



Security Council

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.2628
15 November 1985

UN LIBRARY

NOV 18 1985

ENGLISH

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND
SIX HUNDRED AND TWENTY-EIGHTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 15 November 1985, at 11 a.m.

<u>President:</u>	Mr. WOOLCOTT	(Australia)
<u>Members:</u>	Burkina Faso	Mr. BASSOLE
	China	Mr. LI Luye
	Denmark	Mr. ULRICH
	Egypt	Mr. SHAKER
	France	Mr. de KEMOULARIA
	India	Mr. NARAYANAN
	Madagascar	Mr. RAKOTONDRAMBOA
	Peru	Mr. ALZAMORA
	Thailand	Mr. KASEMSRI
	Trinidad and Tobago	Mr. ALLEYNE
	Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic	Mr. SKOFENKO
	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Mr. TROYANOVSKY
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir John THOMSON
	United States of America	Mr. OKUN

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 Security Council.

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 11.30 a.m.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

THE SITUATION IN NAMIBIA

- (a) LETTER DATED 11 NOVEMBER 1985 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF INDIA TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/17618)
- (b) LETTER DATED 11 NOVEMBER 1985 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF MAURITIUS TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/17619)

The PRESIDENT: In accordance with a decision taken at the 2624th meeting, I invite the representative of Mauritius to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Seereekissoon (Mauritius) took a place at the Council table.

The PRESIDENT: In accordance with a decision taken at the 2624th meeting, I invite the Acting President of the United Nations Council for Namibia and the other members of the delegation of that Council to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Sinclair (Guyana), Acting President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, and the other members of the delegation took a place at the Council table.

The PRESIDENT: In accordance with a decision taken at the 2624th meeting, I invite Mr. Toivo ja Toivo to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Toivo ja Toivo took a place at the Council table.

The PRESIDENT: In accordance with decisions taken at previous meetings on this item, I invite the representatives of Cameroon, Canada, Cuba, the Federal Republic of Germany, the German Democratic Republic, Ghana, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Senegal, South Africa, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia and Zambia to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Engo (Cameroon), Mr. Lewis (Canada), Mr. Oramas Oliva (Cuba), Mr. Lautenschlager, (Federal Republic of Germany), Mr. Ott (German Democratic Republic), Mr. Gbeho (Ghana), Mr. Azzarouk (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), Mr. Sarré (Senegal), Mr. von Schirnding (South Africa), Mr. El-Fattal (Syrian Arab Republic), Mr. Bouziri (Tunisia) and Mr. Lusaka (Zambia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Czechoslovakia and the Islamic Republic of Iran, in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda.

In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Cesar (Czechoslovakia) and Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani (Islamic Republic of Iran) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

The PRESIDENT: The Security Council will now resume its consideration of the item on its agenda.

Members of the Council have before them document S/17631, which contains the text of a draft resolution submitted by Burkina Faso, Egypt, India, Madagascar, Peru and Trinidad and Tobago.

The first speaker for this morning is the representative of Ghana. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. GBEHO (Ghana): I take this opportunity, Sir, to congratulate you most warmly on your assumption of the high office of President of the Security Council for the month of November. As you are aware, my Government and, indeed, your many friends in Ghana hold you in very high esteem because of your wisdom and diplomatic skills, qualities which you employed effectively, during your period of service as Australia's envoy in Ghana, to strengthen relations between our two countries. We are more than convinced that this Council and the international community at large will profit immensely from your leadership. It is my pleasant duty also to convey to you the congratulations of my Government and of your Ghanaian friends on this auspicious occasion.

I wish also to express my sincere thanks to the members of the Council for affording my delegation the opportunity to participate in this important debate.

My delegation asked to participate in the present debate because the question of the independence of Namibia is, as a matter of principle, very important to us. Moreover, we consider that the endless procrastination by the Security Council in the past with regard to action against South Africa is threatening the credibility not only of the Council but of the entire United Nations. But, more than that, the geopolitical ramifications of recent developments in the subregion coupled with the Council's chronic inaction now clearly threaten international peace and security and must command the immediate and serious attention of all States Members of the United Nations.

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

We regard the present debate as a logical continuation of the Council's consideration of the question of Namibia in June this year, which led to the adoption of resolution 566 (1985) on 19 June 1985. It will be recalled that the Council decided in that resolution to remain seized of the matter and to meet immediately after receipt of the Secretary-General's report for the purpose of reviewing progress in the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). The continuity aspect of the current debate is of special interest to my delegation, because the words of resolution 566 (1985) are important and noteworthy as they bear on the current debate. The inescapable import of the words of that resolution is that the Council has already restricted itself to consideration at the present meetings of specific outstanding matters and has undertaken to continue on the path of the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). Indeed, the resolution even goes on to state the determination of the Council to invoke the appropriate provisions of the Charter, including Chapter VII, should South Africa continue to obstruct what the Council has already accepted as its clear duty, namely, the implementation of resolution 435 (1978).

It is our understanding therefore - and my delegation fully agrees with this intention - that the Council will not entertain any extraneous issues at this session, and will proceed, as it has already decided to do, against the background of the Secretary-General's report alone.

The Secretary-General's report (S/17442) is dated 6 September 1985. It tells a familiar story of the determination of the illegal racist régime of South Africa to obstruct the liberation of the Territory of Namibia, which it occupies illegally, through prevarication and diversionary tactics. The racist régime, as has been clear for a long time now, is a past master in political chicanery. Its Ambassador proved that in the most recent resumed consultations with the Secretary-General.

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

According to the Secretary-General's report, instead of conveying his Government's choice of electoral system, he rather raised for the umpteenth time the extraneous issue of the presence of Cuban troops in the People's Republic of Angola. That irresponsible response was, however, predictable, because after reviewing the racist régime's past performance, Ghana - and, I daresay, the majority of Member States of the United Nations - never believed that it would be prepared at this session of the Council to co-operate voluntarily in bringing Namibia to independence. It seems to us, therefore, that the Secretary-General's report not only accurately reflects the status of the consultations but also confirms the fears of the international community about the racist régime's credibility.

My delegation wishes to draw particular attention to the reference to the racist régime's lack of credibility in the Secretary-General's report, not only because we concur in that assessment, but also because such an evaluation should now constitute the bottom line of the Council's consideration of the matter. In other words, members of the Council should ask themselves whether any further postponement of the firm action that it promised to take in June can induce co-operation from the racist régime. It should be obvious to all that the answer can only be in the negative, because that régime has used all forms of subterfuge consistently in the past to defer action and will not hesitate to indulge in it a few more times.

Furthermore, a study of the history of the question of Namibia in the Security Council would show that the racist régime has always been querulous about one issue or another whenever the point of decision was reached. Since 1978, when resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) were adopted, it has always succeeded in avoiding action by regularly raising either the question of the recognition accorded to the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) or the linkage

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

theory or the spirit of constructive engagement, or the impartiality of the United Nations or the alleged favouritism of the Security Council itself. The question of Namibia in the Council has almost become a tale from the Arabian Nights, always to be postponed to the next occasion. The racist régime has become the sweet-tongued Sheherazade who unflinchingly seduces the Council to postpone firm action just before the axe falls.

In the meantime the geopolitical ramifications of the delay continue to become more and more awesome. Not only has the liberation struggle intensified; the racist régime and its puppets in Namibia have also escalated violence, resulting in the death of countless Namibians. It is the same procrastination of action in the Council that afforded the opportunity to an outside Power to introduce the further complication of the question of the presence of Cuban troops in the neighbouring People's Republic of Angola.

Without going into the merits of the arguments that have been used to justify the linkage theory - others have already done so several times over with greater clarity than I can muster - let me just note that the whole area has recently taken on the character of an ominous, East-West ideological battlefield that threatens to alter the geopolitics of southern Africa as a whole, not to mention the continually weakening promise of the independence of Namibia. At the appropriate time Ghana's voice will be heard on the recent allegation that a super-Power is arranging to give unprecedented support to rebel forces in Angola to overthrow the legitimate Government of that country. For the moment, let me just plead with the Council to take appropriate action in the direction of early independence before the situation in Namibia deteriorates any further.

In order to decide on what course of action is most suitable for this series of meetings, my delegation would advise that the Council derive guidance from its own resolution 566 (1985), adopted in June of this year. Our reading of that

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

resolution indicates that only two conditions were imposed by the Council as a precondition for embarking on the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). The first is that the racist régime was to make a choice of one of the two electoral systems mentioned in resolution 435 (1978) and, secondly, it should remove the puppet interim administration recently installed in Windhoek. In fact, it was in those two areas that the Council pronounced itself ready to embark on action under the Charter should the racist régime fail to respond effectively.

Even though the Secretary-General's report is very clear in its conclusion, and would constitute sufficient basis for action, my delegation wishes to recognise that the racist régime's letter dated 12 November 1985 to the Secretary-General and contained in document S/17627 has a direct and relevant bearing on the matter before the Council. My delegation has studied that letter very carefully and has reached the conclusion that it is but one more ploy to delay the Council's threatened action.

First of all, it is significant that it was written just before the beginning of the present debate, when it had of course become absolutely clear to the régime that the Council was serious about its intention to hold a follow-up debate possibly leading to sanctions against South Africa. Secondly, the letter fulfils the condition of the choice of an electoral system by the racist régime, but remains silent on the question of the dismissal of the puppet interim Government. It hopes, presumably, to buy some more time that way. Finally, the letter again places on record the régime's references to such irrelevant issues as United Nations impartiality, SWAPO's status as sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people, financial and other forms of assistance to SWAPO and alleged Council favouritism towards SWAPO over other parties. In case anyone is led to believe that those issues are merely being mentioned in passing by the racist régime, I wish to draw attention to the sentence following the enumeration of the

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

issues in the letter. That sentence reads:

"There is no question of our accepting United Nations supervision of independent elections until this wholly inequitable state of affairs has been rectified." (S/17627, p. 4)

That, I suggest, is a sly way of protesting the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). What progress can be achieved without the implementation of that landmark resolution? Those who still doubt this interpretation should read the statement of the racist régime's Ambassador to the Council, because that statement amplified the conditionality implied in his reference to all those irrelevant issues.

It is our inescapable conclusion - and, we hope, that of the Council - that the racist régime has again, as in the past, displayed bad faith and that it deserves the firm action the Council itself has prescribed. In spite of the letter of the racist régime to which I have just referred, the Council's conclusion should concur with the Secretary-General's, namely, that South Africa has failed again to meet the Council's conditions and thereby continues to obstruct the implementation of resolution 435 (1978).

In the circumstances, what action can the Council legally take against the racist régime? My delegation believes that there are three courses of action open to it: the first is to delay some more in the hope of a positive change in South Africa's attitude. The second is to move on to the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), since the régime's choice of electoral system is now known. The third is to embark on action under the Charter, including Chapter VII, against the racist régime.

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

My delegation does not recommend the first option because, as history has shown, the régime cannot be trusted to exhibit good faith and will therefore continue to plot further delay if given more time. The second option also is not favoured because the racist régime and its friends in the West, in the event of the choice of the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), will effectively and illegally exclude the United Nations from the Territory through the threat of force, while they indulge ad nauseum in histrionics about the usual extraneous issues. The last option is, however, highly recommended because it would be a means of exerting international pressure on the régime to co-operate in the process of liberating Namibians from colonialism and imperialism. The other attraction of that option is that the principle of the exertion of pressure through the ordering of sanctions against the racist régime has already been unanimously agreed upon by members of the Council. The only point at issue is how far the Council should go in the imposition of sanctions.

My delegation does not hide the fact that its preference is for comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against the racist régime, because the effect of such sanctions would be quicker and would induce compliance with the Council's requests, since the régime cannot exist in economic isolation in a highly interdependent world. We recognize, however, that some Member States are still not completely won over to our thinking. Yet time is of the essence. In the circumstances, limited sanctions would be far preferable to any further delay.

We would argue that a combination of the limited and voluntary sanctions already accepted by various forums of the international community, if they were now to be made mandatory, would be the quickest way of reaching agreement in the matter. I am referring to a combination of the elements of the voluntary sanctions agreed to by the European Economic Community and recently by the Commonwealth at

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

the Bahamas meeting and those in paragraph 14 of the Council's own resolution 566 (1985), but this time given teeth by making them mandatory.

In this regard we wish to express our sincere appreciation to the members of the Council who have already initiated a draft resolution in this direction. We hope that the Council can unanimously express the will of the international community to liberate the Namibians from illegal colonialism by adopting the draft resolution on selective mandatory sanctions.

In conclusion my delegation would like to state that we are deeply disappointed by the past delays by the Security Council in taking firm action against the racist régime, but we also believe that the situation in Namibia and in southern Africa, and that of the racist régime itself, have markedly changed for the worse in the last few months and therefore call for a different attitude on the part of the Council. Only a firm Security Council can save Namibia from chaos. At the end of this debate history will be made because posterity will judge whether, against the background of oppression, chicanery, violence and a clear threat to international peace and security in Namibia and southern Africa, this Council acted firmly to pre-empt anarchy and desolation or merely opted for the easy route of procrastination at the cost of human lives.

The Ghana delegation trusts that the Council's decision will be in the direction of an unequivocal fulfilment of the mandate that the Council derives from the Charter. My delegation and indeed the Ghana Government stand ready to play their part in liberating the people of Namibia from the worst form of colonialism left on the African continent.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Ghana for the generous remarks addressed to me, in particular about the very enjoyable and fruitful years I spent in Ghana and West Africa.

(The President)

The next speaker is the representative of Canada. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. LEWIS (Canada): It gives Canada great pleasure, Sir, not to engage on your elevation to the presidency, in what is occasionally a pattern of ritual acknowledgment but to say what I think all of us know, that the regard, respect and affection with which you are held in this community of nations bears witness to the adroit stewardship which you provide to this Council and to its future deliberations. Alas, Canada, bereft of some historical experience, does not share with you, as the United Kingdom does, an unfailing legacy of cricket. Our relationships are more cerebral and binding on the soul. We do not endorse the philistinism of sporting extravaganzas, but in a more determined vein I would point out that we have a common background of a colonial status which moved to sovereign independence in what can be described by and large as a sublimely peaceful transition. That, for Canada and Australia, speaks, I think, to the subject matter of this debate.

I must also take the opportunity to extend an expression of appreciation of the wisdom of the presidency of your predecessor from the United States of America.

Before I enter into the matter immediately at hand, and in the light of your opening comments yesterday morning, Sir, I cannot let the moment pass without making reference to the catastrophe in Colombia. These natural disasters, proliferating as they are, are truly terrifying and I want to read into the record the message sent by the Secretary of State for External Affairs of Canada, the Right Honourable Joe Clark, to his Excellency Augusto Ramirez Ocampo, the Foreign Minister of Colombia:

(Mr. Lewis, Canada)

"I was distressed and saddened to learn of the disastrous loss of life and property as a result of the tragic volcanic eruption in Colombia yesterday. On behalf of the Government of Canada I want to extend my deepest sympathy to all those affected by this terrible disaster. I have instructed my officials to determine how best Canada might provide aid and assistance."

Thank you, Mr. President, for giving me the opportunity to address the Council. Canada, as a non-member, does not often speak before this body. We do so today because of the issue before the Council. This is no pro forma intervention, Namibia is of deep and abiding concern to us.

Since the Council last considered this question, in June, the Government of South Africa - alas, predictably - has continued to defy the international community. Events inside Namibia, however, can give South Africa no cause for satisfaction. The illegal régime, installed without free and fair elections, has failed to gain legitimacy and has fulfilled our collective original prophecies by proving utterly ineffectual. It could not of course be otherwise, given the régime's patently unrepresentative nature. We are compelled to ask how many times must the experience be repeated before South Africa learns the lessons of history, lessons starkly illumined by the experience of decolonization in Africa?

(Mr. Lewis, Canada)

Coincident with this debate, the Council has been presented with a note from the so-called transitional government of national unity, under covering letters from South African authorities, indicating a preference for an electoral system of proportional representation. Since this must be considered to be the position of the South African Government - begrudging though the language in which it is couched may be - it is to that extent welcome. But as always - as my colleagues from Denmark and the United Kingdom have so swiftly and with such insight pointed out - South Africa encumbers every marginal step forward with the shackles of regression. In this case, we have a not-so-veiled attack on the impartiality of the Contact Group and a reassertion of linkage. Neither tactic is acceptable, and South Africa knows it.

In any event, there is a more immediate consideration. Now that South Africa has found an electoral system to its liking, where are the elections themselves? Why should they not now take place? What further reason could possibly justify delay? We do not ask these rhetorical questions to lend credence to an illegal régime. We ask them in order to suggest, as all countries around this table know, that every supposed advance must be measured against the duplicity which it almost inevitably conceals.

When the Council considered Namibia earlier this year it recommended a number of measures to Governments, to which Canada reacted with concrete steps. Our response is aimed at demonstrating the depth of Canada's opposition to South Africa's continued illegal occupation of Namibia and at maintaining the pressure on South Africa to set a date to implement resolution 435 (1978).

More specifically, our Secretary of State for External Affairs announced on 6 July last that Canada had decided to terminate all toll-processing of Namibian uranium imported from South Africa. This action was taken in accordance with Security Council resolution 283 (1970), which, it will be recalled, recommended that

(Mr. Lewis, Canada)

countries and commercial activities related to Namibia carried out by agencies under Government control. I might note that this measure was adopted notwithstanding the economic costs to Canada, which could approximate \$5 million. The processing has been carried out under contracts between Eldorado Nuclear, a Crown corporation, and commercial parties in third countries. We hope that those countries, and others, will also re-examine their policies in the light of resolution 283 (1970).

Canada did more - although this will not come as a surprise. Following the adoption of resolution 566 (1985), a ban on Krugerrand gold coin sales was introduced in co-operation with Canadian banks. In addition, the question of transportation was reviewed. As a result, an embargo on air transport between Canada and South Africa was instituted. It covers both cargo and passenger flights. It will end all charters, and rule out any prospect - I repeat, any prospect - of concluding a bilateral air services agreement.

We think these actions demonstrate that Canada takes the recommendations of this Council seriously.

But, quite apart from specific initiatives, we also recognize that Namibia continues to be an issue involving self-determination, regional peace and security, regional economic development and the role of the United Nations. As we said in June, Namibia's right to independence is rooted inextricably in the very principles on which the United Nations was founded.

At the recent Commonwealth Heads of Government meeting in Nassau, Canada's Prime Minister, the Right Honourable Brian Mulroney, joined other leaders from all continents, representing 49 countries with one quarter of the world's population, in declaring grave concern over the continued delays in achieving Namibian independence. As members know, Commonwealth leaders categorically rejected South Africa's attempts to link Namibia's independence to extraneous issues. They

(Mr. Lewis, Canada)

reaffirmed resolution 435 (1978) as the only acceptable basis for an independent Namibia. Finally, they agreed that action directed against apartheid should be directed equally towards ensuring South Africa's compliance with the wishes of the international community on the question of Namibia.

In other words, Namibia remains front and centre for the Commonwealth, and the Commonwealth conveyed to South Africa, with unmistakable clarity, that independence is an immediate imperative. This Council, too, has a crucial role to play - the crucial role to play - in reminding South Africa that its previous commitments to Namibian independence under United Nations auspices must be honoured. That would best be done, in our opinion, by a strong resolution reinforcing measures already recommended. It should also be a unanimous resolution. This is no time to send a mixed signal to Pretoria.

The Council must continue to reject the implausible security considerations invoked by the Government of South Africa. By rough calculation, it is at least 900 kilometres at the nearest point between South Africa's northern border and the northern border of Namibia. What takes place or does not take place 900 kilometres from South Africa's borders can hardly be considered a direct security threat. The linkage argument will not wash, period.

We have listened with interest and care to the statements delivered in this debate. The representative of Zambia spoke with quiet and persuasive eloquence of the right of Namibians to self-determination and the tragic consequences of further delay.

The Secretary-General of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), Mr. Toivo ja Toivo, made equally telling points about the nature of his people's struggle for self-determination. It was a moving experience for us to hear this reasonable man, at long last free in person and, as ever, committed to the freedom of his people. Could we have foreseen his presence among us even two years ago?

(Mr. Lewis, Canada)

I have just been informed that another group of political prisoners have been released in Namibia. Are there not here larger lessons to be drawn by South Africa? What might happen if South Africa also released its own political prisoners - the Mandelas and the leaders of the United Democratic Front? Might South Africa not find that they, too, are reasonable men, open to rational discussion and rational argument if dialogue, mere dialogue, is given a chance?

South Africa's continued refusal to set a date to implement the United Nations plan is a wilful breach of good faith and of the assurances given to members of the contact group and to the United Nations itself. Canada for one has stated clearly that this behaviour will contribute to the widening gap in our bilateral relationship. As we said last June, the contact group may still have a role to play during the actual implementation of resolution 435 (1978), as well as a role in bringing about an agreement to set a date to implement the United Nations plan. Canada, therefore, continues to be frustrated by the contact group's inactivity and sense of immobility. This is a situation that we might want to consider further, in co-operation with our friends from the front-line States and contact group partners.

We expect that the resolution which emerges from these Council meetings will set the stage for renewed diplomatic efforts. Canada is obviously ready to assist. In the meantime, we support with full heart the unrelenting determination of the United Nations to achieve independence for Namibia on a just and equitable basis.

There is one other matter that we wish briefly to raise. In the face of the present military and diplomatic impasse, we must constantly remind ourselves of the aggravated plight of the Namibian people and refugees. Several days ago Canada deposited its annual contribution to the United Nations Fund for Namibia. We do not wish to be presumptuous, but other countries, especially non-contributors or

(Mr. Lewis, Canada)

those whose contributions are little more than token, might wish to reconsider their funding. This is a time when social, educational, economic and humanitarian assistance are acutely necessary and, for the future prospects of the country, absolutely indispensable.

Unanimity of action should be our goal. Unanimity will keep the issue at the forefront of the international agenda and send yet again, but with mounting force, a strong, clear message to South Africa. All of us must do our part to maintain and intensify the pressure. The Toivos of Namibia will one day triumph, of that there is no question. It is simply, if painfully, a matter of time. History will be left to calculate the consequences for South Africa of its obdurate and unconscionable delays.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Canada for the warm words he addressed to me and for his pertinent reflections on the links between Canada and Australia.

The next speaker is the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. LAUTENSCHLAGER (Federal Republic of Germany): First, Mr. President, permit me to thank you and the other members of the Security Council for enabling my delegation once more to participate in a Security Council debate on Namibia. I should like to take this opportunity to congratulate you sincerely on assuming the presidency of the Security Council for the month of November. I am sure that the deliberations of the Security Council will benefit from your wide experience and your proved diplomatic skill. I should also like to address to the representative of the United States, Ambassador Vernon Walters, who during the month of October presided over the work of the Security Council, the sincere appreciation of my delegation.

As we all know, the question of Namibia figures among those issues in the United Nations on which there is basic agreement. All United Nations Member States are agreed in principle on guiding Namibia to independence, in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978). As a then Security Council member, the Federal Government, in 1978, actively participated in the adoption of that resolution. The Federal Government contributed to the formulation of essential parts of the resolution and as a member of the Western contact group supported its implementation. It is for this reason that the Federal Government feels particularly committed to the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and has participated in all the debates on Namibia in the Security Council ever since.

Unfortunately, implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) has not been possible so far. That is why even today what I said in this Chamber on the occasion of the last Security Council debate on Namibia, on 12 June 1985, is still valid. I said then, referring to resolution 435 (1978):

(Mr. Lautenschlager, Federal
Republic of Germany)

"Action to implement it is long overdue, and my Government can understand the embitterment of the African States. It shares their disappointment at Namibia still not having gained independence. My Government believes that the right of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence must be recognized and should be implemented irrespective of any other problem ..."

(S/PV.2586, p. 6).

The position of the Federal Government on the question of Namibia has always been and will continue to be clear and unequivocal. As I stated here on 12 June 1985, the Federal Government considers resolution 435 (1978) to be the indispensable basis for a settlement of the Namibia question. In our view it is the only basis on which Namibia can acquire internationally recognized independence. According to that resolution, the constitution of an independent Namibia must be elaborated solely by a constituent assembly convened as a result of free and fair elections under United Nations supervision.

It is also for this reason that the Federal Government has taken note with great concern of the installation of the so-called interim government in Namibia in June of this year. Such unilateral measures taken by the Republic of South Africa to set up constitutional institutions and to delegate governmental responsibility in Namibia are incompatible with Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and are therefore regarded as null and void by the Federal Government. The Federal Government, in concert with all other partners in the contact group, made an unambiguous statement to that effect to the Government of the Republic of South Africa.

Prompted by the installation of the so-called interim government in Namibia in June of this year, the Security Council convened and adopted resolution 566 (1985). In that resolution the Secretary-General was requested to report by the first week of September on the implementation of the principles contained in

(Mr. Lautenschlager, Federal
Republic of Germany)

resolution 435 (1978). In his report the Secretary-General was compelled to state that

"there has been no progress in my recent discussions with the Government of South Africa concerning the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978)". (S/17442, p. 6)

In its resolution 566 (1985) the Security Council further resolved to reconvene after the report of the Secretary-General had been submitted and, in case of lack of progress in the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), to invoke paragraph 13 of resolution 566 (1985) providing for the consideration of the adoption of appropriate measures under the United Nations Charter, including Chapter VII, as additional pressure against the Republic of South Africa.

The Federal Government relies on the influence and the pressure exercised by the international community of States and the international public at large on the Republic of South Africa. This applies to South Africa's unacceptable policy of apartheid as well as to its policy towards Namibia. For this reason, the Federal Government actively contributed to the adoption of the decisions by the Foreign Ministers of the member States of the European Community in Luxembourg on 10 September 1985. The Federal Government strictly applies the restrictive measures against the Republic of South Africa implied in those decisions.

The Federal Republic of Germany, as a member of the European Community, regards the adoption of these restrictive measures, as well as the threat of further measures in case substantial reforms are not undertaken in southern Africa, as a political signal to the Government of South Africa. It is known that in view of many examples in the past the Federal Government has repeatedly expressed doubts as to the effectiveness of comprehensive restriction of economic and trade relations. It is important to seek a common position, based on consensus, of the

(Mr. Lautenschlager, Federal
Republic of Germany)

international community of States. In view of the situation in southern Africa, we were very anxious to make sure that the decisions by the Foreign Ministers of the member States of the European Community in Luxembourg last September expressed a common position as a clear and unequivocal political signal to the Government of South Africa. We are convinced that the United Nations Security Council will have to tackle the same task. It is in this sense that we emphasize our support for yesterday's appeal by the representatives of the United Kingdom and Denmark to attach more importance to a common position of the international community than to short-lived voting successes.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany for the generous words he addressed to me.

There are no further speakers on my list. However, as other representatives have indicated a wish to speak later, I propose to adjourn the meeting now and to fix the time for the next meeting of the Council to continue consideration of the item on our agenda in consultation with all members of the Council.

The meeting rose at 12.20 p.m.