



Security Council

UN LIBRARY  
AUG 24 1989  
UN/ISA COLLECTION

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.2881  
22 August 1989

ENGLISH

---

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND  
EIGHT HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-FIRST MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Tuesday, 22 August 1989, at 10.30 a.m.

President: Mr. DJOUDI

(Algeria)

Members: Brazil  
Canada  
China  
Colombia  
Ethiopia  
Finland  
France  
Malaysia  
Nepal  
Senegal  
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics  
United Kingdom of Great Britain and  
Northern Ireland  
United States of America  
Yugoslavia

Mr. FACHINI GOMES  
Mr. KIRSCH  
Mr. DING Yuanhong  
Mr. GRILLO  
Mr. TADESSE  
Ms. RASI  
Mr. GAUSSOT  
Mr. HASMY  
Mr. RANA  
Mrs. DIALLO  
Mr. BYKOV  
  
Mr. RICHARDSON  
Miss BYRNE  
Mr. KOTEVSKI

---

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 11.10 a.m.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

THE SITUATION IN NAMIBIA

LETTER DATED 10 AUGUST 1989 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF GHANA TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/20779)

LETTER DATED 10 AUGUST 1989 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF ZIMBABWE TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/20782)

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): In accordance with the decisions taken at the previous meetings on this item, I invite the representative of Ghana to take a place at the Council table; I invite the representatives of Afghanistan, Angola, Bangladesh, Burundi, Cameroon, Congo, Cuba, Egypt, the Federal Republic of Germany, Guatemala, India, Indonesia, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mali, Mauritania, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, South Africa, Uganda, the United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Gbeho (Ghana) took a place at the Council table; Mr. Roshan-Rawaan (Afghanistan), Mr. Diakenga Serao (Angola), Mr. Mohiuddin (Bangladesh), Mr. Niyungeko (Burundi), Mr. Engo (Cameroon), Mr. Adouki (Congo), Mr. Oramas Oliva (Cuba), Mr. Badawi (Egypt), Mr. Bräutigam (Federal Republic of Germany), Mr. Villagran de Leon (Guatemala), Mr. Dasgupta (India), Mr. Sutresna (Indonesia), Mr. Treiki (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), Mr. Diakite (Mali), Mr. Ould Mohamed Mahmoud (Mauritania), Miss Moncada Bermudez (Nicaragua), Mr. Garba (Nigeria), Mr. Ahmed (Pakistan), Mr. Shearar (South Africa), Mr. Katsigazi (Uganda), Mr. Mongella (United Republic of Tanzania), Mr. Zuze (Zambia) and Mr. Midence (Zimbabwe) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The Security Council will now resume its consideration of the item on its agenda.

(spoke in Arabic)

The first speaker is the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. TREIKI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (interpretation from Arabic): At the outset I should like, on behalf of my delegation, to express our pleasure at seeing you, dear brother, presiding over the work of the Council for this month. My country is closely linked to Algeria by bonds of friendship in a common march towards the future. Your personal experience and abilities are an earnest of success in our deliberations.

I should also like to express our appreciation to your predecessor, our friend the Permanent Representative of Yugoslavia, who conducted the Council's work during the past month in an exemplary manner.

Speaking as representative of the African Group for this month, our personal friend the representative of Ghana has already detailed the views of Africa on the item before the Council and discussed solutions to the problem. I shall therefore begin by expressing appreciation for the valuable efforts made by the Secretary-General, his Special Representative in Namibia and their staff in the face of the difficulties that they have had to overcome in order to implement resolution 435 (1978) on the independence of Namibia.

Those efforts are at a most critical stage following this Organization's 40-year-long struggle to arrive at this point. The injustices of the apartheid régime borne by the Namibian people during the long occupation have been enormous. Indeed, we are all aware of the dangers that have attended the situation, because we face a ferocious enemy that has put into practice the apartheid system, a heinous crime against humanity.

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

If we have forced that enemy to comply with the will of the international community, we do not expect it to surrender very easily. The measures adopted by the apartheid régime to obstruct implementation of resolution 435 (1978) and the achievement of Namibia's independence are only too well known to all of us. Hence this Council will be living up to its responsibilities only if it adopts the necessary measures that will allow the Secretary-General and his staff to implement the resolution.

The Organization of African Unity (OAU) has repeatedly affirmed its support of the Namibian people under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), its sole, legitimate representative. The resolutions adopted at the summit Conference of the OAU last month echoed that position. At that Conference my country affirmed - and it reaffirms today - its support of SWAPO until Namibian independence.

We reaffirm our confidence in the Secretary-General and his Personal Representative and hope that this Council will indeed be able to adopt the necessary resolutions and measures to achieve its goals.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): I thank the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya for the kind words he addressed to me.

(spoke in French)

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

Mr. ROSHAN-RAWAAN (Afghanistan): Let me begin by saying how pleased we are to see you, Sir, a distinguished diplomat of fellow Muslim and non-aligned Algeria, in the presidency of the Security Council for the month of August. We are fully confident that, with your experience and wisdom, you will guide the activities of the Council with distinction.

May I also congratulate your predecessor, Ambassador Dragoslav Pejic, the Permanent Representative of Yugoslavia, on his very successful leadership of the Security Council in the month of July.

We regret the fact that the Security Council is once again seized of the question of Namibia. We express this regret because when, on 22 December 1988, an agreement was signed by Angola, Cuba and South Africa which paved the way for the implementation, after 10 years, of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), the entire international community hoped that the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia would be faithfully implemented. That this has proved not to be the case due to South Africa's intransigence, and thereby the agony of the Namibian people has been compounded even at this latest stage, is indeed regrettable.

That is exactly why the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Movement deemed it necessary to express its deep concern in its communiqué of 10 August of this year. It is also why the African Group has decided to come before the Security Council, the body responsible for the full implementation of resolution 435 (1978).

We have heard the well-founded concerns of the African countries through the statement made by the representative of Ghana. The same concerns have been expressed by a great number of African and other countries in their statements to

(Mr. Roshan-Rawaan, Afghanistan)

the Council. We fully share those concerns, and we join them in their request to the Council to adopt urgent and effective measures to alleviate the causes of these concerns.

The fact that half way through the process of the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) the notorious Koevoet is still continuing murder, harassment and intimidation in northern Namibia is a serious violation of the provision of that resolution. The Secretary-General, Mr. Javier Perez de Cuellar, in his address to the twenty-fifth Summit of the Organization of African Unity, in Addis Ababa, on 24 July 1989, has stated that the absorbing of ex-elements of Koevoet in the South West Africa Police (SWAPOL) is not in accord with the terms of the United Nations plan. We believe that the requirements of the plan cannot be met unless the notorious Koevoet is completely disbanded and its command dismantled. It is also necessary that the use by SWAPOL of armoured personnel carriers and heavy machine-guns be stopped. The United Nations plan adopted by the Security Council allows only the carrying of light arms by the police.

Equally the adoption of the recent Voter Registration Proclamation by the Administrator-General is a violation of both the United Nations plan and the principle of free and democratic elections. The registration of South Africans and other non-Namibians, which has been allowed under the Proclamation, is obviously contrary to such a principle. It is our hope that the Security Council will adopt measures providing for amendment of the Proclamation so as to ensure truly free and democratic elections in November. The amendments should also remove barriers artificially created in the present Proclamation aimed at denying SWAPO a free election campaign and fair participation in it.

The excessive powers that the Constituent Assembly Proclamation has vested in the Administrator-General are in our view designed to deprive the Namibian people of true independence. The virtual veto power to reject any course of action the

(Mr. Roshan-Rawaan, Afghanistan)

constituent assembly may desire not to be followed is contrary to both the expressed wish of the Namibian people for sovereign independence and resolution 435 (1978). This Council has the responsibility to ensure the full independence of the Namibian people.

We sincerely appreciate and fully support the efforts of the Secretary-General in ensuring that the plan for the independence of Namibia is faithfully implemented. We are confident that the Council will not fail to strengthen his role and that of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG). It is our earnest hope that, through the constant support and encouragement of the Security Council, UNTAG and United Nations missions elsewhere will perform their noble duties with exemplary success. That will be yet another proof of the effectiveness of the United Nations peace mechanism, which all of us want to see enhanced. Such success will also go a long way in increasing the prestige and influence of our Organization.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I thank the representative of Afghanistan for the kind words he addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Zimbabwe, who wishes to make a statement as Chairman of the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. MUDENGE (Zimbabwe): Your colleagues in the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries are pleased to see you, Sir, occupying the presidency of the Security Council and presiding over its affairs with such dignity and distinction. Algeria occupies a very special and dear place in the annals of African liberation as well as in the history of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, and indeed in

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

the conduct of international diplomacy today. You yourself are a pillar of the diplomatic intercourse at the United Nations today. For those reasons the fate of Namibia could not have been placed in more trusted hands.

Similarly, I wish to recognize the outstanding contribution made by your predecessor, our friend and brother Ambassador Pejic of Yugoslavia.

My delegation has listened very carefully to all the contributions to this debate. We have been gratified by the seriousness with which members view current developments in Namibia. The emerging consensus on what is not going well and what now needs urgently to be done to rectify the situation has more than vindicated our decision to convene the present meetings of the Security Council.

The decision to convene the present meetings of the Security Council was not made lightly. For over four months the African Group and the non-aligned countries have resisted the pressures to do so. For even though, during those four months, there have been critical moments when calling for a formal meeting would have been more than justified, we did not want to do anything that could have adversely affected the implementation process. We wanted to give every opportunity to those charged with implementing resolution 435 (1978) to put things right. We therefore resorted to what the representative of South Africa called "quiet and effective diplomatic negotiations". The Committee of Eighteen Non-Aligned Countries maintained a regular diplomatic shuttle between the Presidents of the Security Council and the Secretary-General in an effort to try to get Pretoria to comply with its solemn commitments under resolution 435 (1978).

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

The Secretary-General's efforts to achieve that objective are well known to this lofty body. Indeed, during this debate we have been informed by some delegations of their own bilateral efforts to help. But alas, South Africa has remained obstinate and wedded to its delinquent ways. That is what forced the convening of these meetings of the Council. And that is what is "a great pity" (S/PV.2876, p. 36), and not the convening of the present meetings of the Security Council as the representative of South Africa has suggested.

That things are not going well in Namibia is not by accident but by design. There is method to the madness in Namibia today; there is nothing innocent or haphazard about it. It is all part of a grand scheme. South Africa may have been pushed by events to get out of Namibia, but it has no intention of letting Namibia out of its orbit. It is still determined to keep Namibia as a client State under a puppet régime directed and controlled by the master puppeteers from Pretoria. South Africa has concluded that to achieve that objective the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) must be denied, by hook or by crook - but largely by crooked means - a two-thirds majority in the constituent assembly so that it will not be able to write a Namibian constitution that would make the country truly independent of Pretoria. It seeks a stalemated constituent assembly, with its puppets holding the balance of power. In that way it could then dictate the type of constitution to be adopted and the pace at which the transition to independence would take place. If perchance Pretoria were to be frustrated in its efforts to engineer such an outcome in the elections in Namibia, it has already in place a whole panoply of destabilization schemes developed and perfected over the past 10 years in order to keep Namibia weak, dependent and unstable.

From the beginning of this exercise, non-aligned countries warned that Pretoria had no intention of playing fair in Namibia. We pointed out that South

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

Africa would use intimidation and resort to rigging in order to cheat SWAPO out of certain victory. Yet there were others who argued contrariwise and went so far as to force this lofty body to cripple the effectiveness of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG) by reducing its military component on the grounds of economy and a belief that Pretoria would play according to the Queensberry Rules in Namibia. But that is now part of history, a history punctuated by poor judgement at times compounded by ineptitude.

Let me now address in turn each of the four main actors - namely South Africa, our dear friend the Secretary-General, the Security Council and the international community at large - that have been identified during this debate as having a contribution to make towards putting things right in Namibia.

To date, South Africa has not shown good faith in Namibia. Last week, members of the group of 18 non-aligned countries on Namibia completed a seven-day fact-finding mission in that country. Among the members of the delegation were seven ambassadors from the front-line States and India who have been in Namibia observing the implementation process continuously for the past few months. Their report does not reflect what was called "only a week to 10 days" (S/PV.2880, p. 21) of observation. It is a disturbing exposé of how Pretoria is trying to cook the elections in Namibia. It shows clearly that Pretoria's non-compliance is part of a calculated strategy to subvert and manipulate the electoral process.

In his two statements the South African representative made much of what he called the withdrawal and confinement to base of the South African troops ahead of schedule and the disbandment of SWATF and ethnic forces, as well as the dismantlement of their command structures. Let us take a look at that.

What he did not reveal was that South Africa had left behind approximately 1,000 officers and men forming the command structure, under the cover of providing

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

administrative support to the demobilized SWATF. That officer corps is allegedly engaged in humanitarian duties such as teaching and medical services. About half are manning air services. Over 20,000 men of SWATF continue to receive their salaries once or twice a month from the officer corps that has remained behind. The effect of this arrangement is that, although in theory SWATF has been demobilized, in reality it is still intact; it can be remobilized within hours.

And there is nothing innocent about that arrangement; it is part of a plan devised years ago. In 1982 the officer then commanding SWATF, Major-General Charles Lloyd of the South African Defence Forces, spelled out South Africa's strategy in the event of the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). He stated that SWATF would only be partially demobilized for a temporary period, but not fully dismantled as demanded under resolution 435 (1978). At all times, explained Major-General Lloyd, SWATF would retain the capacity to remobilize within hours. It should be noted that this was conceived of long before the events of 1 April 1989. A plan to breach the provisions of resolution 435 (1978) along the lines of what is taking place in Namibia today has therefore been on the drawing-board at least since 1982. All members of SWATF are on pay until November. About 1,000 of them have been mobilized on the pretext of providing security to certain chiefs and headmen; and according to reliable reports a large number of SWATF personnel have remained in garrisons, especially in the northern part of Namibia. Elements of the Lloyd plan of 1982 can be clearly discerned in what is happening today in Namibia.

Why, may we inquire, is this huge force being preserved when resolution 435 (1978) says it should be done away with? South Africa has plans afoot for mischief-making in a future Namibia. These are Pretoria's instruments for the destabilization of a future Namibian Government and for intimidation during the present electoral process.

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

Much has been made of the recent offer by South Africa to withdraw and confine Koevoet. Let no one be taken in by this move. It is a dangerous step. The Administrator-General talked of retraining and preparing Koevoet for new responsibilities in Namibia. Resolution 435 (1978) says Koevoet should be disbanded and its command structure completely dismantled. Now the Administrator-General seeks unilaterally to amend resolution 435 (1978) by keeping Koevoet intact for any eventualities. South Africa is thereby putting in place yet another mechanism for destabilization and intervention in the affairs of a future Namibia.

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

The Council should reject confinement of Koevoet as a solution. It must insist that, once surrounded by UNTAG, Koevoet should be disarmed and disbanded and its command structure dismantled. This is a debt the United Nations owes to the future Government of Namibia and its people. On this we dare not shirk our responsibility.

Koevoet is a sinister force of cut-throats and murderers. Its commander and creator, General Hans Dreyer, was once a member of Ian Smith's notorious killer squads known in my country as the Selous Scouts. When South Africa announced the so-called disbandment of Koevoet and its integration into the South West Africa Police Force (SWAPOL) in December 1988, Dreyer was made police commander in northern Namibia, where most of the Koevoet men were based. This was, of course, months before the events of 1 April 1989. Under Dreyer the Koevoet for a long time continued to operate much as before, using its monstrous-looking armoured vehicles of intimidation known as CASSPIRS, bearing the same automatic and semi-automatic weapons and wearing its old uniforms.

Dreyer and his men have been largely responsible for raising the false alarms about incursions and infiltrations into northern Namibia. Between 11 and 14 July this year, just a few days before the Secretary-General visited Namibia to demand, inter alia, the disbandment of Koevoet, the Hans Dreyer disinformation machine mounted a propaganda campaign of such falsehoods against SWAPO that even Goebbels himself would have been left aghast by its audacity. Specific dates, exact numbers and precise beacon and entry points were fabricated, and names of individuals were mentioned to give a ring of authenticity to the charge that SWAPO was not observing the agreement. The settlement plan was in jeopardy, it was proclaimed. As a result, the Administrator-General sent out the orders. Selected army units were reactivated and some were put on red alert, ready to strike at what in the end proved to have been phantom SWAPO infiltrators.

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

Another 1 April charade was avoided, thanks to quick action by the front-line States' observers, who immediately put together a team composed of SWAPO officials, UNTAG elements and people from their own ranks to go and investigate the so-called infiltration. The team confronted Dreyer and challenged him to substantiate the alleged sightings of SWAPO, only to establish that the whole story of infiltration was a tapestry of lies woven and peddled by a most skilled artist of mendacity. Because of this quick response a potential tragedy was averted and the Secretary-General was saved from great embarrassment.

The history of the events of 1 April 1989 will be written one day, and the world will learn of the gruesome massacre of kneeling prisoners being shot by South African security forces at point blank range in the prison grounds at Oshakati and other places. It is then that SWAPO will reply to some of the baseless accusations that have been levelled against it during this debate.

It was not my intention to go too much into past events, but in his two interventions the South African representative went out of his way to attack and vilify SWAPO and its leadership, accusing them of spreading untruths and dishonouring agreements. In this he was taking unfair advantage of the fact that SWAPO has not had a chance to defend itself, since it has decided to be bound by its self-denying commitment under the impartiality understandings. This is an outrage.

We have heard much about the commitment and remarkable dedication of the Administrator-General, Advocate Louis Piennar, to his scrupulous and impartial observance of resolution 435 (1978). To most of us Advocate Piennar has not been such a paragon of virtue. His role in the Dreyer disinformation campaign of 11-14 July was anything but reassuring, and his initial drafts of the registration and electoral laws are worthy primers in electoral rigging, whereas his present

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

draft proclamation on the constituent assembly is a veritable manual on neo-colonialist and paternalistic arrogance. That Pretoria has now, according to what we heard yesterday, apparently decided to permit an upper limit of about 5,000 of its former colonial functionaries in Namibia to exploit the four-year residence qualification does not change the fact that this was intended to be a cheating loophole. The Administrator-General has so far refused to repeal all discriminatory and restrictive laws - in particular, Proclamations AG.80 (1980) and AG.23 (1989) - or to grant amnesty to all SWAPO detainees, as required under resolution 435 (1978); indeed, he has so far dismally failed the impartiality test by not ensuring balanced coverage by his anti-SWAPO broadcast media. All this would be enough to make us question Piennar's suitability, but recent stories about Mr. Piennar cast even darker shadows on his role in Namibia.

In February 1987 Mr. Piennar joined a Koevoet unit in hot pursuit of SWAPO combatants. After two SWAPO fighters had been "eliminated", to use Mr. Piennar's term, a member of Koevoet began kicking sand into the eyes of one of the dead SWAPO fighters. Mr. Piennar just stood by fascinated as he watched this sadistic spectacle. "I found the absolute hate in his eyes interesting", recalled Mr. Piennar after the event. "Interesting!" Besides finding this "interesting", the Administrator-General said he "did not understand the motive for the action". However, he makes it clear that he "identified them with the battle against terrorism. It was not done because of hatred, but to further a democratic dispensation". How the kicking of sand into the eyes of a dead person furthers democracy has been a source of puzzlement to many of us. SWAPO is justified in wondering how such a man can be impartial where that party is involved, given that background. No, to us Piennar is not a man of honour.

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

South Africa has to make up its mind whether or not it is now prepared to let Namibia become free and truly independent. The option of turning Namibia into a Bantustan, with the concurrence of the United Nations, is simply not on; it is a fantasy, pure and simple, because before that can happen the process will be aborted. We therefore say to South Africa, after the debacle of Nkomati: "Namibia is both an opportunity and a test you cannot afford to lose or fail. Seize this chance!" The price of failure in Namibia is too ghastly to contemplate, not only for South Africa and southern Africa but for the standing of the United Nations and for international collaboration in general.

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

Besides what South Africa must do right if there are to be free and fair elections in Namibia, there is the central role of the Secretary-General and his UNTAG team. Let me on behalf of the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Countries express our appreciation for all his efforts, especially his recent personal visit to Namibia to see for himself what is being done and to give on-the-spot guidance to his officials in the field. Equally, we wish to compliment the many UNTAG officials who are carrying out their duties often under trying conditions.

We regret that some have lost their lives and others have been abused and harassed by racist bigots whose minds are poisoned and whose hearts are hardened by the evil doctrine of apartheid. Of late we have heard that in those areas where the UNTAG presence is adequate the situation has improved. But the situation must improve in all parts of Namibia and not just in some.

It is therefore imperative that UNTAG be given adequate manpower resources fully to carry out its mandate under resolution 435 (1978). From the reports we have it is abundantly clear that there is a need to monitor the activities of SWAPOL. The Secretary-General should now proceed with full deployment of the authorized UNTAG forces and also urgently consult with the Council in order to send desperately needed additional police monitors. The situation brooks no delay. In this context we fully share the views expressed in the letter by a distinguished bipartisan group of United States senators - comprising Senators Edward Kennedy, Claiborne Pell, Patrick Leahy, Paul Simon, Alan Cranston, Christopher Dodd, Terry Sanford, Dale Bumpers, Richard Lugar and Mark Hatfield - when they said of the UNTAG police numbers:

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

"They are stretched too thin. We don't see how the 500 additional police that will be in place in August will remedy this situation. Accordingly, we ask that you give serious consideration to a substantial and prompt increase in the number of UNTAG police over and beyond the current planned addition." In addition to the police monitors, the report of the group of 18 members of the Non-Aligned Movement who have just returned from Namibia calls for additional civilian personnel and transport and communications equipment. Indeed, all the non-governmental organizations and other observers who have been to Namibia recently concur on the need to increase substantially the UNTAG presence if there is to be the possibility of free and fair elections. The Secretary-General can be assured of the full support of the non-aligned countries in all his endeavours to remedy the present critical situation.

The major responsibility to put things right, of course, rests with this lofty body. We thank the members of the Council for their favourable response to our request to convene formal meetings to consider the deteriorating situation in Namibia. The time was absolutely right for the Council to meet formally to review the implementation process. It is now vital that the Council pronounce itself on the present situation. The Secretary-General has pointed out that there are provisions of resolution 435 (1978) that are not being complied with by South Africa. The Secretary-General and his Special Representative have both exerted great efforts to rectify the situation, but without achieving complete success. He now needs the muscle of the Council to complete the task.

The Non-Aligned Caucus has submitted a well-considered, non-polemical draft text restating the provisions calling on South Africa to comply with its commitments under resolution 435 (1978) if there are to be free and fair elections in Namibia. More specifically, the Council is being requested to give the

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

Secretary-General adequate manpower resources to discharge his responsibilities effectively in Namibia. We hope that the Council will act boldly and decisively by adopting the draft resolution before it unanimously and by responding promptly and favourably to proposals the Secretary-General may make on additional manpower.

Finally, we should like to appeal, through the Council, to the international community to tell South Africa to abide by the provisions of resolution 435 (1978). We urge as many outside observers as possible to go to Namibia to observe the implementation process. We appeal to the mass media to report fairly on Namibia and not to be victims of "Dreyerism".

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I thank the representative of Zimbabwe for the kind words he addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Ghana, on whom I now call.

Mr. GBEHO (Ghana): I have listened carefully to the statements in the debate, including that of the representative of South Africa, on the current situation in Namibia, especially on the implementation of the settlement plan, and I should like to make a few comments and observations before the debate ends.

Let me begin by expressing the sincere gratitude of the Group of African Countries to the delegations that have convincingly stated the case against intimidation, coercion and harassment, as well as for the holding of free and fair elections in Namibia. Their findings and proposals for resolving the difficulties that are currently bedevilling the electoral process in the Territory have been reasonable and convincing, particularly because they follow the terms of resolution 435 (1978). I sincerely hope that the clear consensus that has emerged from the debate will assist the Security Council in dealing firmly, fairly and promptly with the situation.

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

In view of certain statements made in the debate, I must once again clarify that the aim of the African Group in requesting the convening of the Security Council was to draw attention to the serious violations by South Africa of the terms of resolution 435 (1978) in the implementation of the electoral process and to urge the Council to act in the matter, thereby enhancing the effectiveness of the Secretary-General and the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG) in their efforts. These objectives have been upheld and supported by most of the delegations that have spoken.

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

In our view, Namibia would achieve free and fair elections only if the Council were seen to be alert and willing to act to right wrong and to uphold its own principles. We have not complicated, and would not complicate, the task of the Secretary-General, nor would we destroy the full and united support that he and UNTAG require at this hour. We have not substituted, and would not substitute, the Security Council for either the Secretary-General or his Special Representative. The Council has mandated certain actions and it should openly and impartially ensure that they are carried out. To argue to the contrary or to insinuate caprice is to misinterpret our motives for requesting this debate.

I am happy to note that of equal concern to almost all delegations, and central to the debate, are the activities in northern Namibia of elements of the South African military unit, Koevoet. Recognizing the strong prospects of a condemnation in the Security Council debate of the intimidatory activities of that unit, South Africa sought adversely and capriciously to affect the debate by the issue of a press release on 15 August 1989, just one day before the commencement of the debate, announcing its decision to remove 1,200 Koevoet elements from the South West Africa Police (SWAPO) and to have them confined. Some delegations regarded that move predictably as having answered our complaints against the dreaded Koevoet elements. I beg to disagree. That action clearly shows South Africa's own guilt in illegally deploying members of Koevoet in the first instance.

Furthermore, the Administrator-General began his statement to which I have just referred by stating that:

"... as and when the situation in the northern area returns to normal and the potential threat posed by the presence of PLAN elements north of the border recedes",

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

he could consider reducing SWAPOL forces in the area. It sounds authoritative enough but what must be borne in mind by members of the Council is that it is an illegal act because the SWAPOL forces he refers to include Koevoet elements whose actions are vitiated by illegality and intimidation. Secondly, it must be remembered by members of the Council that the Administrator-General is under obligation to disband that unit totally and not either to reduce the number or confine its members. Thirdly, it stands to reason, therefore, that it would be illegal and unacceptable that elements of Koevoet, in being confined instead to being disbanded, could ever be used again by the Administrator-General, whether or not he adjudges the situation to be right.

The African Group of countries regard the decision of the Administrator-General as irregular and are vehemently opposed to it because it unilaterally varies the prescription of resolution 435 (1978). It sets a bad precedent thereby and sows the seed for future conflict in Namibia. I wish to state unambiguously that the African Group would regard any acceptance of the announced removal and confinement of Koevoet elements, instead of totally disbanding them, as undermining resolution 435 (1978) and therefore deserving of our active opposition.

Members of the Council may wish to note that the Administrator-General's statement only expressed the intention to remove Koevoet elements from SWAPOL and that no date was fixed for the said removal. Also, the 1,200 men to be removed for confinement were described by the Administrator-General as the remaining Koevoet members in SWAPOL. This is a claim that I would urge the Council to verify, for the simple reason that earlier estimates of the number of Koevoet elements absorbed into SWAPOL had been much higher than is now given in that statement.

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

The representative of South Africa informs the Council that only about 5,000 qualified South Africans had so far been, or were expected to be, registered. That may be so at present. But the Secretary-General would still be well advised to investigate the provisions of the Registration of Voters Law in order to close loopholes that allow South Africans who have served in the armed forces, in the police and in the civil service of Namibia to register to vote. To accept that there is no threat because of the paucity of numbers, and in spite of the principle involved, may be dangerous, as many more South African nationals could subsequently take advantage of the loophole.

In my opening statement on 16 August, I brought some of the weaknesses in the draft proclamations to the attention of the Security Council. Several interventions since then have echoed those concerns and I will not repeat them. Allow me, however, to mention two further examples which are strikingly unusual and highly undesirable, especially as they relate to the conduct and secrecy of the elections.

Section 7 of draft election proclamation No. 90, as now drafted, allows for representation by party agents at polling stations only at the time of "the determination of the result of the poll". We believe that the draft should be amended to enable such agents to be present at all times during the voting. Their presence would enable them, for instance, to challenge the right to vote of any person believed not to be qualified. They may also be allowed to be present when the boxes are moved from one place to the other, because it is in such movements that the boxes are most vulnerable. After all, we know the South Africa with which we are dealing.

Section 23 provides for the use of ballot envelopes and for recording registration numbers on such envelopes. Although the intention may have been no more than to ensure that only eligible voters are permitted to vote, the principle

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

of voting by secret ballot could be easily compromised. Any system that could allow anyone to tell subsequently how a person voted is completely unacceptable, especially because of the danger that it forebodes to the voter in a Territory controlled by South Africa. With a view to removing that danger, it would be advisable to reconsider the use of envelopes with registration numbers recorded on them. This is an important consideration, since Namibians are likely to avoid the polls in significant numbers if the interpretation of the requirement persists that the authorities will know how voters cast their ballots.

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

In the light of these and similar comments, which I believe are cogent, the Council may wish to demand that the Secretary-General's Special Representative in Namibia ensures that all legislation concerning the electoral process and the Constituent Assembly conform with universally accepted norms for the conduct of free and fair elections and that no party is indirectly penalized by the Administrator-General.

In his comment on our criticisms of the draft proclamations, which, incidentally, most members of the Council feel should be looked at again, the representative of Pretoria asked for positive contributions on the procedures for free and fair elections from certain African countries, including mine. I can only ascribe the request to his total ignorance of our record in this area. Let me direct him to the Trusteeship Council's reports on the holding of a United Nations plebiscite in my country in the 1950s on the eve of our independence, where he would be happy to learn that the elections which were similar to those being held in Namibia today were not only free and fair but also that the metropolitan Power concerned did not attempt to bend the law. If, however, the intention in mentioning the three African countries, including Ghana, was just to embarrass, then by the same token South Africa, against the background of its apartheid and State terrorist policies in South and southern Africa, is less qualified even to appear in these halls.

In coming to the Council at this time, members of the African Group were not unaware of the efforts being made by some countries at the bilateral level to influence South Africa in favour of a free and fair electoral process. That those countries had reason to take up the matter with South Africa at all proves that there has been international concern for the electoral process. That those countries have not succeeded completely in getting South Africa to respect the

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

terms of resolution 435 (1978) is proof enough of the need of the present Council debate. We do not consider it flattering to South Africa that it should be asked by individual members of the international community to obey the rules. The African Group would not have resorted to the Council if it had had the slightest assurance that South Africa and its Administrator-General would be impartial. We recognize the efforts of the individual Governments concerned, but it must be understood that we simply cannot leave this important matter to the fortunes of bilateral diplomacy only. Reassurance from a few countries, especially those often blind to South Africa's wrong-doing, cannot be a water-tight guarantee for free and fair elections. Actions by individual countries at the bilateral level should complement the overall responsibility of the Council in the matter, and not replace it.

In his statement, the representative of South Africa found fault with the convening of a meeting of the Security Council at this time because, in his opinion, everything was well on track for achieving free and fair elections. He went on to impute that it was the sole intention of those who sought the meeting to once again chastise his régime publicly. The conduct of the debate speaks for itself. Let me remind him of an old African saying that if you are a member of a community who begins to feel that the community is always picking on you or bothering you, then you should critically reflect upon the possibility of your being the bother to the community. I am sure that there is an indigenous South African version of that piece of African wisdom.

To conclude, I wish to state that the current Security Council debate has helped along the course of justice and fair play, even before it ends, and the African Group is naturally pleased. We came here to expose South Africa's unfair and biased handling of the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), and members of

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

the Council cannot have escaped the clear voice of the international community. The debate and the action that the Council will soon decide upon for restoring prospects for free and fair elections were meant to constitute pressure on South Africa. We regret that South Africa has to be pressured at all times to do what is right but that is the history and nature of the Pretoria régime and we must together ensure that it conforms to the norms of international law and practice.

Beyond the immediate need to ensure an electoral process that cannot be faulted, however, is the more important image of the Security Council and the United Nations generally as the instrument for the achievement of the rights of peoples, for ensuring the self-determination of colonial peoples and for assuring sustainable international peace and security. There is no sufficient reason that this image should be tainted only on account of South Africa.

We hope that the Council will now take the necessary action to put the electoral process back on track and to give back to all parties to the electoral process in Namibia the hope for an independent Namibia through free and fair elections.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I have the pleasure now to make a statement as the representative of Algeria.

First I wish to thank all those who during this very rewarding debate have had kind words for my country and identified Algeria with the defence of freedom and peace. I can assure them that Algeria will always stand by the just causes of Africa, of the Arab peoples and of peoples everywhere whose rights are threatened. It is only natural, therefore, that my delegation should join other African countries in appealing to the Security Council to defend the rights of the fraternal people of Namibia during this crucial period when they must finally be allowed to exercise their rights to independence and sovereignty.

(The President)

The question of Namibia has mobilized the international community for more than 40 years. Ever since the creation of the United Nations to the adoption of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and the denunciation of South Africa's mandate in Namibia, the international community has ceaselessly proclaimed the independence of Namibia to be its direct responsibility. The adoption on 16 February last of Security Council resolution 632 (1989) nourished the hope that the many decisions of the United Nations on this question would finally prevail and that the United Nations plan for genuine restoration of the sovereignty of the Namibian nation would be implemented in an unimpeded manner.

(The President)

And yet here we are, six months later, faced with a disturbing fact impartially established by numerous distinguished observers and confirmed in the course of this debate.

In Namibia the Pretoria régime is still doing its utmost to perpetuate its domination. The Namibian people is still faced with intimidation and violence after many of its sons were assassinated last 1 April. The action of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG) is frequently thwarted by South African attempts to reduce its mission of supervision and control to that of mere passive observer. South African violence does not spare this Organization, proof of which was the serious incident in Outjo on 10 August last which took the life of a member in the service of UNTAG. Koevoet elements, after having prolonged their régime of terror for a number of months, have not yet been demobilized. The electoral process worked out by the United Nations for the self-determination of the Namibian people has been obstructed through procedural manipulation to change the outcome. The future constituent assembly of Namibia, which is the expression of the independence of that country, is the focus of the attentions of the occupying régime which seeks in advance to confiscate its authority. The South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), which has gloriously led the national liberation struggle of the Namibian people, is today accused of all manner of evil by the South African authorities in their attempt to find excuses to shirk their obligations in Namibia as set forth by the Security Council.

The serious situation in Namibia has already been denounced by Africa and the Non-Aligned Movement. It has mobilized the full energies of the Secretary-General, Mr. Javier Perez de Cuellar, to whom my country wished to pay a well-deserved tribute for all his efforts towards ensuring the full implementation of and strict respect for resolution 435 (1978). It is to muster firm support for his actions that Africa has come to the Security Council. With elections in Namibia only a few

(The President)

weeks away, it is now up to the Security Council to act decisively and see to it that the spirit and the letter of its own plan are faithfully carried out in order to preserve the inalienable rights of the Namibian people to genuine independence and thereby the credibility of the United Nations.

Because serious difficulties that have been clearly identified are being encountered in the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), the Security Council must now act decisively in three directions:

First, it must issue a firm and unmistakable warning to make it absolutely clear to the South African authorities that acceding to the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) in no way presupposes a concession on their part but signifies a response - however belated - to a Security Council decision. Hence the occupier must understand that it cannot make the implementation of the United Nations plan suit its own convenience, nor can it expect the United Nations to agree to any attempt to undermine the totality of the plan. Thus, when referring to impartiality, one has in mind impartiality between the Namibian political parties in the democratic electoral process.

Secondly, it must take immediate action to ensure the lifting of any and all repressive and discriminatory measures still in force in Namibia. In the first place, what is done with the Koevoet elements must be in keeping with resolution 435 (1978) - that is, they must be completely demobilized and their command structure dismantled. Similarly, the local police, SWAPOL, must assume its mission within the limits and under the control provided by the United Nations plan. Moreover, the oppressive laws must all be abrogated so that they will not be used against those who fought for freedom and could still be deprived, even today, of freedom during the elections. Finally, it is up to the United Nations to deploy the necessary forces in order effectively to maintain security in Namibia and to ensure that the electoral process proceeds as it should. In this respect, we

(The President)

welcome the recent decision of our Secretary-General to increase the international police force by 500, and we call on him not to hesitate to continue reinforcing UNTAG as necessary, in keeping with the agreement reached in the Security Council and spelled out in the explanatory statement of 9 February last.

Thirdly, it must reaffirm the provisions of resolution 435 (1978) in order to discourage here and now any attempt to pervert the process leading to Namibia's accession to independence which implies in particular the following:

First, the text published on 21 July by the Administrator-General on electoral registration must be revised to safeguard the sacred principle of the right of peoples to self-determination. This principle has in fact been jeopardized by the attempt to allow South African nationals to take part in the elections in Namibia. Voter registration of South Africans on Namibian electoral rolls - which has been the subject of much publicity - is a violation of international law and a challenge of the will of the United Nations. It is imperative that this situation come to an end and that appropriate corrections be made so that, as the plan spells out, only the people of Namibia will be called upon freely to determine its own future.

Next, the draft proclamation on the constituent assembly must be reformulated to prevent any neo-colonialist attempts. In its present form, this text in effect deprives a significant number of Namibian militants of any chance of being elected to the constituent assembly and provides that the representative of the colonial Power, the Administrator-General, will be President of that assembly and that the same Administrator-General will exercise over it a virtual veto right. Such provisions are quite clearly a serious violation of the sovereignty of the Namibian people as embodied in its only constituent assembly.

Finally, the Council must see to it that the post-electoral period not be artificially and indefinitely prolonged by South Africa. While resolution

(The President)

632 (1989) of 16 February last did not indicate the date on which the Namibian Government should be established, it should nevertheless be recalled that the independence plan for Namibia proposed on 10 April 1978 provided that authority in the Territory should pass to that same Government during 1978. That is a fundamental indication - which is still relevant - of the fact that after the elections the Namibian people must be allowed to exercise full sovereignty without delay.

And here it is fitting to say that, while South Africa has finally bowed to the urgency of implementing the process of Namibia's independence, it is not because it has suddenly become concerned about its international standing and now cares about international law and legality. It has finally agreed to the process because it has been forced to do so and because it sees the process as quite inevitable. Hence, if for decades South Africa has resorted to every imaginable stratagem - all condemned by the Council - to keep Namibia under its colonial domination, should we now expect that it will go along with carrying out to the letter the process of Namibian independence? Clearly South Africa will be tempted - indeed it may well be planning now - to stop at nothing to maintain its domination in Namibia, even by the seeming independence of Namibia in its zone of domination.

(The President)

Lest one be tempted to credit South Africa with benevolence in this matter, it should be recalled that it is the country of apartheid and a start has not yet been made on the dismantling of that system. Apartheid's survival is in itself an indictment: a régime that is repressive and anti-democratic cannot at the same time be respectful of the sovereign rights and independence of a neighbouring country.

In bringing this matter to the Security Council, the African Group has defended the interests of the Namibian people, to be sure; but it has also acted on behalf of the entire international community, as is demonstrated by the favourable response it has received in the course of the debate in the Security Council, which has shown that it has acted in timely fashion - as is indicated by the decision of the Administrator-General, though belated and inadequate, to withdraw the Koevoet elements from the local police, SWAPOL.

The Council must now respond to Africa's appeal with determination, for law must be restored in Namibia and at the same time the Council's authority must be reaffirmed. Our Secretary-General, who on our behalf has assumed defence of the integrity of resolution 435 (1978), must always be able to count on our firm support, particularly at this crucial time.

For all those reasons the Council's action must be resolute and equal to the challenges of freedom, justice and credibility that face us today in Namibia.

I now resume my functions as President of the Council.

There are no further speakers for this meeting. The next meeting of the Security Council to continue its consideration of the item on its agenda will be fixed in consultation with the members of the Council.

The meeting rose at 12.30 p.m.