepal was a proud sponsor of the historic General Assembly resolution 41/11, in line with its policy and record of support for similar initiatives, including the 1971 General Assembly Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace and the 1976 proposal for the establishment of a zone of peace, freedom and neutrality in South-East Asia. It may also be recalled that Nepal supported proposals for the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in South Asia, in the Mediterranean and covering the entire continent of Africa. Similarly, Nepal has extended support for the Tlatelolco Treaty of 1967 and the Rarotonga Treaty of 1985, representing a regional approach to non-proliferation in Latin America and the South Pacific, respectively. It also welcomed the demilitarization and denuclearization of Antarctica, in accordance with the 1959 Antarctic Treaty.

(Mr. Josse, Nepal)

At this juncture, I wish to recall that in 1975 His Majesty King Birendra formally proposed that Nepal be declared a zone of peace. Based on the organic linkage between peace and development and Nepal's desire to provide concrete expression to the basic principles of the United Nations and the ideals of the Non-Aligned Movement, I am pleased to disclose that it has received the valuable support of 98 States Members of the United Nations, for which my delegation is profoundly grateful. I should add that support from the international community for Nepal's peace zone proposal has corresponded to increasing appreciation of new concepts of confidence-building and conflict-limiting measures related to disarmament. That, we believe, was reflected during the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, notwithstanding, its failure to adopt a final declaration. Nepal has promoted studies on the legal status of peace zones in international law - including those encompassing the territory of a single State - by the Asian-African Legal Consultative Committee, which has Permanent Observer status with the United Nations. We believe similar efforts might well be usefully emulated by legal organizations representing other regions of the globe.

To revert more directly to the agenda item, my delegation wishes at the outset to congratulate the Brazilian Government on its initiative in hosting the first meeting of the States of the zone of peace and co-operation of the South Atlantic.

We have studied the Final Document of the first meeting issued in Rio de Janeiro on 29 July 1988, contained in document A/43/512, and are greatly encouraged by the progress that has been made thus far in the fulfilment of the goals set out in the declaration of 1986, establishing the zone. My delegation has been encouraged by the potential that has been visibly demonstrated for promoting

(Mr. Josse, Nepal)

not only peace and security in the South Atlantic but also gainful regional co-operation among countries on both sides of the South Atlantic. This, we believe, is worthy of emulation by others, including those in the Indian Ocean region.

In particular, my delegation has been struck by the wide spectrum of co-operative possibilities that have been identified and opened, including not only those in the economic and political areas but also in the social, cultural and environmental spheres.

My delegation reiterates its conviction that strict adherence to the declaration on the South Atlantic as a zone of peace and co-operation would make a major contribution to peace and security over the vast and strategic ocean expanse of the South Atlantic. We also continue to hold that scrupulous adherence to the terms of the declaration would help to avert geographic proliferation of nuclear weapons and prevent threats to regional and international security, including, as they do, commitments to the non-introduction of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction, as well as the non-extension of rivalries and conflicts that are foreign to the region. It requires no great imagination to realize that such threats could emanate from the disturbed southern African region, given the racist Pretoria régime's policy of apartheid, its continued illegal occupation of Namibia and its increasing military power and unsupervised nuclear capabilities.

My delegation further holds that faithful adherence by all to the declaration of the South Atlantic as a zone of peace and co-operation, together with the Tlatelolco Treaty on a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Latin America and the Rarotonga Treaty on a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the South Pacific, would make a major contribution to international peace and security, as the South Atlantic, Latin America, and the South Pacific collectively cover a substantial portion of the globe's land and ocean expanse.

(Mr. Josse, Nepal)

We recall the request by the General Conference of the Organization of States Parties to the Tlatelolco Treaty, in Montevideo in April last year, for preparation for a study on the relationship between the nuclear-weapon-free zone of Latin America and the zone of peace and co-operation of the South Atlantic. We believe that a similar study taking into account also the Rarotonga Treaty could be both useful and relevant.

We should like to express our deep appreciation to the Secretary-General for his report entitled "Zone of peace and co-operation of the South Atlantic" (A/43/576 and Add.1).

My delegation reiterates its appreciation of the efforts of States of the zone to implement the terms of the historic General Assembly resolution 41/11 and would urge them to continue their worthy endeavours in that regard. My delegation is honoured to be a sponsor of draft resolution A/43/L.25, introduced by Brazil, and hopes that it will receive consensus endorsement by the General Assembly.

Mr. PINEDO VIDAL (Colombia) (interpretation from Spanish): By resolution 42/16, of 10 November 1987, the General Assembly decided to include in the provisional agenda of the forty-third session the item entitled "Zone of peace and co-operation of the South Atlantic", thereby following up resolution 41/11, of 1986, which solemnly declared the Atlantic ocean in the region situated between Africa and South America a zone dedicated to the noble purposes of peace and co-operation. This background is general knowledge. It reaffirmed the inherent historical process by which man focuses his attention and hope on the abundance of the seas, which those who study the subject refer to as the phenomenon of the attraction of the sea. This also embodies the concept of man and the surrounding land. These three things give rise to the right of communities to administer their resources and their duty to preserve them in accordance with the norms which international law has forged over the years.

(Mr. Pinedo Vidal, Colombia)

Accordingly, the Colombian delegation views with satisfaction the progress achieved at the first meeting of States of the zone of peace and co-operation of the South Atlantic, which was held in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, from 25 to 29 July this year. We agree with the statement made at the conclusion of meeting concerning the need to draw attention to the importance of relations between States developing

"under conditions of peace and freedom, in an environment free from tensions and in conformity with the principles and rules of international law and with the United Nations Charter". (A/43/512, p. 3)

We believe that this is a basic premise for the economic and social progress of the region.

Our country, situated as it is between two oceans, has always rejected all practices which endanger the marine ecosystem, including nuclear tests, illegal and irrational exploitation of living resources by high seas fishing, and pollution from whatever source, because of the importance of the seas.

We believe that the introduction of nuclear weapons or other weapons of mass destruction in the marine environment is a threat to human security and peaceful coexistence. The States of the zone of peace and co-operation of the South Atlantic were therefore quite right to draw the attention of the militarily important States to the fact that in order to ensure attainment of the objectives of the 1986 Declaration, it is necessary that they show their readiness to reduce and eventually eliminate the military presence in the region, and also refrain from introducing nuclear weapons or weapons of mass destruction in the region. This shows the importance of the obligations assumed under the new law of the sea to use the high seas and scientific marine research exclusively for peaceful purposes and of compliance with the obligation of States to protect and preserve the marine environment in general, as was accepted in the 1958 Geneva Convention concerning

(Mr. Pinedo Vidal, Colombia)

protection and preservation of the living resources of the high seas, the conventions signed in the context of the International Maritime Organization, the legal instruments of the regional seas programmes of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and the new 1982 Montego Bay Convention on the sea.

The scope of the zone of peace and co-operation of the South Atlantic extends to other matters which enjoy international support and have been the subject of many declarations by the United Nations. These include the condemnation and rejection of the racist apartheid régime in South Africa, the transfer of dangerous waste to other parts of the world, the illegal, colonial occupation of Namibia and the acts of aggression against the People's Republic of Angola. Colombia endorses these causes, as it has indicated in various forums, including the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, the United Nations Council for Namibia and the General Assembly, because we feel that the situations involved are detrimental to human dignity and a violation of the fundamental principles and norms which govern the international community.

The Colombian delegation shares the concern expressed by the States of the zone of peace and co-operation of the South Atlantic regarding the failure to begin negotiations between the Governments of Argentina and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to find peaceful means of settling once and for all the problems outstanding between the two countries, including the future of the Malvinas Islands, despite the appeals in General Assembly resolutions and despite the provisions of the Charter. So long as this situation persists, there will be a constant threat to peace in the South Atlantic. For this reason we express our hope for a speedy solution.

(Mr. Pinedo Vidal, Colombia)

In the light of all these considerations, the delegation of Colombia supports the draft resolution which has been submitted to us on this item.*

* Mr. Huerta Montalvo (Ecuador), Vice-President, took the Chair.

Mr. BRANCO (Sao Tome and Principe): In the annals of history, very few events have had the dramatic impact, or the horrible consequences, of the North Atlantic slave trade, which flourished for more than two centuries. From the seventeenth to the nineteenth century the Atlantic Ocean, which could have and should have been a bridge of friendship, respect and economic development for peoples of different lands and different cultures, became instead a watery highway of death, destruction and misery, and of mankind's inhumanity to fellow human beings.

In the modern era, of course, no one - with the exception of the apartheid régime of South Africa - governs in a manner reminiscent of the days of slavery. However, modern military armaments and alliances have made mankind slaves, not of bondage, but of fear, uncertainty and insecurity.

Our oceans, which should by now have become corridors of peace and co-operation, have not yet done so. However, we note that, slowly but surely, there is an international movement to codify in international law a new status for all this planet's oceans and all our international waterways.

It was for that reason that my delegation was among those that enthusiastically supported resolution 41/11 of 27 October 1986, which declared the South Atlantic a zone of peace and co-operation.

It is our strong belief that respect for the region of the South Atlantic as a zone of peace and co-operation, especially through the reduction and eventual elimination of the military presence of other States, the non-introduction of nuclear weapons or other weapons of mass destruction and the non-extension into the region of rivalries and conflicts that are foreign to it, will represent a contribution to the endeavours by the international community to reduce tensions and threats to international peace and security. In view of recent trends in international relations, that goal is of paramount importance.

(Mr. Branco, Sao Tome and Principe)

The co-sponsors of resolution 41/11 shared the belief that the questions of peace and security and those of development are interrelated and inseparable. That explains our determination to promote regional co-operation for social and economic development, the protection of the environment, the conservation of living resources, and the peace and security of the entire region.

Last year the General Assembly urged the States of the region to continue their actions aimed at fulfilling the goals of the Declaration, in particular through the adoption and carrying out of concrete programmes to that end.

In response to the call of the General Assembly, and thanks to the generous hospitality of the Brazilian Government, the first meeting of representatives from States in the South Atlantic region was held in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, from 25 to 29 July this year. The results of the meeting are before the Assembly in document A/43/512. However, I should like to stress a few points that are of particular importance to my delegation.

First, the States of the region reaffirmed their special responsibility for the preservation of peace and security in the zone and their willingness to work together towards that end. This responsibility is reflected in our commitment to develop our relations based on dialogue, understanding, mutual interest and respect for the sovereign equality of all States, to the benefit of the peoples of the region, and for that purpose to identify and implement creative forms of co-operation, including greater interzonal trade and exchanges of technological and scientific knowledge among them. In this regard, the development of transportation and communications within the zone is of paramount importance.

The second point, of special interest to my country, is the determination of the States of the zone to protect the South Atlantic environment from pollution and

(Mr. Branco, Sao Tome and Principe)

their decision to establish a "dump watch" with the aim of monitoring and controlling the dumping of hazardous, toxic and nuclear wastes in the maritime areas of the region, including the high seas.

Last but not least, the countries participating in the Rio de Janeiro meeting share the view that the situations in South Africa and Namibia constitute great threats to global and regional security. The increasing military build-up by the racist régime and its capability of developing nuclear power for the manufacture of weapons cannot be ignored; they present clear threats to the achievement of the goals of the Declaration.

While reaffirming our special responsibility vis-à-vis the implementation of resolution 41/11 establishing the zone of peace and co-operation in the South Atlantic, we recognize that the participation and co-operation of other States is of fundamental importance. It is our hope that the international community, and in particular those States that have special interests in the region, will join our efforts.

Mr. PAOLILLO (Uruguay) (interpretation from Spanish): The countries of the South Atlantic have already begun to take the necessary steps to turn the Declaration on the zone of peace and co-operation into a political and legal fact. An important phase in the implementation of General Assembly resolution 41/11 has just been completed with the holding in Rio de Janeiro of the first meeting of States of the zone. The Governments that participated in that meeting expressed again their firm and continuing political will to move ahead with their aim of adopting decisions, establishing machinery and drawing up instruments to strengthen the principles and institutions for peace and development in the region.

(Mr. Paolillo, Uruguay)

The Final Document adopted at that meeting, which has been circulated as General Assembly document A/43/512, formulates a series of principles and purposes that clearly show that the common interest of keeping the region outside military or political conflicts and promoting development through co-operation can surmount natural factors that might adversely affect the unity of the zone - such factors as geographical distance and the political, ethnic and cultural diversity of the countries in the region.

This political will should be consolidated and strengthened with a view to overcoming obstacles created artificially by the action of States as well as individuals. Indeed, we must bear in mind that while on the one hand the South Atlantic offers generously to the countries of the zone its abundant fishing resources, its strategic value, its importance as a vast arena for exchanges and communications, its many natural ports and an enormous variety of still unexploited resources all along its coasts, on the other hand it poses great challenges that the countries of the zone must face together as soon as possible.

(Mr. Paolillo, Uruguay)

First of all, there are the political and military challenges. It should be remembered that there are areas of discord and instability in the zone which are proving to be genuine obstacles to the attainment of the objectives we seek. As indicated in the Final Document of the first meeting of the States of the zone, and reiterated in the preamble of the draft resolution in document A/43/L.25 which is now before the General Assembly,

"questions of peace and security and those of development are interrelated and inseparable". (second preambular paragraph)

In this connection we should mention the situation in the Malvinas Islands - a problem the solution of which requires that the parties involved heed the appeals of the international community and resume negotiations as soon as possible with a view to putting an end to the dispute.

Equally troubling are the questions of Namibia, where there appear to be signs of a process which might lead to a final solution, and in particular of the practice of apartheid in South Africa, which continues to be the most flagrant provocation of human sensitivity and as a result a very serious obstacle to the development of co-operation among the peoples of the area.

Secondly, in addition to the political problems, the South Atlantic is still being threatened in other ways; for example, by problems of overfishing by fishing fleets from outside the region, the pollution of the marine environment, particularly that resulting from the transfer to marine areas of the zone of toxic or radioactive waste generated in other parts of the world, and climatic changes which are the result of the thinning of the ozone layer, which is having more intense effects in the southern hemisphere.

In view of the urgency and the nature of these problems, while it is obvious that the preservation of the South Atlantic as a zone of peace and co-operation

(Mr. Paolillo, Uruguay)

is clearly the responsibility of the countries of the region, the attainment of such an objective also depends largely on the conduct and will for co-operation of the States outside the zone. Hence the appeal made in past resolutions of the General Assembly and reiterated in the draft resolution now before us for all States to refrain from any action inconsistent with the objectives of the declaration. Similarly, we should also remember that the following appeal made in the declaration to militarily important States continues to be valid: that they respect the region as a zone of peace and co-operation and adopt concrete measures to ensure the reduction and eventual elimination of their military presence therein, and the non-introduction of nuclear weapons or other weapons of mass destruction.

The establishment of a zone of peace is not an action which is directed against any State or group of States. It is not intended as a design against anyone; rather, it aims at enhancing the security, development and progress of the Latin American and African peoples of the region. It has already been recognized by the international community, in several resolutions of the General Assembly, that the establishment of zones of peace in various parts of the world can, in appropriate conditions, favour not only the strengthening of the security of the States belonging to such zones but also international peace and security in general.

Nor should the establishment of the zone of peace and co-operation be seen as an attempt to disregard the fundamental principles and norms of international law governing the uses of the oceans. In this connection it is appropriate to recall the reference made to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea in paragraph 25 of the Final Document adopted at the Rio de Janeiro meeting. The Convention was signed by all the countries of the South Atlantic and ratified by some of them, and even though it has not entered into force it contains the

(Mr. Paolillo, Uruguay)

principles and norms of the law of the sea the international community understands should govern relations between States in connection with the uses and exploitation of the oceans and their resources.

Accordingly, the countries of the South Atlantic have proposed consulting and exchanging information on all matters related to the development and application of the Convention, including mutual knowledge about national legislation on the topic.

The assistance the many organizations, agencies and relevant bodies of the United Nations system can provide in this connection could be extremely valuable. The United Nations Office for Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea has already responded to the appeal contained in paragraph 6 of resolution 42/16, as reiterated in paragraph 31 of the Rio de Janeiro document, and is studying the possibility of holding technical meetings of the countries of the zone with a view to promoting knowledge about the new legal régime governing the oceans as contained in the Convention, and to help them in dealing with problems concerning the law of the sea which they share. On the question of financing such meetings, Uruguay is prepared to contribute to the programme by offering to serve as host of the first meeting.

The effective establishment of a zone of peace and co-operation in the South Atlantic is a process in which the declaration adopted by the General Assembly is but the point of departure. What is needed now is for the States of the zone to persevere in their endeavours towards co-operation in elaborating progressively and continually political and legal formulas and to adopt measures which will put them into practice. To that end, the participating States of the Rio de Janeiro meeting agreed on a series of recommendations and measures, such as the commitment to

(Mr. Paolillo, Uruguay)

exchange information on specific needs and capabilities for technical and economic co-operation in matters of agro-industry, energy, meteorology, oceanography and other areas, and the decision to establish a dump watch to verify, collate and disseminate information on ship movements in the region.

Meetings of States of the zone constitute the appropriate machinery for undertaking the task of developing and crystallizing the principles concerning the zone of peace and co-operation. That is why it was decided in the Rio de Janeiro Final Document to hold periodic meetings and establish co-ordination to encourage action and measures to facilitate the attainment of the objectives of the declaration.

The massive support the international community has given to draft resolutions concerning this item in the past, which we hope to obtain again this year, is a factor conducive to our fulfilling the task we, the countries of the South Atlantic have set ourselves, the completion of which will be of benefit to all.

Mr. ADEYEMI (Nigeria): The Nigerian delegation is pleased to participate in the debate at this session of the General Assembly on agenda item 31, entitled "Zone of peace and co-operation of the South Atlantic". The dedication of my delegation to the principles and objectives of the zone of peace and co-operation of the South Atlantic is a manifestation of our total and unflinching support for the establishment of zones of peace and co-operation in various regions of the world. We share the conviction that international co-operation enhances the security of States and that this lends impetus to the quest for international peace and security as enshrined in the United Nations Charter.

(Mr. Adeyemi, Nigeria)

In this connection, my delegation shares the view that the South Atlantic has a critical role to play in the emergent South-South co-operation, particularly between Africa and Latin America. The initiative in resolution 41/11 of 27 October 1986 deserves to be encouraged by the generality of the international community.

Countries of the zone have particular identities and common national objectives which my delegation feels should be pursued in concert for the common well-being of the Governments and peoples of the region. Enhanced political understanding and co-operation within the zone are, therefore, a major preoccupation of member States of the zone in their quest to achieve the level of development required for the well-being of their peoples.

The convergence of our views led to the declaration of the region as a zone of peace and co-operation in 1986 in this forum. Our overall desire for peace, justice and development within the zone makes it imperative for the international community to give its full support to the ideals of the declaration. My delegation, therefore, joins those that have called for an international understanding of the goals and objectives that the member States of the zone have set out to achieve. More importantly, it would be desirable for Member States of this Organization to lend support to our stated aspirations.

In addition to political understanding, economic and technical co-operation among the like-minded countries of the zone is a vital component of our objectives. This can be achieved only in a region where there is mutual trust and confidence to provide a basis for meaningful growth and development. Permit me, therefore, to stress the element of confidence-building amongst States of the zone. Regrettably, this vital aspect of our objectives is being undermined by apartheid South Africa, whose inhuman policies continue to generate incalculable

(Mr. Adeyemi, Nigeria)

tension and ever increasing hostilities. Our search for arrangements that would prevent threats to our sovereignty and vital national interests in the zone is negated by the criminal actions of the racist régime as well as its destabilizing manoeuvres against the front-line States. My delegation will, therefore, continue to insist on the exclusion of apartheid South Africa from participating in meetings initiated by Member States of the United Nations as long as the barons of racism persist in their diabolical acts against their own black majority population and their neighbours in southern Africa.

Another strong case against apartheid South Africa is its nuclear-weapon programme, for which, regrettably, it has continued to receive support from certain Member States of this body. In flagrant defiance of the collective wish of the international community, South Africa has continued to develop its nuclear-weapon capability, with a clear intention of blackmailing African Governments, particularly the front-line States. Rather than offering solace to the racists, the international community has an abiding moral responsibility to bring more pressure to bear on the racist regime to renounce its nuclear-weapon programme as well as its monstrous system of apartheid. For our part, we will continue to commit resources that will eventually promote the emergence of a South Atlantic which is free of tension, aggression and racial conflict.

My delegation is gravely concerned about the security of the entire South Atlantic, especially the coastboard of the southernmost tip of Africa in relation to the vital sea-lanes of communication on its western wing. The South Atlantic has been relatively one of the most peaceful zones of the world. It is our desire to maintain peace in the zone and thus guarantee freedom of navigation for all nations. My country, and indeed the entire West African subregion, depend so much on the South Atlantic waterways that we cannot afford its militarization.

(Mr. Adeyemi, Nigeria)

I must stress, in this connection, that apartheid South Africa has consistently engaged in clandestine activities which can only have the effect of undermining our stated objectives, among which is our desire to maintain free maritime traffic in the South Atlantic. Having built up a naval force beyond its legitimate defence needs, South Africa has thus placed itself in a position which enables it to step up its campaign of blackmail against its neighbours. Not surprisingly, the maritime trade of these States is now adversely affected by South Africa's massive naval build-up. It is not in the interest of global peace and security for the racist régime of South Africa to be assisted in developing its naval force to a level that permits it to constitute an ominous threat to peace and security in the region. It is for this reason that we submit that South Africa's acts of aggression and subversion against its neighbours must be discouraged - and here South Africa's Western friends have a critical and decisive role to play - by ensuring that no external assistance is rendered to the racist régime in furtherance of its naval ambitions.

To lend further concrete expression to the goals and objectives of the declaration, representatives of States of the zone met in Rio de Janeiro from 25 to 29 July 1988. Apart from a reaffirmation of the determination by participants in the conference to develop their relations in conditions of peace, freedom and security, there was an extensive exchange of views on all aspects of feasible ways and means of implementing the principles reflected in resolution 41/11. To that end, some mechanisms for programme implementation were carefully identified. Conspicuous in the Final Document of the Rio meeting was the expression of hope that in the near future the community of South Atlantic States would welcome the acknowledged representatives of an independent Namibia and credible leaders of a South Africa divested of apartheid. I again call on the international community to lend support to this lofty goal and objective.

(Mr. Adeyemi, Nigeria)

I should like to address a subject that has become so vital to the international community, the question of clandestine dumping of radioactive and other hazardous wastes in developing countries, particularly in Africa. Paragraph 28 of the Rio Final Document, to which I referred earlier, declared the intention to have the South Atlantic zone free from any radioactive and other hazardous wastes and so keep marine life in the zone free from pollution. During the general debate at this session of the General Assembly much has been said of such clandestine dumping, and the details of such despicable acts need not be repeated here. Suffice it to add that no one denies the fact that those waste merchants currently engaged in illegal dumping are fully aware of the gravity of their actions and their effects on the environment and human health but have none the less persisted in their criminal activities out of inordinate greed and avarice.

With several vessels carrying tons of hazardous wastes and roaming the high seas in search of dumping sites that are fast diminishing, following a red alert that has now been raised world-wide, there are now genuine fears that some of those wastes may be dumped on the ocean floor and so cause serious damage to marine life. As sovereign Governments, we must exchange information on the activities of these waste merchants and take effective measures to stop them in their tracks before more harm is done to the marine ecosystem and the environment generally.

In this connection, the Nigerian delegation is profoundly appreciative of the contributions made by non-governmental organizations, which in their relentless pursuit of the objective of a clean environment have recorded impressive successes in unmasking these merchants of death. We commend their efforts and salute their indefatigable courage.

Before I conclude, please permit me to reaffirm Nigeria's commitment to the objectives of peace and co-operation in the South Atlantic. To this end we call on

(Mr. Adeyemi, Nigeria)

States of other regions to make credible contributions for the realization of these objectives by refraining from introducing any weapons of mass destruction into the South Atlantic zone. In this regard, we enjoin the friends of South Africa to reconsider their ongoing collaboration with the Pretoria regime, particularly in the field of nuclear technology, and reflect on the grave consequences for stability and peace in the zone at present posed by such continuing collaboration. Cutting off such links with the racist régime in Pretoria is perhaps the minimum we expect from them in order fully to transform the South Atlantic into a veritable zone of peace and co-operation.

On a final note, the Nigerian delegation would like to say that it is proud to associate itself with and even be a co-sponsor of draft resolution A/43/L.25, now being submitted to this body on this important agenda item. Its broad theme and pertinent provisions are self-explanatory, as they are commendable. It is our fervent hope that the draft resolution will receive the unanimous endorsement of the General Assembly.

Mrs. DIALLO (Senegal) (interpretation from French): The Senegalese delegation wishes to reaffirm its commitment to the objectives of the zone of peace and co-operation of the South Atlantic and to reiterate its determination to work with the member States of the zone, and with the support of the entire international community for its effective implementation.

As a country on the shores of the South Atlantic, our country has, from the very beginning, supported the positive initiative of Brazil, which we are pleased to commend once again, as well as all the consultations that led to the preparation of the declaration of 27 October 1986 whereby the General Assembly made the ocean region situated between Africa and South America a zone of peace and co-operation.

In this regard, my country also participated in the first meeting of States of the zone held between 25 and 29 July 1988 in Rio de Janeiro. The meeting adopted a Final Document that has been distributed as an official document of the General Assembly (A/43/512). It represents the first significant step towards the implementation of the objectives determined for the zone. Indeed, as requested in resolution 42/16 of 10 November 1987 on the question, during their Rio de Janeiro meeting the States of the zone succeeded in determining the intrinsic characteristics of the zone and the primary responsibility of the members to promote these goals and objectives, and they determined boundaries and established the bases for a programme of trans-Atlantic international co-operation, particularly in the maritime area. They also identified the main sources of conflict and tension threatening peace and development in the zone, first and foremost the policy of apartheid of the South African Government, its illegal occupation of Namibia and its manoeuvres to destabilize the States of the region.

(Mrs. Diallo, Senegal)

In this regard, I would observe that in his report to the General Assembly on agenda item 35, on the law of the sea, the Secretary-General notes that

"The first meeting of South Atlantic States (July 1988) produced a number of conclusions that can be expected to have a particular impact on the development of co-operation in the region towards preservation of peace and security, economic and social development, protection of the environment and conservation of resources ... the States concerned expressed their determination to exchange scientific information and strengthen regional marine scientific research capabilities." (A/43/718, para. 29)

Since the seminar held in 1976 in Lagos, Nigeria, to consider ways and means to create a zone of peace and co-operation in the South Atlantic, the States of the zone have been able fully to measure the implications of such an undertaking, particularly as regards disarmament and security, economic and social development, the preservation and protection of the environment, and respect for and promotion of human rights and the rights of peoples.

While promotion of the objectives of the zone is primarily the responsibility of the States of the region, political support and co-operation from third countries are also necessary to give the zone a universal character - the more so since international law has not yet precisely defined zones of this type. Here we encounter the whole problem of geographic delimitation and the legal status of the zone for the purpose of defining the rights and duties of States of the zone and other countries. Thus we are pleased that in the Secretary-General's report in document A/43/576, States outside the region clearly express their support for the initiatives of the States of the zone to proceed with the process of strengthening international peace and security through the organization and development of zones of regional solidarity and co-operation.

(Mrs. Diallo, Senegal)

At this stage in the formation of the zone of peace and co-operation of the South Atlantic, my delegation feels that, parallel with the efforts of States of the region, it would be useful to profit from experience gained vis-à-vis already existing de-nuclearized zones or zones of peace, as well as from studies already completed or now under way on this question. Similarly, the specialized agencies, bodies and organs of the United Nations system, and the regional and subregional organizations of Africa and Latin America, should be used to help the States of the region establish the international instruments and acquire means necessary to achieve the objectives of the zone.

These are the preoccupations of the participants in the Rio de Janeiro meeting, and they are reflected in draft resolution A/43/L.25, of which Senegal is a sponsor and which is now before the Assembly. The delegation of Senegal invites all other delegations to give this draft resolution overwhelming support.

Mr. AGUILAR (Venezuela) (interpretation from Spanish): Venezuela attaches great importance to the initiative of establishing a zone of peace and co-operation of the South Atlantic and accordingly my country has decided to co-sponsor draft resolution A/43/L.25, which follows up on resolution 41/11, whereby the General Assembly solemnly declared the Atlantic Ocean in the region situated between Africa and South America a zone of peace and co-operation.

(Mr. Aguilar, Venezuela)

Venezuela, as a South American country with a coast on the Atlantic - the ocean into which flows our main river, the Orinoco, a river highway of vital importance for our communication with the outside world and the exports of a fundamental sector of our basic industry - could not fail to participate in an initiative of this kind the purpose of which is to protect that vast and strategically valuable ocean region from any action that might create or exacerbate situations of tension or conflict. That is why Venezuela enthusiastically supports the planned undertaking aimed at preserving the South Atlantic as a zone intended exclusively for the promotion of co-operation among its coastal States and other interested States and the co-ordination of their efforts in a common endeavour for the benefit of peace, security and progress in the region.

Venezuela has always supported the creation of zones of peace in different parts of the world and shared the view of the international community that, as indicated in paragraph 64 of the Final Document adopted at the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, the establishment of zones of peace in various regions of the world is a measure that can play a decisive role in the field of disarmament since it has the objective of contributing

"to strengthening the security of States within such zones and to international peace and security, as a whole". (resolution S-10/2, para. 64)

In the case of the South Atlantic region, establishment of the zone takes into account the fact that the objective of ensuring peace and security cannot be envisaged in isolation. It must be approached bearing in mind its close connection with the needs stemming from economic and social development. Hence, in addition to promoting peace, this initiative seeks to help mobilize the efforts of the participating countries to promote co-operation in its broadest sense so that peace is built on a foundation of economic stability and social well-being.

(Mr. Aguilar, Venezuela)

In associating itself, through its sponsorship of draft resolution A/43/L.25, with this lofty undertaking, Venezuela is aware of the important benefits that the establishment of the zone of peace and co-operation in the South Atlantic will surely bring, not only to the participating countries but also to the international community in general, in its efforts to promote the objective of security, which, as has repeatedly been said, is an inseparable element of peace and one of the most profound aspirations of mankind.

My delegation joins previous speakers in calling upon all States represented here to co-operate, in accordance with paragraph 4 of the draft resolution we are going to adopt in the promotion of the objectives of peace and co-operation of the countries of the South Atlantic and to refrain from any action inconsistent with those objectives.

Mr. LOZINSKIY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet Union consistently advocates the establishment of zones of peace and nuclear-free zones in various parts of the world in the belief that they play an important role in reducing the threat of nuclear war and help lay the foundations for a comprehensive system of international security.

The positive changes in the world political climate, influenced by the first steps towards real nuclear disarmament and the incipient process of settling acute regional conflicts, are promoting the development of multilateral efforts in this direction as well.

The Soviet Union attaches great importance to the establishment of a zone of peace and co-operation in the South Atlantic in accordance with General Assembly resolution 41/11 and the full implementation of its goals with broad support from the international community.

This position was affirmed once again in the joint declaration on the principles of mutual actions for peace and international co-operation signed

(Mr. Lozinskiy, USSR)

recently by the President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet Mikhail Sergeevich Gorbachev and the President of the Federative Republic of Brazil, Mr. José Sarney, in Moscow.

We believe that the first meeting of States of the zone, which took place in Rio de Janeiro in July this year, was an important milestone on the path towards the creation of a zone of peace and co-operation of the South Atlantic. The Final Document then adopted reflects the desire of the States of the region to maintain peace and security through elimination of the foreign military presence; the non-deployment of nuclear weapons or other weapons of mass destruction there, the complete eradication of apartheid in South Africa; the strengthening of economic and technical co-operation and scientific ties; and preservation of the environment. The meeting promoted the strengthening of the organizational structure of co-operation in the South Atlantic.

The Soviet Union welcomes those constructive initiatives and for its part is ready to work practically to promote security in the region. We reaffirm our readiness to discuss with the United States of America and other major naval Powers, and of course the States of the South Atlantic, the question of appropriate measures for implementing the General Assembly's appeal for reduction of the military presence in the region and the non-deployment there of nuclear or other types of weapons of mass destruction. Practical steps to guarantee the security of maritime communications in the South Atlantic would also be very important.

Taking into account the emerging positive trends and the development of multilateral co-operation in the South Atlantic, we share the view that, given the Tlatelolco and Raratonga Treaties and the Declaration of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Africa and of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean, favourable conditions are being created for declaring the entire Southern Hemisphere a nuclear-free zone in the foreseeable future.

(Mr. Lozinskiy, USSR)

The United Nations, which is increasing its contribution to the solving of the many complex problems of contemporary international relations, has the potential to promote in practical ways the conversion of the South Atlantic into a zone of peace and co-operation. The Soviet delegation therefore supports the draft resolution before the General Assembly in document A/43/L.25 and will vote in favour of it.

Mr. ADOUKI (Congo) (interpretation from French): The People's Republic of the Congo as a co-sponsor, voted for resolution 41/11, of 27 October 1986, whereby the United Nations General Assembly declared the South Atlantic a zone of peace and co-operation. My delegation, realizing the importance of that declaration, considers it indispensable to support preceding speakers by contributing to today's debate on agenda item 31.

It is clearly a matter of the greatest interest to the States of the zone of peace and co-operation of the South Atlantic to bear in mind resolution 41/11 and speed up consideration of questions of regional peace and co-operation. For those States, the same problem of survival is involved as in other regions, such as the Mediterranean, where, with the support of the United Nations Environment Programmes, a plan of action for the Mediterranean has been developed. The Indian Ocean and the South Pacific, for example, are also significant in this regard.

As a representative of a State with an extensive coastline opening on to the Atlantic Ocean, and therefore a member of the group of States of the zone of peace and co-operation of the South Atlantic, I must stress the importance and priority that attach to all the questions which the States of the zone recently identified on the occasion of the first meeting of States of the zone of peace and co-operation of the South Atlantic, held in Rio de Janeiro. That meeting adopted a text of historic scope, entitled "Final Document of the first meeting of the States of the zone of peace and co-operation of the South Atlantic" (A/43/512). The United Nations should welcome the fact that the States of the zone met so quickly to debate questions of concern to the zone and, above all, that they chose to draft and adopt a final document as a practical expression of their readiness to work together and, at the same time, new evidence of the identity of the zone of the South Atlantic.

(Mr. Adouki, Congo)

What can we deduce from that document, with its two main aspects, political and economic? First, it says that questions of peace and security and those of development are interrelated and inseparable and that the coastal States bear a special responsibility for the preservation of peace and security in the South Atlantic. Nevertheless, it is necessary, in order to achieve the objectives of the declaration of 27 October 1986, that the States of other regions, in particular the militarily significant States, scrupulously respect the region of the South Atlantic as a zone of peace and co-operation and demonstrate their willingness to adopt concrete measures to ensure the reduction and eventual elimination of their military presence therein and to abstain from introducing nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction and from extending their rivalries and conflicts, which are alien to it, into the region.

In the Final Document there is condemnation of the abhorrent policy of apartheid in South Africa, the continued illegal occupation and colonial domination, of Namibia and South Africa's acts of aggression against Angola and other front-line States, and all other situations which affect the independence, sovereignty or territorial integrity of the States on both sides of the South Atlantic. The hope that in the near future the community of South Atlantic States will be able to welcome representatives from an independent Namibia and a South Africa free from apartheid was shared by all the participants in the Rio de Janeiro conference.

The States of the zone coincided again in the area of regional co-operation for economic and social development. They noted that the existing level of co-operation among them does not correspond to the potential of the region - a situation which derives to a large extent from outdated and unfair patterns of trade and financial relations on a global level and the grave economic

(Mr. Adouki, Congo)

conditions which affect the States of the zone. In the Final Document specific areas for co-operation are identified, such as transportation and communications, oceanographic research, protection of the environment and so on.

The dumping in the South Atlantic and on the territory of the States of the region of industrial waste from other parts of the world did not escape attention. The States of the zone condemned the dumping of hazardous toxic and nuclear wastes in the region. The States decided to establish a "dump watch" to monitor closely the movements of suspect vessels and to disseminate information concerning them.

These praiseworthy efforts are in the right direction and deserve the encouragement of the international community. On their effective implementation depends the attainment of the objectives proclaimed in the declaration. It depends also, however, on the often very limited ability of the States of the zone to resolve the basic problems that made the declaration necessary. Thus, it is gratifying and comforting that their efforts may be supported by those of other States in a movement of solidarity and harmony. It is in that spirit that my delegation has noted with satisfaction the responses of countries which are not members of the zone as recorded in the report submitted by the Secretary-General.

Finally, my delegation eagerly hopes that the broadest possible support will be given by Member States to draft resolution A/43/L.25.

Mr. SALLAH (Gambia): At the time of the inclusion of the item on zone of peace and co-operation of the South Atlantic in the agenda of the forty-first session of the General Assembly, the Government of the Gambia supported without reservation the concept of peace and co-operation in the South Atlantic. My delegation was most heartened at the passage of General Assembly resolutions 41/11 and 42/16 by an overwhelming majority of the members of the Assembly. While we commend the members of the Assembly who fully supported the efforts undertaken by States of the zone of peace and co-operation in continuing to promote peace and co-operation, we are somewhat dispirited by the rash decisions of countries that raise fears of progressive militarization of the region and the totally unacceptable and irresponsible practice of dumping industrial and toxic waste. My delegation reiterates its unswerving support for the ideals of the zone of peace and co-operation of the South Atlantic and the establishment of a "dump watch" in the region.

Following the prolonged drought and the relentless encroachment of the desert in our region, we in the South Atlantic area can no longer tolerate any further form of environmental degradation, especially that which is man-made. As stated by my Minister from this rostrum during the general debate, the Gambia will support the "dump watch", first proposed by the Federal Republic of Nigeria, in order that countries which may be subject to the dumping of industrial waste may be alerted in good time to enable them to put in place all the precautionary measures for safeguarding their environment. We believe that the United Nations should set up a special committee that would look into the activities of industrial companies guilty of such crimes.

The pages of history are replete with evidence of the lack of mutual respect and co-operation among nations in different parts of the world. The wars that

(Mr. Sallah, Gambia)

ensued have left unhealed wounds and seething animosities between the nations involved. For the States of the South Atlantic to become so embroiled would be a most foolhardy and self-destructive pursuit and would undoubtedly threaten the fragile peace initiatives flowering in much of the global community. It is for this reason that the countries of the region choose to promote further regional co-operation in social and economic development and, at the same time, call upon others outside the region scrupulously to respect the region of the South Atlantic as a zone of peace, free from nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction. The adoption of resolution 41/11 and subsequent resolutions should stand as an international model to those countries that refuse to recognize the wisdom of co-operation instead of confrontation.

Regrettably, one régime, that of South Africa, continues to be obstinate in its inhumane policy of apartheid and the denial of self-determination and independence to the people of Namibia. Indeed, despite international expressions of revulsion at its behaviour within its borders and against its weak neighbours, South Africa has embarked on more repressive behaviour against its own people and the people of Namibia, thereby threatening to engulf the whole of the African continent in the flames of armed conflict.

It is the opinion of my delegation that such continued behaviour by South Africa could lead to the antithesis of the zone of peace and co-operation described in resolution 42/16. The international community could witness the proliferation of nuclear weapons in a region relatively free from such horrors, if South Africa is allowed to continue its inhumane policies. The countries of our region are already painfully burdened with the flow of the conventional arms that have taken the lives of so many innocents - men, women and children. Therefore, the Gambian delegation fervently pleads that South Africa reconsider the path it has determined

(Mr. Sallah, Gambia)

upon, embark on the road towards national dignity, international peace and justice, and abandon its desperate, unconscionable pursuit of repression, which is at once financially and morally unrewarding.

The dependence of the nations of the world on each other's national resources and free marine transport of these riches underscores the need for the zone of peace and co-operation in the South Atlantic, cultural differences notwithstanding. My delegation is also very pleased with the decision of the Government of Argentina to intensify its pursuit of a broad process of integration and co-operation with the Governments of Uruguay and Brazil, including the signing of economic protocols. My delegation is also grateful to the Government of Brazil for the tireless efforts being made to bring about closer co-operation among the countries of the South Atlantic, and for hosting the first meeting of the countries of the region in Rio de Janeiro earlier this year. At the opening session of that meeting the Minister for External Relations of Brazil acknowledged the cultural ties that bind Brazil and Africa. The Minister expressed his hope that continued adherence to the principles of General Assembly resolution 42/16 would lead to greater joint peace efforts and prosperity through mutual, tension-free sharing of the Earth's dwindling resources.

The Gambia fervently reaffirms its commitment to the tenets of resolution 42/16 and trusts that co-operation between the countries of the South Atlantic in a zone of peace will continue and even intensify.

Mr. ESSY (Côte d'Ivoire) (interpretation from French): In the history of its international relations Côte d'Ivoire has given tangible proof of its desire for peace, which it continually affirms. It was in this spirit that it supported from the outset the timely initiative of Brazil, which, through the declaration of the South Atlantic as a zone of peace and co-operation, aims at the preservation of

(Mr. Essy, Côte d'Ivoire)

the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of the States of the South Atlantic and the development of their relations in peace and freedom.

There is therefore no need for my delegation to reaffirm the total acceptance by Côte d'Ivoire of the declaration of 27 October 1986 and its sincere desire to spare no effort to serve the purposes of that declaration.

Moreover, my delegation takes this opportunity to express its sincere appreciation to the Brazilian Government for its initiative, which is in the interest not only of the States of the region but of mankind as a whole. We also wish to express our gratitude to Brazil for having convened the first meeting of States of the zone of peace and co-operation of the South Atlantic, held at Rio de Janeiro last July, for the purpose of ensuring implementation of the relevant General Assembly resolutions. That meeting, whose historic importance need not be emphasized, enabled the countries of the zone to identify a vast range of possible areas of co-operation in the interest of peace and development in the South Atlantic region, and to begin to apply the declaration in practice.*

* The President returned to the Chair.

(Mr. Essy, Côte d'Ivoire)

It is generally recognized that, apart from its function at the world-wide level, the concept of a zone of peace constitutes a promise of harmony and peace at the regional level. As mentioned in the final document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to Disarmament in 1978, the establishment of such zones could help to strengthen the security of States belonging to them and, generally speaking, could promote international peace and security. It was therefore quite right for the representatives of the States of the South Atlantic, meeting in Rio de Janeiro, to affirm that questions of peace and security are intimately linked with the question of development and to agree that co-operation with a view to peace and development among the States of the regions is essential in order to attain the objectives of the zone of peace and co-ordination of the South Atlantic.

As far as my delegation can see, it is therefore clear that complete attainment of the objectives of the Declaration of the South Atlantic as a zone of peace and co-operation is dependent on three essential conditions: peace within each State of the zone; peace between the States of the zone; and peace between the States of the zone and the rest of the world. Co-operation for development can be established only in a climate of peace, and it is a pleasure to note that in the final document resulting from their first meeting the States of the zone, with a view to protecting peace, have committed themselves to implementing and defending the same principles and to working towards bringing together men, ideas, cultures and knowledge. Since the States of the zone have the same concept of peace, it will be easy for them to co-operate closely with a view to the elimination of threats to that peace. Such threats undeniably include the arms race and the accumulation of weapons of mass destructions, apartheid and racial discrimination in South Africa, and the conflicts over Namibia and the Malvinas Islands, which

(Mr. Essy, Côte d'Ivoire)

would not exist if their peoples had not been deprived of the exercise of their right to self-determination, if States had not interfered in the internal affairs of other States, and if those who hold power in States had not shown contempt for dialogue and had not met popular expressions of human rights by the unpopular use of force.

Another threat to peace is represented by the growth of poverty in the developing countries, particularly in countries where the prices of basic commodities and terms of trade have been greatly affected by speculation. In this context, Côte d'Ivoire welcomes the willingness of the States of the zone to study ways and means of strengthening and expanding ties of co-operation for the benefit of all in the context of economic and technical co-operation among developing countries. Furthermore, my delegation stresses the special importance it attaches to the protection of the environment, particularly the marine environment. We believe that it is necessary and urgent for measures to be taken at the international, national and regional levels effectively to combat the dumping in the South Atlantic region of dangerous toxic and nuclear wastes. Côte d'Ivoire, for its part, has already taken legislative steps in this direction.

Clearly efforts must continually be made by the States of the zone to serve the goals of the Declaration of the South Atlantic as a zone of peace and co-operation. These efforts will be inadequate, if not futile, unless they have the support of the international community as a whole. For this reason it is urgent for all States to help to attain the objectives of peace and co-operation established by the Declaration. In this way the Atlantic Ocean, the strategic and economic importance of which is no secret to anyone, will be preserved as an element in the search for harmony and union among nations and not as an element of disunity.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): We have heard the last speaker in the debate on this item. Therefore the Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolution A/43/L.25.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

Against: United States of America

Abstaining: Belgium, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands

Draft resolution A/43/L.25 was adopted by 144 votes to 1, with 7 abstentions (resolution 43/23).*

* Subsequently the delegations of Malawi and Vanuatu advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I call upon those delegations wishing to speak in explanation of vote.

Mrs. GROSS (United States of America): The United States is once again compelled to vote against the draft resolution on the South Atlantic zone of peace and co-operation. As we have explained in this forum in the past, our opposition is based on the view that such a resolution would be inconsistent with the generally recognized principles under international law of the freedom of navigation of the high seas and the right of innocent passage through territorial waters. The United States cannot accept such restrictions. In addition, we believe that any attempt to establish an internationally-recognized zone of peace should be made through multilateral negotiations among relevant parties rather than through a General Assembly resolution.

Miss GUERRA (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): On 27 October 1986, in resolution 41/11, the General Assembly solemnly declared the South Atlantic a zone of peace and co-operation. In the adoption of that resolution the international community expressed its support for the efforts made by the States of that region to develop their relations in conditions of peace and freedom. Since that time the Government of Mexico, convinced that the attainment of the objectives of that Declaration will help to preserve international peace and security, has expressed its support for efforts to consolidate the zone and it welcomes the holding of the first meeting of States of the region, held in Rio de Janeiro from 25 to 29 July 1988.

The resolution which the General Assembly has just adopted shows once again that the international community attaches great importance to the constructive initiative of the States of the zone. It is precisely because of the endorsement which the United Nations has given to the establishment of the zone of peace and

(Miss Guerra, Mexico)

co-operation of the South Atlantic that my delegation finds it strange that, unlike resolution 42/16, which urges all States to refrain from engaging in any act which is incompatible with the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly, the resolution which has just been adopted does not contain any reference to the obligation of all States to respect the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the resolutions of the General Assembly.

Mr. SPOTTORNO (Spain) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/43/L.25, just as it has voted in favour of similar draft resolutions since the introduction of this item in the General Assembly two years ago.

At the time, we explained our affirmative vote as a contribution to a great political principle: strengthening international peace, security and co-operation. We also said that it was our understanding that the resolutions on this item could not imply any change in the applicable legal norms and principles of international law, especially those concerning the law of the sea. What we said then is valid today.

With regard to the second preambular paragraph of the draft resolution just adopted, which clearly establishes that questions of peace and security and those of development are interrelated and inseparable, I would recall that the Spanish delegation, in the statement it made in the general debate at the Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development, held here at Headquarters last year, expressed its position on the complex relationship between peace and security, on the one hand, and economic development, on the other.

Mr. COSTA PEREIRA (Portugal): My country is happy to recognize that we are witnessing an important and positive trend in international relations and, simultaneously, the relevant role played by the United Nations Secretary-General in the lessening of tensions in various regions of the world.

Portugal has always followed with the greatest attention matters relating to the South Atlantic, a region with which we have long-standing, historical ties and where are located the vast majority of countries of Portuguese expression - Angola, Brazil, Cape Verde, Guinea-Bissau and Sao Tome and Principe, with which we maintain close relations.

(Mr. Costa Pereira, Portugal)

Having in mind the recent important progress towards the solution of some regional conflicts, the role played by the United Nations and the objectives of the draft resolution under consideration, Portugal voted in favour of this text despite its deficient geographical delimitation of the area covered by its provisions. Notwithstanding that fact, we are convinced that the resolution just adopted by the General Assembly will contribute to reinforcing concrete steps already taken to ensure the strengthening of international peace and co-operation as well as the promotion of the principles and purposes of the United Nations Charter.

In that context, Portugal will continue to support the ongoing efforts to settle regional conflicts - in particular, those concerning Namibia and the overall situation in southern Africa, to which we devote particular attention.

Mr. SERVAIS (Belgium) (interpretation from French): My delegation has been following with sustained interest and positive attention the regional efforts to ensure peace, security and co-operation.

However, we find that there are too many uncertainties and ambiguities in draft resolution A/43/L.25, just adopted by the General Assembly. My delegation would have hoped for more clarity on various aspects of the draft resolution, in order to be able to support it unreservedly.

For that reason, Belgium abstained in the vote.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): That concludes our consideration of agenda item 31.

AGENDA ITEM 29

QUESTION OF NAMIBIA:

- (a) REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS COUNCIL FOR NAMIBIA (A/43/24);
- (b) REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION WITH REGARD TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (A/43/23 (Part V), A/AC.10/9/960);
- (c) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/43/724);
- (d) REPORT OF THE FOURTH COMMITTEE (A/43/780);
- (e) DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/43/24 (Part II), chapter I)

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to take note of the report (A/43/780) of the Fourth Committee concerning the hearings of organizations?

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I should like to propose that the list of speakers on this item be closed tomorrow at noon.

May I take it that there is no objection to that proposal?

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I would request representatives who wish to participate in the debate to inscribe their names on the list of speakers as soon as possible.

I now call on the Rapporteur of the Special Committee on the Situation with Regard to the Implementation of the Declaration of the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, Mr. Ahmed Farouk Arnouss of the Syrian Arab Republic, to introduce the Special Committee's report in document A/43/23 (Part V).

Mr. ARNOUSS (Syrian Arab Republic), Rapporteur of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the

(Mr. Arnouss, Rapporteur,
Special Committee of 24)

Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (Special Committee of 24): As the Rapporteur 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, I have the honour to introduce to the General Assembly the chapter of the report of the Special Committee in document A/43/23 (Part V), covering its work during the year on the question of Namibia.

The report, which relates to agenda item 29, is submitted pursuant to operative paragraph 12 of General Assembly resolution 42/71 of 4 December 1987, on the implementation of the Declaration. In that paragraph the General Assembly requested the Special Committee to continue to seek suitable means for the immediate and full implementation of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) in all Territories that had not yet attained independence and, in particular, to formulate specific proposals for the elimination of the remaining vestiges of colonialism.

(Mr. Arnouss, Rapporteur,
Special Committee of 24)

In continuing to perform these tasks in relation to the question of Namibia, the Special Committee took into consideration the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly, in particular resolution 42/14, as well as the related decisions of the Security Council, the United Nations Council for Namibia and other intergovernmental organizations.

As will be noted from the report, the Special Committee again examined in depth developments relating to the question of Namibia, with the participation of the representatives of the Council for Namibia and the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO).

As reflected in paragraph 13 of the report, the Special Committee reaffirmed that Namibia was the direct responsibility of the United Nations until it attained independence. The Committee noted with grave concern the critical situation that continued to prevail in and around Namibia as a direct result of the continued illegal occupation of the Territory by the racist minority régime of South Africa.

The Committee reaffirmed the inalienable right of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence in a united Namibia, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). It also reaffirmed the legitimacy of their struggle to achieve freedom by all means at their disposal.

The Committee reiterated its conviction that the apartheid régime of South Africa was responsible for creating a situation that seriously threatened international peace and security, as a result, among other factors, of its persistent non-compliance with, and violation of, United Nations resolutions and decisions; in the form of denial to the people of Namibia of their basic human rights; its policy of apartheid; its brutal repression of, and violence against, the

(Mr. Arnouss, Rapporteur,
Special Committee of 24)

Namibian people; its repeated acts of aggression, subversion and destabilization against neighbouring States; its continued manoeuvres to prevent the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978); and its sinister attempts to impose an internal settlement on the people of Namibia, in order to consolidate its illegal hold over the Territory. The Committee stressed that there were only two parties to the conflict, the Namibian people, represented by the South West Africa People's Organization, their sole and authentic representative, and the racist régime of South Africa, which illegally occupied Namibia.

The Committee reiterated that any political solution to the Namibian situation must be based on the immediate and unconditional termination of South Africa's illegal occupation of the Territory, the withdrawal of its armed forces, and the free and unfettered exercise by the Namibian people of their right to self-determination and independence, in accordance with the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

It reaffirmed that the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, embodied in Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978), was the only internationally accepted basis for a peaceful settlement of the Namibian question and it demanded immediate implementation of the plan without pre-condition or modification. The Committee denounced and rejected the attempts by South Africa or any other State to impart to the question of Namibia a dimension different from that which it was, namely, an act of colonial domination; in its view, the question had always been and continued to be a decolonization issue and must be addressed and resolved in accordance with the provisions of the Declaration.

The Committee rejected any attempt to establish a linkage between the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and extraneous issues as being a ploy intended to delay the independence of Namibia. The Committee strongly

(Mr. Arnouss, Rapporteur,
Special Committee of 24)

rejected the policies of constructive engagement and linkage, which had encouraged the racist régime of South Africa to continue its illegal occupation of Namibia, and called for their abandonment so that the resolutions and decisions of the United Nations on Namibia could be implemented.

The Committee strongly condemned South Africa for its military build-up in Namibia, its use of the illegally occupied international Territory as a springboard for perpetrating armed invasions, subversion, destabilization and aggression against the neighbouring States, its introduction of compulsory military service for Namibians, its proclamation of a so-called security zone in Namibia, its forced recruitment and training of Namibians for tribal armies, and its use of mercenaries to suppress the Namibian people. It unequivocally condemned the provision of financial and military support to the bandits of UNITA. The Committee condemned the military and nuclear intelligence collaboration between South Africa and Western and other countries, which constituted a violation of the arms embargo imposed against South Africa by the Security Council in its resolution 418 (1977) of 4 November 1977. The Committee urged the Security Council to adopt further measures to widen the scope of that resolution.

The Committee also deplored the continuing collaboration of certain Western States and other countries with the racist régime of South Africa in the political, economic, military, nuclear, financial, cultural and other fields, and declared that such collaboration encouraged the Pretoria régime in its defiance of the international community and obstructed efforts to eliminate apartheid and bring to an end South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia. The Committee thus called for the immediate cessation of such collaboration.

In reaffirming that the natural resources of Namibia, including its marine resources, were the inviolable heritage of the Namibian people, the Committee

(Mr. Arnouss, Rapporteur,
Special Committee of 24)

strongly condemned the activities of all foreign economic interests operating in Namibia that were illegally exploiting those resources and demanded that those interests should immediately withdraw from the Territory inasmuch as they constituted a major obstacle to Namibia's independence.

The Committee reaffirmed that such interests would have to pay damages to the future legitimate government of an independent Namibia. It expressed its support for the initiation of legal proceedings by the United Nations Council for Namibia in the domestic courts of States against corporations or individuals involved in the exploitation, transport, processing or purchase of Namibia's natural resources, as part of its efforts to give effect to Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia.

The Committee strongly recommended that the Security Council respond positively to the overwhelming demand of the international community by imposing forthwith comprehensive mandatory sanctions against that régime under the terms of Chapter VII of the Charter.

In reaffirming its solidarity with and support for SWAPO, the Special Committee commended the people of Namibia who, under SWAPO leadership, had intensified the struggle at all levels, demanding the immediate and unconditional implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). It also commended SWAPO for its continued co-operation with the United Nations in its efforts towards the full and speedy implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

On behalf of the Special Committee, I commend the report to the serious attention of the General Assembly.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I call on Mr. Zuze of

Zambia, President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, to present the report of the Council.

Mr. ZUZE (Zambia), President of the United Nations Council for Namibia:

Let me at the outset convey to you, Sir, our warm and sincere congratulations on your election to the presidency of the General Assembly at the forty-third session. The outstanding and effective manner in which you have guided the deliberations of this Assembly tells the story of your immense personal ability as a seasoned diplomat. We in the Council for Namibia are pleased that the Assembly is considering this important item under the esteemed leadership of a great son of Argentina, a country which is unequivocally committed to the independence of Namibia and the total eradication of the evil system of apartheid in South Africa.

May I also extend our deep appreciation to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Perez de Cuellar, for his keen awareness of the problems facing the United Nations, his tireless efforts towards their solution and his determination to strengthen the role and effectiveness of the Organization. The positive developments of the past months on matters pertaining to the maintenance of international peace and security in several areas of the world could not have been achieved without the sustained diplomatic endeavours of the Secretary-General and his staff over the years.

The commitment of the Secretary-General to the independence of Namibia has similarly been unequivocal and his perseverance unflinching. He continues to work tirelessly to facilitate Namibia's transition to independence. The United Nations Council for Namibia appreciates his efforts and assures him of its continued co-operation and support.

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

The question of Namibia has been on the agenda of the United Nations since its founding a little over four decades ago. Throughout this period, statesmen, world leaders and others have reaffirmed the inalienable right of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence. As we begin to debate the question of Namibia today, we are reminded of the fact that 14 November also marks the centennial of the birth of the late Prime Minister of India, Jawaharlal Nehru, the great statesmen and an indefatigable foe of apartheid, minority rule, colonialism and racism. Mr. Nehru was instrumental in the struggle for India's independence. He himself experienced the indignities and repression that are daily visited upon the Namibian people by the racist régime of South Africa. He often spoke eloquently in support of the right of the people of Namibia to self-determination and independence. So, as the General Assembly takes up this important item, it is fitting that we pay special tribute to the man and recognize the courage with which he spoke out against oppression and injustice.

The fact that to date Namibia is still under foreign occupation should not be viewed as lack of resolve on the part of the United Nations to end the colonial situation in the Territory. The United Nations has been instrumental in a number of initiatives aimed at the early attainment of the independence of Namibia. In pursuit of its Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, the General Assembly terminated South Africa's mandate over the Territory and placed Namibia under the direct responsibility of the United Nations in October 1966. The following year the General Assembly established the United Nations Council for Namibia as the legal Administering Authority for the Territory until independence and charged it with the responsibility of protecting, representing and promoting the rights and interests of Namibia and its people.

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

Since then the General Assembly has spared no effort to end South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia and enable the people of the Territory to exercise their inalienable right to self-determination and national independence.

Despite the efforts of this world body to secure the decolonization of the Territory, Namibia's freedom still remains a cherished dream. South Africa's ruthless military occupation continues to oppress the Namibian people and to deny them their most fundamental rights. The situation in Namibia represents a unique complex of problems facing southern Africa. Namibia is the embodiment of colonialism, institutionalized racism, occupation, aggression and systematic economic plunder. It constitutes an example of one of the most flagrant violations of the United Nations Charter and of the ethical and juridical principles governing relations between the peoples and Governments of the contemporary world. Quite apart from the suffering of the people of the region, another consequence of Pretoria's diabolical actions against the people of Namibia and of southern Africa as a whole has been the serious deterioration of the political and security situation in the region.

Let it be said again that South Africa has repeatedly defied the United Nations over the question of Namibia with impunity. It has persistently refused to implement the resolutions and decisions of the Security Council and this Assembly. In the light of this intransigence, the General Assembly has over the years urged the Security Council to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the Pretoria régime under Chapter VII of the Charter as a means of compelling South Africa to withdraw unconditionally from Namibia. Regrettably, this peaceful alternative has been rejected by some Western permanent members of the Security Council, which have chosen to abuse their veto privilege in that Council.

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

It goes without saying that persistent veto action by Western permanent members of the Security Council has encouraged the Pretoria régime to be intransigent and to increase its repression in the Territory while at the same time engaging in acts of aggression against and destabilization of the front-line and other independent States of the region.

The glimmer of hope arising from the adoption of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which together with resolution 385 (1976) set the framework for the United Nations plan for the independence of the Territory, was soon dashed by the blatant dilatory manoeuvres of the South African régime. In the 10 years which have elapsed since the adoption of resolution 435 (1978) Pretoria has continuously resorted to raising a variety of obstacles which have prevented the implementation of that resolution, while at the same time increasing the militarization of the Territory and the brutal repression of the Namibian people.

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

As the Assembly is aware, negotiations outside the United Nations framework involving Angola, Cuba, South Africa and the United States are currently reported to be taking place, which, given the desired solution, could see the end of South Africa's illegal occupation and the establishment of an internationally recognized Government for the Namibian people. While some have expressed optimism on the outcome of those talks, it must be said that South Africa's record in international negotiations on self-determination and independence for Namibia has consistently shown deception, bad faith and falsehoods, all intended to buy time and international goodwill for its apartheid policies. The apartheid régime has mastered the game of deliberately raising the hopes of the international community by its deceptive manoeuvres, which are usually followed by demands for new linkages - the latest being the linkage regarding Savimbi and his band of UNITA rebels and so-called United Nations impartiality. South Africa has yet to pass the test of negotiating in good faith.

It must be emphasized, further, that the major reason behind Pretoria's present appearance of willingness to co-operate in a search for peace in the region stems from severe military setbacks suffered by its forces in south-east Angola during the first few months of this year. Beyond this point, no one knows Pretoria's future plans for southern Africa. We in the Council for Namibia feel the obligation to warn against misplaced optimism.

The Council for Namibia has unequivocally and categorically rejected any solution of the Namibian question outside the framework of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). Throughout its two decades of existence the Council for Namibia has left no stone unturned in its endeavours to mobilize international

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

support for, and solidarity with, the struggling people of Namibia, as well as to assist the growing number of Namibians who have been forced to flee from the Territory.

In fulfilment of the mandate entrusted to it by the General Assembly, the Council for Namibia regularly engages in consultations with Governments throughout the world to seek greater support for the cause of Namibia and to review all measures that may be taken to promote the implementation of United Nations resolutions regarding the Territory. The Council for Namibia also maintains under continuous review the political, economic, social and military developments in and relating to the Territory which affect the struggle of the Namibian people for freedom and independence.

The Council for Namibia took specific steps to protect Namibia's natural wealth by enacting in September 1974 Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia. It has repeatedly denounced and condemned the activities of South Africa and other foreign economic interests which for decades have ruthlessly exploited the Territory's resources. In 1985, after years of study and preparation, the Council for Namibia decided to take legal action in the domestic courts of States against those corporations or individuals involved in the exploitation, transport, processing or purchase of Namibia's natural resources.

As for the legal Administering Authority for Namibia, the Council for Namibia has been entrusted by the General Assembly with the responsibility of representing the Territory and defending its interests in all international forums. Thus, since 1975 it has obtained full membership in many of the specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system, as well as in a number of international conferences, such as the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea.

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

In the discharge of its responsibilities in preparing the people of the Territory for independence, the Council for Namibia directs and co-ordinates a comprehensive programme for assistance to Namibians, which includes support for the United Nations Institute for Namibia, where a future cadre of Namibian skilled personnel receive education and training and are thus prepared to undertake the administration of a future independent Namibia. The Council for Namibia also conducts the implementation of the Nationhood Programme, covering projects in nutrition, agriculture, mining, management, communications, health and vocational training.

Last, but not least, the Council for Namibia strives to keep the question of Namibia at the forefront of international attention. In this regard, it regularly organizes a number of activities, such as international conferences, seminars and workshops, to denounce the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa and to mobilize world public opinion for the independence of the Territory. In addition, it conducts intensive programmes of dissemination of information on the current situation in Namibia and maintains close co-operation with non-governmental organizations, parliamentarians, and groups and institutions supportive of the Council's work and objectives.

Despite all the aforementioned activities undertaken by the Council for Namibia to bring about Namibia's independence, the Territory is still under South Africa's colonial domination. Pretoria's defiance of the will of the international community as embodied in United Nations resolutions and decisions calling for its immediate withdrawal from Namibia indeed knows no bounds.

As a result of this intransigence by the racist régime, there is a critical, need for this body to be action-oriented and redouble its efforts to bring pressure

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

to bear on South Africa finally to put an end to its illegal occupation of Namibia.

The draft annual report of the United Nations Council for Namibia presented to the forty-third session of the General Assembly contains five draft resolutions. As in previous years, the draft resolutions appeal to the international community to support initiatives aimed at exerting pressure on South Africa to withdraw from the Territory, and take into account decisions contained in resolutions previously adopted by the General Assembly on the question of Namibia, as well as developments in the Territory's struggle for independence. The draft resolutions will be introduced to the Assembly individually at a later stage. I should like simply to seize this opportunity to express the strong hope that they will meet with the overwhelming support of the Member States of our Organization.

Let this be the last session of the General Assembly at which Namibia is considered in the context of a Non-Self-Governing Territory. Let us work for the deletion of this item from the agenda of the United Nations once and for all. This is our solemn responsibility. It is our collective obligation, which must be fulfilled without further delay.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.