

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

FORTIETH YEAR

2595th MEETING: 19 JUNE 1985

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2595/Rev.2)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in Namibia:	
(a) Letter dated 23 May 1985 from the Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17213);	
(b) Letter dated 23 May 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Mozambique to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17222);	
(c) Further report of the Secretary-General concerning the implementation of Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) concerning the question of Namibia (S/17242)	1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/ . . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

2595th MEETING

Held in New York on Wednesday, 19 June 1985, at 3.30 p.m.

President: Mr. Errol MAHABIR (Trinidad and Tobago).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Australia, Burkina Faso, China, Denmark, Egypt, France, India, Madagascar, Peru, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2595/Rev.2)

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. The situation in Namibia:
 - (a) Letter dated 23 May 1985 from the Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17213);
 - (b) Letter dated 23 May 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Mozambique to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17222);
 - (c) Further report of the Secretary-General concerning the implementation of Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) concerning the question of Namibia (S/17242)

The meeting was called to order at 5.40 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in Namibia:

- (a) Letter dated 23 May 1985 from the Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17213);
- (b) Letter dated 23 May 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Mozambique to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17222);
- (c) Further report of the Secretary-General concerning the implementation of Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) concerning the question of Namibia (S/17242)

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decision taken at the 2583rd meeting, I invite the representative of Liberia to take a place at the Council table.

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

2. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decision taken at the 2583rd meeting, I invite the Acting President of the United Nations Council for Namibia and the other members of the delegation to take a place at the Council table.

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

3. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decision taken at the 2583rd meeting, I invite Mr. Nujoma to take a place at the Council table.

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

4. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with decisions taken at previous meetings on this item [2583rd to 2587th, 2589th, 2590th, 2592nd and 2594th meetings], I invite the representatives of Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Canada, the Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, the German Democratic Republic, the Federal Republic of Germany, Ghana, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Kuwait, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Poland, Seychelles, South Africa, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, Uganda, the United Arab Emirates, the United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia and Zimbabwe to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Zarif (Afghanistan), Mr. Bessaïeh (Algeria), Mr. Van-Dunem (Angola), Mr. Muñiz (Argentina), Mr. Choudhury (Bangladesh), Mr. Moseley (Barbados), Mr. Tshering (Bhutan), Mrs. Carrasco (Bolivia), Mr. Legwaila (Botswana), Mr. Maciel (Brazil), Mr. Tsvetkov (Bulgaria), Mr. Engo (Cameroon), Mr. Lewis (Canada), Mr. Gayama (Congo), Mr. Malmierca (Cuba), Mr. Moushoutas (Cyprus), Mr. César (Czechoslovakia), Mr. Al-Ashtal (Democratic Yemen), Mr. Dinka (Ethiopia), Mr. Ott (German Democratic Republic), Mr. Lautenschlager (Federal Republic of Germany), Mr. Asamoah (Ghana), Mr. Karran (Guyana), Mr. Charles (Haiti), Mr. Foldeak (Hungary), Mr. Kusumaatmadja (Indonesia), Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani (Islamic Republic of Iran), Mr. Shearer (Jamaica), Mr. Kuroda (Japan), Mr.

Kiilu (Kenya), Mr. Abulhassan (Kuwait), Mr. Vongsay (Lao People's Democratic Republic), Mr. Makeka (Lesotho), Mr. Azzarouk (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), Mr. Zain (Malaysia), Mr. Gauci (Malta), Mr. Muñoz Ledo (Mexico), Mr. Nyamdoo (Mongolia), Mr. Alaoui (Morocco), Mr. Murargy (Mozambique), Mr. D'Escoto Brockmann (Nicaragua), Mr. Gambari (Nigeria), Mr. Shah Nawaz (Pakistan), Mr. Cabrera Jovane (Panama), Mr. Nowak (Poland), Ms. Gonthier (Seychelles), Mr. von Schirnding (South Africa), Mr. Wijewardane (Sri Lanka), Mr. Birido (Sudan), Mr. Al-Atassi (Syrian Arab Republic), Mr. Türkmen (Turkey), Mr. Odaka (Uganda), Mr. Al-Mosfir, (United Arab Emirates), Mr. Mkapa (United Republic of Tanzania), Mr. Le Kim Chung (Viet Nam), Mr. Gojob (Yugoslavia), Mr. Goma (Zambia) and Mr. Mudenge (Zimbabwe) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

5. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform the Council that I have received a letter from the representative of Guatemala in which he requests to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the agenda. In accordance with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite that representative to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Fajardo Maldonado (Guatemala) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber.

6. The PRESIDENT: Members of the Council have before them document S/17284/Rev.1, which contains the revised text of a draft resolution submitted by Burkina Faso, Egypt, India, Madagascar, Peru and Trinidad and Tobago. On behalf of the sponsors of the draft resolution, I should like to inform the Council of the following further changes in the text, which will be reproduced as document S/17284/Rev.2. Operative paragraphs 13 and 14, as revised, now read as follows:

"13. *Strongly warns* South Africa that failure to do so would compel the Security Council to meet forthwith to consider the adoption of appropriate measures under the Charter, including Chapter VII, as additional pressure to ensure South Africa's compliance with the above-mentioned resolutions;

"14. *Urges States Members of the United Nations that have not done so to consider in the meantime taking appropriate voluntary measures against South Africa, which could include the following:*

"(a) Suspension of new investments and application of disincentives to that end;

"(b) Re-examination of maritime and aerial relations with South Africa;

"(c) Prohibition of the sale of krugerrands and all other coins minted in South Africa; [and]

"(d) Restrictions on sports and cultural relations."

7. I should like to draw the attention of members of the Council to document S/17253, which contains the text of a letter dated 10 June 1985 from the representative of Mongolia to the Secretary-General.

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

9. Mr. FAJARDO MALDONADO (Guatemala) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. President, I wish to thank you and the members of the Council for allowing my delegation to speak. As this is the first time we have participated in the debate on Namibia, we should like to express our pleasure at seeing you, Sir, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Trinidad and Tobago, a fraternal country of the Caribbean, presiding over these series of important meetings. We are sure that your skill and knowledge of international problems guarantee success for the Council's deliberations.

10. I should also like to take this opportunity to congratulate the representative of Thailand on the effective manner in which he conducted the work of the Council during the month of May.

11. Guatemala is taking part in the debate on the question of Namibia because we are concerned over recent events, which affect the interests and daily life of the population of the Territory and which endanger international peace and security.

12. Once again the Council finds it necessary to discuss the question of Namibia, as it already has on innumerable occasions. The General Assembly has been dealing with this matter for 20 years and has adopted a number of resolutions demanding Namibian independence, but those resolutions have been completely ignored. In its resolution 2145 (XXI) of 26 October 1966, the General Assembly terminated South Africa's mandate over the Territory of Namibia, and the United Nations assumed direct responsibility for the administration of the Territory and the preparation of a programme that would allow the Namibian people to exercise its right to self-determination and independence. Then the General Assembly adopted resolution 2372 (XXII) of 12 June 1968, recommending that the Security Council urgently take measures, in accordance with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, to ensure the immediate removal of the South African presence from Namibia and to secure for Namibia its independence in accordance with resolution 2145 (XXI). Subsequently the Council reaffirmed the legal responsibility of the United Nations in relation to Namibia, and it adopted resolution 435 (1978), which my Government fully supports.

13. Guatemala feels enough time has passed and every avenue has been explored to bring about an orderly, peaceful transition to independent life in Namibia within a unified, integrated territory. We believe that resolution 435 (1978) is the only acceptable basis for the peaceful, final settlement of the question of Namibia. We are therefore

concerned at the actions and attitudes of the South African Government, which seem to be aimed at perpetuation of the colonial situation in that territory or at unacceptable, partial and conditional independence.

14. The international community cannot remain silent in the face of the South African Government's intransigence, which by obstructing implementation of the Security Council's categorical decisions on Namibia is thus violating its resolution 435 (1978) and 439 (1978), as well as resolutions and decisions of the General Assembly. Thus it is endangering not only regional but international peace and security.

15. The South African Government decision to set up a so-called interim government, ignoring the Council's decisions on this question, flouts the opinion of the international community. That is why Guatemala joins all other nations in rejecting that manoeuvre, in keeping with the Secretary-General's report to the Council [S/17242]. We hope that Pretoria will carefully consider the consequences of its decision and desist from taking actions that contravene decisions adopted by the Council.

16. Guatemala endorses the efforts of the international community, and strongly supports the Secretary-General's efforts aimed at accelerating Namibia's accession to genuine and internationally recognized independence. We support the demand for an end to the unlawful occupation of that Territory and the call for the adoption of urgent measures for the immediate and unconditional implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia, as approved by resolution 435 (1978).

17. At the present crucial stage of our consideration of the problem of Namibia, my Government considers it a matter of capital importance that the Council firmly assume the United Nations responsibility for the process leading to that Territory's independence. The Council is responsible for implementation of its resolutions, and it should adopt a clear position regarding defiance of its efforts. At the same time it must reaffirm and ensure full implementation of resolution 435 (1978), the sole, fundamental basis for a peaceful settlement of the question. Consequently, the Council must unanimously reject any action aimed at contravening decisions already adopted.

18. Solution of the problem of Namibia and the final eradication of the outrageous system of *apartheid* are inescapable obligations of the international community. Failure to fulfil those obligations can only jeopardize international peace and security.

19. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the Acting President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, Mr. Noel Sinclair, upon whom I now call.

20. Mr. SINCLAIR (Guyana), Acting President of the United Nations Council for Namibia: I have been mandated by the United Nations Council for Namibia to inform the Council that the United Nations Council for Namibia held a special meeting on 17 June in order to

focus the attention of the international community on the installation by South Africa of a so-called interim government in Windhoek, in violation of the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council on Namibia.

21. Statements were made at that meeting by the Secretary-General of the United Nations, the President of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the Chairman of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, the Chairman of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* and the chairmen of regional groups. Statements were also made by members of the United Nations Council for Namibia, including its Acting President.

22. Participants unanimously condemned this unilateral action by South Africa, declaring it null and void in accordance with the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, as well as the decisions of the United Nations Council for Namibia recently adopted at its Extraordinary Plenary Meetings at Vienna. They declared that the installation of the so-called interim government was an affront to the efforts of the United Nations Council for Namibia and of the United Nations for the early implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978)—approving the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia—and was proof of the criminal duplicity of the South African régime.

23. They reaffirmed their fullest support for the struggle of the Namibian people and for SWAPO, their sole, authentic representative, emphasizing the necessity for the co-ordination of efforts with SWAPO for the independence of Namibia.

24. They expressed concern about the tense situation in the southern African region, in particular about South Africa's recent acts of aggression against Angola and Botswana; they emphasized the need for appropriate measures to be taken by the international community, and urged the Security Council to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

25. They reaffirmed the decisions recently adopted by the United Nations Council for Namibia at its Extraordinary Plenary Meetings, held at Vienna, in particular those contained in its Programme of Action [see S/17184, annex], to the effect that the Council would promote the imposition of mandatory sanctions against South Africa by the Security Council in conformity with Chapter VII of the Charter at its next meeting on the question of Namibia, with the aim of ensuring the implementation of the United Nations plan and that it would further urge members of the Security Council which have protected South Africa in the past to show the necessary political will to exert maximum pressure on South Africa to ensure its compliance with the terms of resolution 435 (1978).

26. The PRESIDENT: It is my understanding that the Council is ready to proceed to the vote on the draft resolu-

tion before it. Unless I hear any objection, I shall put the draft resolution to the vote now.

27. I shall first call on those members of the Council who wish to make statements before the voting.

28. Mr. MAXEY (United Kingdom): In my statement [2590th meeting], I said that my delegation regarded resolution 435 (1978) as central to our discussions. I expressed the hope that we would reach an outcome which gave new impetus to the Council's efforts to implement that resolution. It was clear from the debate that members of the Council were unanimous in condemning South Africa's installation of an interim government in Windhoek; in condemning recent attacks by South African forces in neighbouring countries; in regarding resolution 435 (1978) as the only internationally accepted basis for a peaceful settlement of the Namibian problem; and in pressing for an urgent decision by South Africa to implement that resolution. These elements should and could have provided the basis for a draft resolution commanding the unanimous support of the Council. The adoption of such a draft resolution would have sent a clear signal of our disapproval and our determination to the South African Government. It would have assisted continuing efforts to negotiate the implementation of the settlement plan.

29. My delegation therefore went to great lengths to try to bring about a draft resolution on these lines. As the Council knows, we formulated specific and constructive proposals which, in our view, should have been acceptable to all Council members. I must pay tribute, Mr. President, to the constructive efforts you made to the same end. I much regret that these proposals did not meet with the response for which we had hoped, and that a draft resolution has been submitted which it is known we cannot support.

30. We cannot support any suggestion that armed struggle is to be preferred to negotiations. We do not think it helpful to ask the Secretary-General to undertake steps which, in their nature or time frame, are unrealistic.

31. Above all, we do not think that the Council should seek to tie the hands of Member States in the manner proposed or to prejudge the outcome of future meetings. Our vote on this draft resolution therefore does not imply acceptance that, in future circumstances which are as yet unknown, the Council will embark on a predetermined course of action. Each Member State should act in the way it considers most appropriate to assist the Council in the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). The Council has a responsibility to protect and advance the settlement plan. It is in accordance with that responsibility as we see it that the United Kingdom is obliged to abstain in the vote today.

32. It remains our firm intention to continue our efforts to bring about the earliest possible implementation of the United Nations plan. We hope that this aim is shared by all other members of the Council.

33. The PRESIDENT: I now put to the vote the draft resolution contained in document S/17284/Rev.2.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Australia, Burkina Faso, China, Denmark, Egypt, France, India, Madagascar, Peru, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Against: None.

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

The draft resolution was adopted by 13 votes against none, with 2 abstentions [resolution 566 (1985)].

34. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those members of the Council who wish to make statements after the voting.

35. Mr. WOOLCOTT (Australia): In the Australian statement to the Security Council on this question six days ago [2588th meeting], my delegation urged the Council to send to the South African Government to clear, strong and unambiguous message. The Council's debate on this matter can have left South Africa in no doubt as to the strength and the unanimity of international opinion.

36. Today, in agreeing to a resolution, the Council has reinforced that opinion. My delegation would like to pay tribute to you, personally, Mr. President, to the representatives of the front-line States, to the members of the Council and to SWAPO for the efforts that have been made to bring about a draft resolution which could be adopted by the Council.

37. Australia supported the resolution we have just adopted. We did so because our commitment to the United Nations plan and its early implementation is complete. We have on many occasions signalled quite clearly our attitude to South Africa's intransigence which is the reason for the intolerably long delay in implementing the plan.

38. We have rejected the linkage of the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola to the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). To us, this puts the cart before the horse. Moreover, Australia resolutely condemns the establishment of the interim government in Namibia. In voting in favour of this resolution, we wish to join other countries in demonstrating clearly to South Africa that the patience of the international community is close to exhaustion.

39. We are dealing with a Government which applies a universally condemned system of State-controlled racism, which has consistently and illegally defied the Council in relation to Namibia and which has, in recent days, broken again yet another norm of international behaviour with its aggression against Botswana. The Australian Prime Minister has made it clear only recently, in speaking of Australia

lia's total rejection of the policies of *apartheid*, that Australia will remain ready to support the imposition of mandatory economic sanctions against South Africa in response to its *apartheid* policies. In the context of the current resolution, our belief is that only fully respected and universally applied economic sanctions can be really effective. The alternative to mandatory economic sanctions—uncoordinated unilateral measures—is, in our view, unlikely to be effective. This is not, of course, to deny the rights of States to take voluntary measures of the type referred to in the resolution. Indeed, Australia has freely chosen to take a number of such measures. But, in the absence of mandatory economic sanctions, the scope for taking such measures remains a matter for consideration by individual Governments.

40. We express the hope that the adoption of this resolution will serve to induce South Africa finally to heed the call of the world community for the early implementation of the United Nations plan for an independent Namibia.

41. Mr. CLARK (United States of America): We especially wish to express our gratitude to you, Mr. President, for your tireless efforts over the past several days to bring about a unanimous resolution. Your tact, wisdom and endurance have guided us, impressed us and left us greatly in your debt.

42. As you know, Sir, from our long conversations, my delegation sought to support a strong resolution on Namibia which would have sent a clear, united, unambiguous message to the Government of South Africa. We regret that, despite these efforts, unanimity was not achieved. Let me be clear in saying that the United States rejects the establishment of a so-called interim government in Namibia as null and void. These institutions created by Pretoria have no standing. We condemn any act by any party which could be seen as leading to a settlement outside resolution 435 (1978), the only internationally acceptable basis for a peaceful solution to the Namibia problem. We have also condemned South Africa's attack on Gaborone, Botswana, and its attempted raid in Cabinda, Angola.

43. The United States remains committed to and actively involved in the search for Namibian independence, in accordance with resolution 435 (1978). We have come a long way in this search and will continue to pursue our objective, an objective we share with all members of the international community, for as long as there is a prospect for success.

44. In spite of the recriminations and condemnations we have heard in the Council chamber over the past several days, and in spite of some of the formulations in the resolution before us, it is clear to all of us here that one key issue remains to be resolved before resolution 435 (1978) can be implemented: finalizing an agreement on the withdrawal of foreign combat forces from Angola. It is not a matter of doctrine or of juridical pre-condition. It is, however, an objective fact that must be dealt with. This has been recognized by all parties to the negotiations. In this regard, we welcomed the letter of 17 November 1984 from

President Dos Santos to the Secretary-General [*S/16838*], setting out Angola's specific proposals for resolving this issue. This was an important step forward. Our contacts with the parties since that time suggest that there exists a real potential for further progress, but this will only happen if they summon the political will to take further decisions towards peace.

45. Our desire to make clear our opposition to South Africa's action in Namibia has convinced us not to oppose this resolution. However, there were a number of elements in it on which we are not in agreement and which led us, reluctantly, to abstain. We find it hard to reaffirm resolutions that we did not affirm in the first place. Our central concern is that mandatory sanctions are not likely to advance the cause of peace and Namibian independence. Rather, it is our judgement that they are likely to retard that goal. We also believe that economic development is likely to encourage the necessary social and political changes in South Africa and promote the elimination of the abhorrent policy of *apartheid*. We cannot, therefore, in good faith conscientiously join in urging others to undertake actions which we believe would slow down the achievement of that objective.

46. Mr. SAFRONCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): The Soviet delegation supported the draft resolution introduced by a group of non-aligned countries members of the Council. We voted in favour of that resolution because it condemns the racist régime of South Africa for its continued illegal occupation of Namibia, in flagrant defiance of resolutions of the General Assembly and decisions of the Security Council, and also for its installation of a puppet régime in Windhoek.

47. A positive aspect of the resolution that has been adopted is the fact that it unambiguously rejects linking the independence of Namibia to irrelevant and extraneous issues. The resolution contains a warning for the racist régime in Pretoria that its failure to give independence to Namibia would compel the Security Council to consider the adoption of appropriate measures against South Africa as provided in Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

48. However, we are firmly convinced that this resolution does not go far enough in providing for genuinely effective measures that could compel the racist régime of Pretoria to comply with the will of the Council and force it to implement the resolutions of the Council on the granting of immediate independence to Namibia. The measures called for in the resolution are clearly inadequate to alter the conduct of the racist régime of South Africa.

49. Recent events, and in particular the flagrant acts of aggression by the Pretoria racists against Angola and Botswana, the massive repression of the indigenous population of South Africa itself and the establishment of a puppet régime in Namibia, demonstrate with utter clarity that the Government of South Africa will be brought to see reason only by the adoption of sanctions against it, as provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter.

50. Verbal condemnations of the actions of the South African racist régime are clearly inadequate. Such condemnations have been frequent in the past, but the racists are aware of the support of the Western Powers and are becoming increasingly arrogant.

51. We were prepared to vote in favour of a stronger draft resolution, specifically the text initially introduced by the non-aligned countries members of the Council [S/17270]. That draft resolution, as members know, provided for the imposition, at a certain stage, of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the racist régime under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations. To our regret—and, I think, to the regret of all those who genuinely support the people of Namibia in its struggle for freedom and independence—that draft resolution was not brought to the vote. Everyone knows who prevented it being put to the vote and why.

52. For its part, the Soviet Union will continue its unflagging support of the people of Namibia in its just struggle for freedom and independence against the outrageous *apartheid* régime. We are confident that, sooner or later, despite the resistance of the forces of racism and imperialism, the just cause of the Namibian people will triumph.

53. Mr. de KEMOULARIA (France) (*interpretation from French*): The international community is increasingly irritated by South Africa's delaying tactics and intransigence on the question of Namibia.

54. For its part, France wishes to reaffirm here the position stated on 31 May 1985 by its Prime Minister. If there has been no significant movement by the South African Government within 18 months, France will take unilateral economic measures against South Africa.

55. In the Council, France is prepared, when the time comes, to consider the adoption of appropriate measures under the Charter of the United Nations. We do not believe that now is the time to resort to measures on the basis of Chapter VII.

56. The PRESIDENT: Mr. Sam Nujoma, to whom the Council extended an invitation at its 2583rd meeting, wishes to make a further statement. With the consent of the Council, I call on him now.

57. Mr. NUJOMA: At the beginning of the debate, Mr. President, we declared our complete trust and confidence in your wise and enterprising leadership, convinced that you would steer the deliberations of the Council to a successful conclusion. You have not disappointed us in this regard, either in terms of your judicious conduct of the meetings or in terms of the complicated consultations behind the scenes. We are grateful to you for your cooperation and understanding. The delegation of SWAPO extends to you its best wishes as you continue to carry out your demanding mandate during the remainder of your term of office.

58. More than 70 speakers, including Ministers for Foreign Affairs and other high-ranking officials, participated in the debate. The attendance of the Prime Minister, President of the Council of Ministers and Foreign Minister of Peru was particularly gratifying to us. We thank all those statesmen and dignitaries for the strong reaffirmation of their countries' solid support for and solidarity with our struggle for national independence and social liberation.

59. I also reiterate SWAPO's sincere appreciation to the Secretary-General for his continuing efforts to help end the needless suffering and colonial violence, and to bring about Namibia's independence, which has been delayed for too long. We welcome the Secretary-General's latest report on Namibia [S/17242].

60. The Council's debate started with repeated expressions of indignation and condemnation directed at the racist régime of Pretoria for its generalized and persistent acts of aggression, *apartheid* violence and colonial tyranny in southern Africa. The notorious policy of constructive engagement, together with its hated offshoot, the precondition of linkage, was roundly condemned, and the collusion of its authors, Washington and Pretoria, thoroughly exposed. These pernicious and racist policies stand firmly rejected by all because their objective is to entrench *apartheid* further, to delay the independence of Namibia, and to weaken the independent States in the region, in an effort to make them dependent on *apartheid* South Africa. The primary interest of the United States, in collaboration with the Afrikaner régime, is to perpetuate the status quo, namely the continued, unfettered plunder of natural resources by the transnational corporations, and the enslavement of the African majority in South Africa and Namibia.

61. On the positive side, the debate reassured our oppressed but struggling people of the endless support that we continue to enjoy from the overwhelming majority of the nations, peoples and Governments of the world. We know that we can count on their increased all-round material assistance. Virtually all the speakers strongly condemned the racist régime for its decision to install in Namibia a puppet administration composed of Namibian reactionaries and traitors. The racists were warned to desist from that dangerous course, but they contemptuously ignored the demand of the international community and proceeded, using brute force to seek to rearrange the instruments of their colonial and illegal rule. They did this, imposing yet another *fait accompli*, even as the Council was considering the question of Namibia.

62. In the course of the debate we also heard speeches being made by South Africa's friends, which have always shielded it in the Council. They too sounded tough in their pronouncements against the racist Pretoria régime. But speech-making is one thing, and taking concrete action is another thing altogether.

63. Among a series of soul-searching questions that we asked of this august body at the beginning of the debate was the following: "Is this not the time for the Security

ouncil to declare that enough is enough?" [2583rd meeting para. 149].

Just a short while ago the Council was called upon by the sponsors of draft resolution S/17284/Rev.2, as revised, to take a unanimous decision on it. That we enjoyed our wholehearted support. It was the bare minimum that we could take back to our suffering people as assurance that the Council has fully assumed its responsibilities in respect of the independence process of Cuba. Yet, when the going got serious and demanded prompt and decisive action, two of the Western permanent members skirted their responsibilities and instead abstained in the vote, thus sending a clear message to our people that freedom and justice are meaningless ideals when it comes to protecting the economic, strategic and ideological interests of those recalcitrant States.

We welcome the adoption of the resolution and thank the members of the Council who voted in favour. It can also be said that abstention means a polite no, but cannot say "no" to the will and determination of our

valiant people to fight for their liberation. This is not the first time that those imperialist Powers have abstained in the vote and it will not be the last. However, outside this building the reality is different: the progressive peoples of the world community are taking positive actions in favour of our cause. Their actions are being organized and carried out in active solidarity with our struggle and will eventually force their Governments to see the light. I express the hope that those who abstained in the vote today will vote in favour the next time around, for we shall return.

66. There are many fronts on which to wage the struggle. We are committed to the total liberation of our motherland, and in pursuit of that precious goal we are prepared to make the ultimate sacrifice to end colonial conquest and exploitation, until independence is achieved in our country.

67. The struggle continues. Victory is certain.

The meeting rose at 6.35 p.m.
