



Security Council

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.2652
5 February 1986

ENGLISH

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND
SIX HUNDRED AND FIFTY-SECOND MEETINGHeld at Headquarters, New York,
on Wednesday, 5 February 1986, at 10.30 a.m.President: Mr. ADOUKI

(Congo)

Members: Australia
Bulgaria
China
Denmark
France
Ghana
Madagascar
Thailand
Trinidad and Tobago
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
United Arab Emirates
United Kingdom of Great Britain and
Northern Ireland
United States of America
VenezuelaMr. WOOLCOTT
Mr. TSVETKOV
Mr. LI Luye
Mr. BIERRING
Mr. de KEMOULARIA
Mr. GBEHO
Mr. RABETAFIKA
Mr. KASEMSARN
Mr. MOHAMMED
Mr. TROYANOVSKY
Mr. AL-SHAALI

Sir John THOMSON
Ms. BYRNE
Mr. AGUILAR

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 11.35 a.m.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

THE SITUATION IN SOUTHERN AFRICA

LETTER DATED 29 JANUARY 1986 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF THE SUDAN TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/17770)

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Ethiopia, Mozambique, Senegal, South Africa, Sudan, Togo, the United Republic of Tanzania and Zambia in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In accordance with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote, in conformity with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Kouassi (Togo) took a place at the Council table; Mr. Dinka (Ethiopia), Mr. Dos Santos (Mozambique), Mr. Sarré (Senegal), Mr. von Schirnding (South Africa), Mr. Birido (Sudan), Mr. Foun (United Republic of Tanzania) and Mr. Ngo (Zambia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I should like to inform the Council that I have received a letter dated 4 February 1986 from the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, which reads as follows:

(The President)

"I have the honour to request that the United Nations Council for Namibia be invited to participate in the consideration of the Security Council item entitled 'The Situation in southern Africa'.

"The United Nations Council for Namibia will be represented by its delegation comprising the President and Vice-Presidents."

(The President)

On previous occasions, the Security Council has extended invitations to representatives of other United Nations bodies in connection with the consideration of matters on its agenda. In conformity with past practice in this matter, I propose that the Council extend an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure to the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia and the delegation of that Council.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

I invite the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia and the delegation of that Council to take a place at the Council table.

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

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received a letter dated 5 February 1986 from the representatives of the Congo, Ghana and Madagascar, which reads as follows:

"We the undersigned, members of the Security Council, have the honour to request that the Security Council extend an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure to Mr. Neo Mnumzana, Chief Representative of the African National Congress of South Africa to the United Nations, to participate in the consideration of the item 'The situation in southern Africa'."

That letter will be distributed as document S/17793.

If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Council decides to extend an invitation to Mr. Neo Mnumzana in accordance with rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

(The President)

In due course I shall invite Mr. Neo Mnumzana to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Security Council is meeting today in response to a letter dated 29 January 1986 from the Permanent Representative of the Sudan to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17770).

The first speaker is the representative of Togo, on whom I now call.

Mr. KOUASSI (Togo) (interpretation from French): Mr. President, your human qualities, precision and skill are a guarantee of dynamism, effectiveness and success for the Security Council in its work for this month. We are convinced that your first attempt will thus prove to be a masterly performance. It is with those simple words - which nevertheless reflect high confidence - that your regional group, the Group of African States, welcomes, through me, your assumption of the presidency of the most prestigious of United Nations bodies. I congratulate you.

I wish likewise to pay a tribute to your predecessor, His Excellency Mr. Li Luye, Permanent Representative of the People's Republic of China, for the particularly able and responsible manner in which he guided the work of the Council in January.

I would be failing in my duty if I were not to express the satisfaction and gratitude of my Group, Sir, for your help and diligence in convening the Council to consider yet again the problems of southern Africa. I am certain that under your presidency the Council will take measures which will prove effective and appropriate in view of the current situation in southern Africa.

I wish also to thank you, Sir, and through you the other members of the Security Council for having kindly invited me to participate in the Council's consideration of the situation in southern Africa and to make this statement as current Chairman of the Group of African States at the United Nations.

(Mr. Kouassi, Togo)

The situation in southern Africa, the subject of the present meeting of the Security Council, grows more disturbing and more urgent daily. As members know, the situation has three aspects: the policy of apartheid of the Government of South Africa; the illegal occupation of Namibia by the racist régime; and that régime's policy of aggression and destabilization against neighbouring States. Thus, all the ills endured by southern Africa have a common denominator: the racist régime of Pretoria.

Members of the Council are very familiar with those three elements of the highly explosive situation in southern Africa. But I wish to discuss them briefly, stressing the dire consequences which affect and pose a dangerous threat to international peace and security, in order the better to explain what led the current Chairman of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), His Excellency Mr. Abdou Diouf of Senegal, to call for the convening of the Security Council.

Now more than ever before, we are seeing the fulfilment of the predictions made so long ago by the lamented Mangaliso Sobukwe, the faithful companion of Nelson Mandela - that prestigious fighter to whom all of Africa, standing proud and tall, pays eternal tribute for what he represents to it as a living symbol of its age-old resistance against oppression, racism, injustice and tyranny. The late Mangaliso Sobukwe said that

"The beginning of the end of a system is when a people refuses to operate the institutions which can perpetuate its oppression".

The people of South Africa refuse to live today as they did in the past. That is why, through the state of emergency it declared in July 1985, the Pretoria régime is strengthening daily the machinery of repression. The security forces now have a free hand to behave with the most utter arbitrariness.

(Mr. Kouassi, Togo)

Hardly a day passes without police violence. If it is not peaceful demonstrators who are bloodily put down, it is school-children who fall under South African police bullets or leaders of representative black movements who are arrested without explanation and thrown without trial into the South African Government's gaols. The only crime of those blacks is to ask that they be allowed to enjoy in their own country the most fundamental rights guaranteed to all mankind by the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

With reference to Namibia - a Territory under United Nations administration which continues to be occupied illegally by South Africa in violation of all relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council - South Africa continues to increase its evasion, subterfuges and other delaying tactics intended to put off the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) on the accession of Namibia to independence.

(Mr. Kouassi, Togo)

Faced with a choice between the two electoral processes provided for in that resolution to lead to free and democratic elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations, the South African Government has contemptuously and arrogantly raised the problem of the status of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), or that of the alleged partiality of the United Nations and the Security Council, or, lastly, the artificial problem of the presence of Cuban troops in Angola, something that is totally unrelated to the question of Namibia. With each passing day there is a growing danger that the apartheid régime might simply annex Namibia outright.

Thus, incapable as it is of controlling its internal crisis and concerned with perpetuating its illegal occupation of Namibia, South Africa is forced to extend the war beyond its borders, a point made by the current Chairman of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), His Excellency Mr. Abdou Diouf, in his statement on 5 November 1985, in which he said:

"Faced with a grave domestic crisis caused by the régime of institutionalized racial discrimination on which its political and social system is based, the South African Government, while repressing with brutal violence the South African anti-apartheid forces and continuing its illegal occupation of the Territory of Namibia, thus opposing the Namibian people's accession to independence, is applying a systematic policy of political, military and economic destabilization against neighbouring African States. Thus, Angola, Mozambique and Botswana, amongst others, have been the victims of frequent acts of aggression and sabotage."

In the case of Angola, when South Africa has not intervened to destabilize that country directly it has used UNITA as a proxy. Now, it is an error to present UNITA, as some have done, as a body of nationalists and to compare them to freedom

(Mr. Kouassi, Togo)

fighters. It is true that both the MPLA and UNITA fought to throw the colonialists out of Angola. But since Angola's liberation from colonialism and colonial domination, UNITA has become a tool for the destabilization of Angola in the hands of the South African Government. In fact, the armed forces of UNITA are financed, equipped, trained and militarily supported by South Africa. President Abdou Diouf, current Chairman of the OAU, had the following to say in that connection:

"The fact is that since Angola's accession to independence UNITA has gradually become a movement serving the policy of South Africa. Financed, equipped, trained and provided transportation by the South African Army, it serves as a mere cover for the deliberate policy of the Pretoria Government aimed at interfering in the internal affairs of the People's Republic of Angola, the destabilization of the legitimate Government of Angola and aggression against the Angolan people."

The African Heads of State have always spoken out against just that complacent distortion of the facts to the benefit of UNITA. They have opposed any economic, financial or military assistance that armed movement may receive from outside. It is also for that reason that the Heads of State or Government of countries members of the OAU at their twenty-first Summit Meeting held at Addis Ababa from 18 to 20 July 1985 adopted a declaration in which they expressed

"grave concern over the abrogation by the Senate of the United States of the Clark Amendment"

and exhorted the United States Congress

"to ensure that the abrogation of the Clark Amendment does not constitute a licence for covert or overt American involvement in the internal affairs of the Republic of Angola."

(Mr. Kouassi, Togo)

Operative paragraph 1 of that Declaration provides that:

"Any financial, military and logistical support to the enemies of the Angolan people by any Government or private group or government agency, directly or indirectly, would be considered a serious violation of the 1970 Declaration on Friendly Relations among States, and of the provisions of the Charters of the Organization of African Unity and the United Nations." (A/40/666, AHG/DECL.3 (XXI))

It was necessary to recall those elements of the Declaration adopted at the twenty-first OAU Summit Meeting dealing with repeal of the Clark Amendment because, in light of the role being played by UNITA, any assistance given by any country to that movement could only result in delaying the peaceful solution of the numerous problems existing in southern Africa.

Africa has the fullest confidence in the ability of the Security Council to contribute to the establishment of peace in southern Africa. It is that confidence that has led us to request the convening of the Council to consider the contribution the Council could make towards that end at this time.

In our opinion, the Council should demand that the Pretoria Government immediately put an end to the state of emergency, withdraw the army and special police from the black townships and unconditionally release Nelson Mandela and all other political prisoners in South Africa. Any initiative by the South African Government to link the fate of Nelson Mandela to the fate of other persons detained elsewhere in the world is designed only to sow confusion in peoples' minds and must be categorically rejected.

The Council should demand that the Pretoria Government immediately abolish its policy of apartheid and ensure respect for the equality of rights of all South African citizens, without any discrimination, particularly that based on race.

(Mr. Kouassi, Togo)

Apartheid cannot be reformed; it must either be abolished or destroyed. In this respect the Security Council and the international community must not be misled by the bogus reforms that are sporadically put forward by the South African Government, reforms purportedly designed to bring about the gradual elimination of apartheid and usher in an egalitarian society in South Africa. Such so-called reforms are no more than vague promises and in no way bind their authors to any precise action, either with regard to their content or with regard to a timetable for their implementation.

The Security Council should once again demand that the Pretoria Government co-operate in good faith in the immediate implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia in resolution 435 (1978), which continues to be the sole, internationally accepted basis for the independence of Namibia. In that connection the Council should once again set a firm deadline for the Pretoria Government under which it must choose between the two electoral processes provided for in the United Nations plan with a view to the prompt holding of free and democratic elections under United Nations auspices.

Lastly, the Council should request that all States Members of the United Nations refrain from any act capable of further aggravating the complex situation in southern Africa.

If, however, South Africa continues to refuse to heed the voice of wisdom and to persist in its criminal stubbornness, the Council should at a forthcoming session consider adopting comprehensive and mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter.

If, at the conclusion of its current meetings, the Security Council were to succeed in unanimously adopting a resolution containing the aforementioned measures, it would be living up to the trust all the African States had rightly

(Mr. Kouassi, Togo)

placed in it. It would thereby earn the gratitude of the international community because it would have made a valuable contribution to the establishment of peace in southern Africa.

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

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

Mr. SARRÉ (Senegal) (interpretation from French): Mr. President, first I should like to convey to you and to the other members of the Security Council the thanks of the current Chairman of the Organization of African Unity, His Excellency Mr. Abdou Diouf, President of the Republic of Senegal, for being so kind as to convene the Security Council again to discuss the grave tension prevailing in southern Africa.

We have all heard the representative of Togo, who took us on a tour of southern Africa during which we experienced the death-throes of apartheid, destabilization and dashed hopes with regard to Namibia. He gave us a wise analysis of the situation prevailing in the region and expressed the feelings and the views of African States, in the words of the current Chairman of the Organization of African Unity, President Abdou Diouf. Hence I shall not repeat them.

I should like to take this opportunity to convey my condolences and sympathy to the American people and Government on the tragic passing of seven American astronauts.

Before I get into the substance of the item before us, may I express to you, Sir, my sincere and warm congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council and wish you success. Your country is well known for its dedication to the building of international peace and security and thus to the strengthening of the role of the United Nations in international relations. In addition the Congo has always been a stalwart champion of the liberation of the continent from any form of political, economic or racial domination. With all of those advantages in the hands of the consummate diplomat you are, the work of the Council will doubtless be crowned with success.

(Mr. Sarré, Senegal)

We should also like to pay tribute and extend our consideration and esteem to your predecessor, Mr. Li Luye, Permanent Representative of China. The moderation and objectivity he showed last month enabled the Council to work with the necessary calm.

We come before the Council once again. An untutored mind might be tempted to accuse us of abusing its patience to such a degree that we are making it meet constantly. But the real situation is quite different, so please do not think us overly importunate.

We come before the Council because we have faith in our Organization and its ability to meet its responsibility to find a political solution to an issue, apartheid, that is a basic violation of human rights.

We come before the Council because, at a time when the international community intends to launch a broad plan for the economic and social recovery of Africa, one major obstacle, to wit apartheid and its consequences for southern Africa, might prevent it from being implemented.

We come before the Council because one Member of our Organization, one that has subscribed to the principles and purposes of our Charter, refuses to implement them.

We come before the Council because the conduct of South Africa, both within and outside its territory, is an undoubted threat to international peace and security.

Finally, we come before the Council so that it might help us in our efforts to compel the white minority of South Africa to establish the foundations for a democratic and multiracial society and to join in the international consensus for Namibian independence. The eradication of apartheid and the total unconditional independence of Namibia are essential for the return of peace to southern Africa.

(Mr. Sarré, Senegal)

As long as our aspirations, which are based on moral legitimacy, international law and the principles and purposes of the United Nations Charter, are not realized, we shall continue to come to the Council.

Exactly one month has elapsed since this Council received a complaint from Lesotho against South Africa and unanimously adopted its resolution 580 (1985), which reflected the indignation of all of its members at the premeditated and unprovoked massacre of six South African refugees and three Lesotho nationals in Lesotho. In the same resolution, the Council, aware of its responsibilities, reaffirmed Lesotho's right to receive and give sanctuary to the victims of apartheid in accordance with its traditional practice, humanitarian principles and international obligations.

But once again South Africa has shown how little regard it has for resolutions of the Security Council, though the United Nations Charter entrusts the Council the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security.

The people of Lesotho has just emerged from the trials of a total economic blockade imposed upon it by the Pretoria régime on the pretext that it was harbouring fighters of the African National Congress (ANC). In reality, the desired objective was the expulsion of South African refugees from the territory of Lesotho. It is fortunate that His Majesty the King of Lesotho renewed his country's commitment to shouldering its African responsibilities.

In pursuing its implacable logic, which is to hunt down, to destabilize, to attack and to invade neighbouring countries, Pretoria's racist régime has just taken another step fraught with consequences in its attempt to impose a "South African peace" in the southern part of the African continent.

(Mr. Sarré, Senegal)

In fact the South African authorities are officially threatening to send their armed forces against any neighbouring State that intends to receive persons who, for their own strategic reasons, they consider to be active and subversive ANC militants, though, as we of course know, they are only South African refugees who come within the purview of the High Commissioner for Refugees and have fled the horrors of apartheid.

This official position of the Pretoria leaders, which confirms their choice of political blackmail, which has become governmental policy, is undermining the very foundations of international law and the United Nations Charter, just as it is an outright defiance of resolution 580 (1985) of this Council, bearing in mind that

"All Members must refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the Charter of the United Nations".

Africa is once again calling upon the international community and confronting it with its responsibilities. At a time when that community has just celebrated the 40 years of existence of the international Charter, it is inconceivable that a régime that chooses to flout right and reason might continue to defy and disregard the conscience of the entire world, and in particular the Security Council, thereby negating its authority.

(Mr. Sarré, Senegal)

If the necessary preventive measures had not been taken, all of southern Africa would have been plunged into chaos. Indeed, after Lesotho, Botswana would no doubt be involved, and then perhaps Zambia and all the neighbouring countries. As everyone knows, South Africa does not lack the resources; therefore preventive measures by our Council are necessary.

Faced with this grave prospect, a clear threat to international peace and security, the international community cannot remain silent and inactive for fear that it might be accused of complicity. No one is in a better position than the United Nations Security Council, which has been invested by the United Nations Charter with primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, to take the necessary preventive measures; and this is why we are coming before this Council.

Furthermore, this diversionist policy pursued by the Pretoria racist régime cannot distract world public opinion from the true problems, which remain the total elimination of the hateful system of apartheid and the speedy accession of Namibia to independence in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the United Nations which are the Gordian knot of the explosive situation in southern Africa.

Mr. President, as you have noted, each time that tensions mount in southern Africa, South Africa hastens to put before the world proposals for reforms that are really no more than manoeuvres to mislead many Governments. Africa can only denounce and condemn them. In this connection, the current President of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), Mr. Abdou Diouf, has on behalf of Africa denounced the latest proposals of the President of the Republic of South Africa in the following words:

(Mr. Sarré, Senegal)

"In a speech delivered today, 31 January 1986, in his country's Parliament, President Pieter Botha has just announced a series of measures, the most important of which are the following:

"suppression of passes, which would be replaced by other identity cards; the creation of a national council, an advisory body to replace the current Presidential Council; the freeing of Nelson Mandela in exchange, on the one hand, for the freeing by the Soviet Union of Andrei Sakharov and mathematician Anatoly Sharansky and, on the other hand, the freeing by Angola of the South African Captain Wynand du Toit, who was captured and imprisoned by the Angolan authorities.

"Compared with what we expected towards the creation of a climate of dialogue in order to emerge from the present crisis, these measures only show once again for those who might still be sceptical the true face of this decaying political system which is incapable of maintaining South Africa and protecting it from a racial and political explosion with unforeseeable consequences.

"The conditions for this climate of dialogue, furthermore, remain the unconditional release of Nelson Mandela and other political prisoners, an end to the state of emergency, the complete abrogation of repressive legislation against anti-apartheid and political and social organizations; and the beginning of genuine and sincere negotiations between the Pretoria authorities and the legitimate representatives of the South African liberation movements and patriotic forces.

"President Botha thereby confirms the heavy responsibility he bears for the maintenance and aggravation of the current situation in South Africa. He is then, along with those who uphold and support his régime, running the grave risk of plunging South Africa into a racial war that would compromise the

(Mr. Sarré, Senegal)

future desirable coexistence of races and interests which should characterize the post-apartheid society to which the freedom fighters aspire.

"The importance of the historic challenge that the racist régime of President Botha has just thrown down before the conscience of all mankind requires that the international community urgently assume its responsibilities against this abominable régime.

"In these grave circumstances, in my capacity as President of the Organization of African Unity I should like urgently to appeal to the Governments of all countries and all national public opinion to condemn the measures announced by President Botha and to continue to exert the necessary pressure against the South African Government for a total abolition of apartheid".

So it is that a confident Africa expects the Security Council to assume its full responsibility by condemning South Africa unequivocally and by deciding to implement comprehensive and binding economic sanctions against South Africa so that finally southern Africa might become a region of peace and South Africa a multiracial, egalitarian and democratic society, guaranteeing freedom for all.

Indeed it is high time that an end were put to a régime responsible for the suffering of so many men, women and children who want only peace, life, dignity and, above all, freedom.

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

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

Mr. NGO (Zambia): I wish on behalf of my delegation, Sir, and indeed on my own behalf to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of February. My delegation will offer its

(Mr. Ngo, Zambia)

unreserved co-operation in your discharge of your noble task. We are confident that with your well-known diplomatic skill you will discharge your responsibilities in such a manner as to meet our expectations. I therefore wish you full success in the discharge of your great responsibilities.

I take this opportunity also to pay tribute to your predecessor, the Permanent Representative of the People's Republic of China, His Excellency Mr. Li Luye, for the able manner in which he directed the Council's proceedings for the month of January.

We have come to the Security Council to express our grave concern and worry at the worsening security situation in southern Africa, which is indeed a threat to international peace and security. In the recent past, a number of independent African countries in southern Africa have been threatened with military action by South Africa. The only offence that these countries have committed is that they have continued to abide by their international obligations to give sanctuary to South African refugees fleeing from the bestiality of the apartheid system in search of peace and dignity that they cannot find in the country of their birth. As loyal and faithful Members of the United Nations, we the front-line States are doing what the United Nations expects of us, namely, to abide by the accepted conventions which govern the status of refugees.

The threats by South Africa against front-line and other neighbour States in the area are real. The very fact that we have come to the Security Council is an indication that we take these threats very seriously. Indeed, the fact that we have brought the issue to the Security Council is a manifest demonstration of the fact that we reposit great faith in the Security Council. If South Africa wanted to live in peace with its neighbours, we would not be coming to the Security

(Mr. Ngo, Zambia)

Council so very often. But the truth is that South Africa does not want to live in peace. This is evidenced by the fact that while South Africa has made threats and carried out attacks against its neighbours, it has not honoured its peace agreements with some of those neighbours. Indeed, we have heard many promises from South Africa, but none has been fulfilled.

(Mr. Ngo, Zambia)

The racist régime has now embarked on a campaign to weaken its neighbours so that their opposition to the system of apartheid can be compromised. It is doing this, first, by intimidating and forcing its neighbours to sign peace agreements which it does not honour; secondly, by direct invasion; thirdly, by supporting dissidents like Jonas Savimbi in Angola; and, more recently, by economic blockades. The racist régime is also engaged in actions that have ranged from major acts of sabotage to the destruction of homes, clinics, schools, bridges, machinery and equipment. The régime's aim is to cause chaos in these States and therefore prevent a decent alternative to apartheid for the oppressed.

We should like members of this Council to understand that threats and unprovoked attacks against the front-line and other States by South Africa will not resolve anything. On the contrary, they will compound further the complex situation which is bound to result in an unwarranted generalized racial bloodbath in the region if they go unchecked. The Council should also be aware that South Africa's policy of aggression against and destabilization of its neighbours is in flagrant violation of the norms of international law, as well as of the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of the victimized States. The import of this untenable development is that the principle of non-intervention in the affairs of other States, which has served as one of the mainstays of stable inter-State relations, has been completely thrown overboard by racist South Africa.

It is therefore incumbent upon this Council to treat threats of attack against neighbouring States by racist South Africa with the utmost seriousness, because the régime is truly on the loose. More than ever before, the racist Pretoria régime is characterized by arbitrary detentions, banishments, uprooting of families, and the imposition of the state of emergency which has led to even more killings of innocent men, women and children in black townships. Those developments are indicative of the explosive ferment prevalent in South Africa today.

(Mr. Ngo, Zambia)

The situation in southern Africa with all its complexities and ramifications has three dimensions: first, there is the existence of the apartheid system in South Africa; secondly, there is the continuing illegal occupation of Namibia by racist South Africa against the will of the international community and, indeed, against the aspirations of the oppressed people of Namibia; and, thirdly, there is the spectre of South Africa's aggression against and destabilization of neighbouring independent States which are opposed to the obnoxious system of apartheid. The root cause of all these is the existence of apartheid, and we would like the Council to address this fact.

We genuinely believe that the United Nations is man's only hope. However, this hope can be realized only if States Members of the United Nations, particularly the permanent members of the Security Council, have the political will to make the Organization effective. In this respect, we are disappointed that up to now Security Council resolution 435 (1978) on the independence of Namibia has not been implemented. We are even more disappointed at the fact that the independence of Namibia is being tied to issues unrelated to resolution 435 (1978). As we have stated in the past, we are very much opposed to linking the independence of Namibia to the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola, just as we are opposed to the American policy of "constructive engagement" and the use of South Africa and dissidents like Savimbi to destabilize the front-line and other States in the region.

We are greatly pained at the fact that a big Power like the United States of America has chosen to identify itself with the racist régime in South Africa and using it, through dissidents like Savimbi, to destabilize independent African States in the region. The visit by Mr. Savimbi to the United States and the manner

(Mr. Ngo, Zambia)

in which he was received by the Administration are a demonstration of that fact. This is, no doubt, a hostile act by the American Administration against an independent and sovereign State. This is, indeed, a very sad development in international relations.

In the light of the threat to international peace and security in the region posed by the existence of apartheid in South Africa and acts of aggression against neighbouring States, it is more than imperative that the international community find a way of eradicating the system of apartheid. The most direct, potent and peaceful way of doing this is through the application of economic sanctions. We have however noted with disappointment that some countries have consistently blocked the imposition of comprehensive sanctions against South Africa on the false grounds that sanctions will hurt the black people of South Africa and neighbouring States which are economically dependent on South Africa. What is perhaps not fully appreciated is that the people who are supposedly being shielded from the repercussions of economic sanctions are ready to make sacrifices. To them, such sacrifices as those accompanying sanctions are acceptable - it is hoped, on a temporary basis - as against the alternative of continued enslavement, oppression and destruction of human lives and property. We are surprised that the same countries which have created the false impression that sanctions do not work have gone ahead and imposed sanctions against Cuba, Poland, Nicaragua and Libya. They have done so because they know that sanctions do work.

We have called for the imposition of comprehensive sanctions against South Africa, since it is the only remaining option to bring about peaceful change in South Africa. There is no doubt that African Governments have provided leadership and demonstrated their reasoned response to the tragedy in South Africa. As will

(Mr. Ngo, Zambia)

be recalled, the 1969 Lusaka Manifesto offered a non-violent approach to the solution of the southern African problem. Regrettably, the response was cold. It is important at this point, therefore, to underline the fact that calling for economic sanctions against South Africa is not a vindictive response to apartheid; in fact, it is a non-violent response which, if applied assertively and comprehensively, can contribute to a concerted international effort to bring about the changes required in South Africa's policies.

The fact is that South Africa itself has imposed some form of sanctions against its economically weak neighbours. We therefore strongly believe that the imposition of sanctions against South Africa is the only way that this Council can compel it to co-operate, not only in abandoning the system of apartheid but also in the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) on the independence of Namibia and, indeed, on abandoning its policy of aggression and destabilization in the area.

(Mr. Ngo, Zambia)

In concluding my statement, I would say once again that South Africa's system of apartheid and its policy of destabilization pose a great danger to our region. In desperation, the racist régime has now become more cruel and is now even threatening to take "appropriate action" against any country giving sanctuary to refugees fleeing from the atrocities of the apartheid régime. By "appropriate action" South Africa means military action. Only yesterday South Africa again threatened to raid independent African States in the region unless they agreed to a joint security organization. Defence Minister Malan, speaking in Parliament, stated:

"I would like to make a plea to neighbouring States not to ignore this offer. ... Otherwise our security forces will have no alternative but to engage, in our own interests, in cross-border actions against the enemies of South Africa".

But who wants a joint security organization? Definitely not the front-line States, because we have no intention of attacking South Africa. It is South Africa which should learn to live in peace with its neighbours.

As I said at the beginning of my statement, we have come to this Council to register our deep concern at the grave situation currently obtaining in southern Africa as a result of South Africa's attitude towards its neighbours. Apart from this, the racist South Africa has instigated tribes to fight against each other, resulting in the loss of many innocent lives. That is being done in order to consolidate the system of apartheid. Surely, this Council should take effective measures to put an end to the slaughter of innocent men, women and children by the racist South African régime. We therefore believe that this Council has an inescapable responsibility to consider all situations that threaten the preservation of international peace and security in the southern African region.

(Mr. Ngo, Zambia)

Let me end my statement by agreeing with the following suggestion made by our very able Secretary-General, Mr. Javier Pérez de Cuéllar, in his latest report on the work of the Organization:

"... the Security Council should, in the near future, make a deliberate and concerted effort to solve one or two of the major problems before it by making fuller use of the measures available to it under the Charter". (A/40/1, p. 3)

We wish to suggest that one such problem should be the eradication of apartheid.

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

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

Mr. BIRIDO (Sudan) (interpretation from Arabic): First, I wish to express sincere thanks to the Security Council for giving my delegation the opportunity of addressing it today on the situation in southern Africa. I also congratulate you, Sir, and the delegation of your friendly country on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month. Your statesmanship and diplomatic experience will stand the Council in good stead in shouldering its important responsibilities. I extend our thanks and appreciation also to your predecessor as President of the Council, Ambassador Li, the Permanent Representative of the People's Republic of China, a friendly country, for the able and effective way in which he led the Council's work last month.

Once again Africa comes to the Security Council with a request that it consider the developing situation in southern Africa. The continuing deterioration of conditions in the southern part of our continent compels us to turn to the Council once again. The fact that we do so testifies to our firm commitment to work through the Security Council and to our constant desire to see the Council

(Mr. Birido, Sudan)

discharging its duties and thereby sparing our region and the whole world the grave repercussions of those conditions.

The African Group takes no particular pleasure in having to resort repeatedly to the Security Council. Needless to say, however, the question of South Africa, with the various aspects of its development, is one of the highest priorities of the African continent, and indeed of the entire international community. This is borne out by the fact that of the 74 meetings held by the Security Council in 1985, 37, or half, were devoted to consideration of the situation of southern Africa.

Moreover, day in and day out we hear on news bulletins and see on television reports of the number of innocent persons in South Africa who have been killed at the hands of the racist Pretoria régime. According to The New York Times of 1 February 1985, 1100 human beings have been killed in the past 17 months as a result of this policy of terrorism.

The Security Council must not allow the murder of innocent persons in South Africa to become a routine daily event. Rather, it should seriously seek to put an end to the haemorrhaging in southern Africa, by adopting the necessary resolutions to eliminate the policy of apartheid and ensure independence for Namibia.

We heard the statement made by the Security Council on the occasion of the fortieth anniversary of its first meeting, as well as the International Year of Peace. I shall not dwell on the gravity of the situation in southern Africa or the need to deal with it with the necessary effectiveness if we are to translate the aspirations of the international community into concrete reality and to achieve the objectives of the International Year of Peace.

(Mr. Birido, Sudan)

Since the conclusion of the Summit Conference of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) in Addis Ababa last July, the African continent and the entire international community have been following the explosive situation in South Africa and the escalating revolution against the apartheid régime. The wide scope and broad dimensions of those developments constitute one of the most important political phenomena of the present international situation. Throughout the past year the current Chairman of the Organization of African Unity has been making constant efforts in regard to the development of events in southern Africa. That is reflected in his statement on the occasion of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations and his call for the international community to convene an international conference for sanctions against South Africa.

(Mr. Birido, Sudan)

The Chairman also paid a visit to the African front-line States. Since then, events in southern Africa have assumed a serious dimension, characterized by the fact that Pretoria has escalated the destabilization of the neighbouring States and the undermining of their security and integrity, as reflected in the Council by the complaints of Botswana, Lesotho and Angola about South Africa's repeated acts of aggression against them. Those acts culminated recently in Pretoria's arrogating to itself the right to take away the right of other States to grant asylum to those escaping the inferno of the policy of apartheid.

The Council should categorically reject the designs of Pretoria, its acts of aggression against the neighbouring States and the pretexts it uses in its violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the neighbouring States. South Africa, using distorted logic, is trying to legitimize its acts of aggression, which should be firmly deterred. It is incumbent upon the Council to take up a decisive position, condemning South Africa and reflecting the rejection by the international community of its practices and its doing as it pleases with the neighbouring States. We are confident that any failure to stand up to the escalating campaign waged by Pretoria against its neighbours will encourage the racist régime to persist in its aggression, which is a serious threat to the security of the area and of the whole world.

South Africa's threats against the African front-line States and its acts of aggression and blackmail against them are but an extension of the policy pursued by that abominable régime internally against the resolute African majority. Those threats and acts of aggression are also a reflection of the escalating internal resistance to the apartheid régime. That confirms that the problems of South Africa are internal, and not external. It seems clear that, while the acts of resistance against the régime have escalated, the Pretoria rulers have begun a

(Mr. Birido, Sudan)

reign of terror against the neighbouring States, in continuous attempts to bring them to submission. The acts of destabilization carried out by Pretoria have taken many forms, including all-out military aggression, economic blackmail, threats, provocation and acts of sabotage and destruction, in a continuous attempt to interfere in the policies of the front-line States and the other neighbouring States opposed to the apartheid policy pursued by South Africa.

The process of exporting violence and terrorism undertaken by the Pretoria régime against the neighbouring States will not solve the régime's problems. Rather, their solution lies in the elimination of the policy of apartheid and the achievement of Namibia's independence.

Last Friday we followed with interest the statement made by President Botha in the Parliament of the racist Pretoria régime. Regrettably, that statement in substance contained nothing new. It reaffirmed that the white minority is bent on depriving the people of South Africa of its right to equality, justice and freedom. The statement also introduced a new element. The apartheid régime had already linked Namibia's independence to the presence of foreign forces in Angola. This time the régime introduced a new element by making the release of the militant Nelson Mandela conditional on the fate of others, including one of the officers of South Africa who took part in an invasion of Angolan territory with the aim of destroying its economic installations.

By adopting such a position, the Pretoria régime provides categorical proof that it is not serious about dealing with the problems of South Africa, and that it aims to undermine the efforts to remedy the situation in its national and regional context and to place it in the context of the East-West conflict.

On the other hand, we believe that the statement of the President of the Pretoria régime is simply proof of the régime's weakness in its isolation, of the

(Mr. Birido, Sudan)

fact that it is groping in the dark and of the gravity of the crises and challenges facing it, as a result of the escalating resistance, the readiness of the peoples of South Africa and Namibia to provide martyrs every day, the military and economic boycott, the condemnation and denunciation by the States of the world of South Africa's racist policy and the reluctance of financial circles to deal with South Africa as a result of its lack of stability and the imposition of the state of emergency.

In those circumstances, the internal and international opposition to the policy of apartheid must be intensified, and support for the liberation movements, in their just struggle, and for the front-line States, in their steadfastness in the face of the vicious onslaughts of South Africa and its continuous aggression, must be increased.

While we appreciate certain States' actions and their adoption of economic sanctions, we hope that such measures will be broadened to include all aspects of military, technical and economic co-operation, because it has been proved that they are among the most effective means to employ against the South African régime in order to force it to make radical reforms that will result in equality for all the people of South Africa and security and stability in the region. They will also foster the promotion by the international community of human rights and the consolidation of peaceful coexistence among peoples, in addition to complying with the purposes and principles of the Charter and the imperatives of international peace and security.

In that regard, we wish to refer to the meeting between representatives of the front-line States and of the countries of the European Economic Community, held in Lusaka this week. We sincerely hope that the meeting will promote efforts to achieve Namibian independence and eliminate the abominable policy of apartheid in South Africa.

(Mr. Birido, Sudan)

The aggression and terrorism practised by the racist régime in the southern part of the continent are the same as the terrorism and aggression unleashed against the Arab States by the racist Zionist régime in occupied Palestine. The action yesterday by Israeli warplanes against a Libyan civil aircraft was nothing but an act of air piracy, a grave threat to the safety of aviation and an act of outrageous terrorism carried out by the Israeli authorities, in violation of resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council and the principles of international law, in a vain attempt to eliminate and liquidate the cause of the Palestinian people.

(Mr. Birido, Sudan)

Yesterday our Minister for Foreign Affairs issued a statement strongly condemning the act of air piracy and terrorism carried out by the Israeli authorities and calling upon the international community to condemn that act and take the measures necessary to prevent a repetition of it.

It is no less regrettable that at a time when the effort to achieve the independence of Namibia, overcome Pretoria's various manoeuvres, prevent South Africa from reaping the fruits of its aggression against neighbouring States and put an end to the abominable apartheid régime ought to be intensified, Jonas Savimbi's visit to the United States should have added a new dimension to the tension in the region, giving rise to feelings of bitterness and rejection among the States and peoples of Africa towards an act openly jeopardizing the security and stability of a State Member of this international Organization and its legitimate Government. The statement issued at the twenty-first African Summit Conference, held in July 1985, pointed out the danger that would result from the repeal of the Clark Amendment and the beginning of a series of acts of intervention in the internal affairs of Angola. That African summit conference statement clearly noted that this ran counter to the 1970 United Nations Declaration on friendly relations among States. The statement indicated also that any direct or indirect military, financial or other assistance by the United States Government, private groups or Government agencies would run counter to the United Nations Charter and the charter of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), and would constitute an act of aggression against the OAU and blatant intervention in the internal affairs of Angola. Savimbi's visit proved the accuracy of that statement by the OAU Heads of State or Government.

In this context, I would cite a Christian Science Monitor article by David D. Newson on the aid which could be provided to Savimbi:

(Mr. Birido, Sudan)

(spoke in English)

"Those opposing aid to Savimbi see the issue in Angola as but one part of a complex set of problems involving South Africa, Namibia and the 'front-line' black States of southern Africa. In their view, the United States could pay dearly in resuming such aid, both domestically and abroad. Increased aid known to be from the United States would no doubt bring a greater, not a lesser, Soviet effort on behalf of Angola. Current prospects for a negotiated settlement would recede, not advance. Help to Savimbi will definitely be seen in the region as support for South African objectives. This is not the time for the United States to increase its identification with the régime in Pretoria." (The Christian Science Monitor, 7 November 1985)

(continued in Arabic)

The winds of freedom have begun to blow strong in southern Africa; there is no way to stop them. It matters not how long the road and how great the sacrifices. That was clearly the view of Mr. Robert McNamara, former United States Secretary of Defense and former Head of the World Bank, who wrote upon his return from South Africa that

(spoke in English)

"The process of fundamental change has already started. It is irreversible, and it will not end until the blacks share political power with the whites... The success of the black nationalist struggle in South Africa can at most only be delayed - and at immense cost - but clearly not permanently denied.

"The final battle lines have not yet been drawn in South Africa. Fundamental political change, without prolonged large-scale violence, is still possible.

(Mr. Birido, Sudan)

"But time is running short, and the options are running out." (The New York Times, 14 August 1985)

(continued in Arabic)

I hope that we may all remember the clear, frank words of Bishop Tutu, spoken last month at a commemoration of the anniversary of the birthday of Dr. Martin Luther King. He said, with the confidence and sincerity of a revolutionary, that the people of South Africa will triumph and that he could almost see the dawn of freedom and victory which is about to break in the skies of his homeland. He said that when they celebrate their victory and their freedom, the peoples of South Africa and Namibia will remember with gratitude and appreciation all those who stood by them and helped them in their battles, struggle and sacrifice.

It is our hope that all the members of this Council will be among those remembered with gratitude and appreciation by the peoples of southern Africa.

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

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

Mr. von SCHIRNDING (South Africa): I should like, on behalf of the South African delegation, to convey to you, Sir, our best wishes on your assumption of the presidency for this month.

Is it not ironic that the Security Council should have been convened today to consider the situation in South Africa at a point in time when the State President of South Africa, in his opening address to Parliament on 31 January, made far-reaching proposals of historic significance for the future of South Africa and, indeed, the entire southern African region.

It is ironic, but, unfortunately, entirely predictable that the sponsors of this meeting should have convened the Security Council yet again in pursuance of their mindless vendetta against South Africa regardless - typically - of the consequences which their irresponsible actions may hold for the peoples of the region and quite oblivious of the true situation which prevails. But the international community cannot be fooled forever, and despite the worst efforts of our detractors, despite their falsifications and despite their manipulation of the truth, despite their hypocritical rhetoric and all the old clichés, the truth is beginning to seep through. And is it not for this very reason that they have called this meeting? What better stratagem than a Security Council smoke-screen to hide the truth. How convenient to take another swipe at South Africa in order to sweep one's own shortcomings under the carpet.

This meeting at this time is entirely uncalled for and should clearly not be taking place. It is a farce which makes a mockery of the principles governing the activities of the Security Council, which are surely, first and foremost, to promote the establishment and maintenance of international peace and security. The statements we have heard so far this morning from the representatives of Togo and Senegal and Zambia and Sudan have amply demonstrated the hypocrisy of this transparent charade.

(Mr. von Schirnding, South Africa)

It is precisely the goals of the maintenance of peace and security on which President Botha focused in his speech on 31 January. Let me list some of the more important reforms which have taken place in South Africa since President Botha assumed duty. First, there is the development of full black trade-union rights; the recognition of the permanence of urban blacks; the introduction of freehold title for blacks in urban areas; the evolution of black business rights; the scrapping of the Prohibition of Political Interference Act, the Mixed Marriages Act and the relevant provisions of the Immorality Act, to mention but a few. Furthermore, President Botha has confirmed that no South African will be excluded from full political rights and that all should participate both in Government and in the future of South Africa through their elected leaders.

Are these cosmetic changes, as our critics would have the world believe? Is it cosmetic that President Botha reiterated the Government's commitment to the equal provision of education for all population groups, despite the vast expenditures which this involves? Is it cosmetic that the so-called pass system will be scrapped by 1 July this year?

In addition, President Botha outlined the framework for further constitutional developments, and he gave some guidelines, from which I would like to quote. He said:

"We accept an undivided Republic of South Africa where all regions and communities within its boundaries form part of the South African State, with the right to participate in institutions to be negotiated collectively.

"We accept one citizenship for all South Africans, implying equal treatment and opportunities.

"We believe in the sovereignty of the law as the basis for the protection of the fundamental rights of individuals as well as of groups.

(Mr. von Schirnding, South Africa)

"We believe that human dignity, life, liberty and property of all must be protected, regardless of colour, race, creed or religion.

"We believe that a democratic system of government, which must accommodate all legitimate political aspirations of all South African communities, must be negotiated.

"All South Africans must be placed in a position where they can participate in Government through their elected representatives."

Finally, the President said:

"We have outgrown the outdated colonial system of paternalism as well as the outdated concept of apartheid."

These are not simply empty promises. These are pronouncements of a reformist President. For example, President Botha announced that he intended to negotiate the establishment of a national statutory council which, pending the creation of constitutional structures jointly to be agreed upon, would consider and advise on matters of common concern, including proposed legislation on such matters. The President proposed that this council should consist of members of the South African Government and of representatives of the self-governing national states, as well as leaders of other black communities and interest groups. Is that cosmetic? It is on the contrary, I submit, very clear that this is the first step towards institutionalized power sharing in South Africa.

As President Botha pointed out, there are no easy and simple solutions to our problems. We have no ready examples and models for us to reproduce, but we are ready and we are determined to address these challenges.

As far as our international relations are concerned, President Botha reaffirmed South Africa's commitment to international coexistence through co-operation and negotiation, particularly in the southern African sphere. But he also emphasized that there could be no peace and no stability in our region as long

(Mr. von Schirnding, South Africa)

as countries knowingly harbour terrorists who plan and execute acts of terror against a neighbouring State. He reiterated that, as far as South West Africa/Namibia is concerned, we remain prepared to implement Security Council resolution 435 (1978), provided agreement can be reached on Cuban withdrawal from Angola.

In more general terms, President Botha once again extended a hand of friendship to our neighbours and expressed the hope that the Governments of the region would give tangible expression to our common desire for peace and stability. This would include the withdrawal of all foreign forces from the region, the peaceful settlement of disputes, regional co-operation on common problems and an unequivocal ban on support for violence across national boundaries. More specifically, the President proposed the establishment of a permanent joint mechanism for dealing with matters of security, particularly threats to the peace and prosperity of the subcontinent.

I referred earlier in my statement to President Botha's speech as being of historic dimension for South Africa and, indeed, for all the peoples of southern Africa. Certainly no previous South African Government at any time in our history has taken such far-reaching and dramatic decisions. But transition to the new era which President Botha has foreshadowed can only be achieved by negotiation, and not by violence, and if this Council wishes to make a positive contribution to this end, it could best do so, not by passing negative resolutions, but by encouraging the people of South Africa towards negotiated political structures acceptable to all.

(Mr. von Schirnding, South Africa)

That was the thrust of President Botha's speech, and that is the policy of the South African Government. Threats of sanctions and other punitive measures will lead nowhere. South Africa has extended, once again, a hand of friendship. We have reaffirmed our commitment to reform at home and to peaceful coexistence with our neighbours.

In stark contrast, the African National Congress (ANC) has announced that it plans to intensify its campaign of violence and terror in South Africa. Is it not time that the members of this Council condemned such violence? Or does the Council condone the killing and maiming of innocent men, women and children by the ANC's murder squads, while it debates yet another draft resolution condemning South Africa? Responsible leaders of all South Africa's communities have expressed their abhorrence of these reprehensible acts of violence. But the Security Council of the United Nations remains eloquently silent.

Nevertheless, let me conclude on a more positive note.

Despite all the venomous rhetoric which has been directed at South Africa in this Council ad nauseam, I would still hope that President Botha's speech will be accepted at face value for what it is: a genuine reaffirmation and commitment to the reform of South African society in the social, economic and political spheres to provide fully, on a basis of co-operation and consultation at every level, for the aspirations of all the peoples of South Africa. We wish to live in peace with our neighbours, to co-operate with them and to assist them to the best of our ability. Those are our aims, and I would hope that the Security Council, if it genuinely has the interests of the peoples of southern Africa at heart, will see its way open to accord these aims the support which they deserve. We, for our

(Mr. von Schirnding, South Africa)

part, are committed irrevocably to political power-sharing. We are committed to reconciling and accommodating disparate conditions, and nothing will deflect us from our path.

Let me conclude with a comment made the other day by President Botha. He said, "I know there are some who say I should have gone further. Let them rest assured, I will go further. The wheel of reform is turning."

The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is Mr. Neo Mnumzana, to whom the Council has extended an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. MNUMZANA: On behalf of the African National Congress (ANC), its militants and combatants, and on behalf of the oppressed and struggling men, women and children of South Africa and their revolutionary army, Umkhonto we Sizwe, I wish to convey the warmest greetings to you, Mr. President, and to all delegations here present.

I also take this occasion to congratulate you, Mr. President, on your accession to the helm of the Security Council for the month of February. As a representative of the People's Republic of the Congo, a country always in the forward ranks of the struggle for the total liberation of Africa as well as for global peace and freedom, and given your distinguished record of service to your country's tradition of commitment to those noble ideals, I am convinced that your leadership will place the work of the Security Council in good stead. May I also most profoundly thank and congratulate your illustrious predecessor, the Permanent Representative of the People's Republic of China, who during his term of office executed his duties with characteristically exemplary distinction.

Through you, Mr. President, I also wish to thank the Security Council for allowing us to speak.

(Mr. Mnumzana)

I would like at this point, through the United States Mission, to convey our condolences to the people of the United States, particularly the kith and kin of those who lost their precious lives on the occasion of the tragedy that recently overtook the space shuttle "Challenger".

We have all just been witness to insolence and arrogance and to the insults that have been levelled at all of us here present by the representative of the apartheid régime. The Council will have no problem agreeing with me that to reply to such a provocation is to dignify it. I will content myself with noting at this stage that on 31 January the Head of State of apartheid gave us more of the same. In other words, he gave us another non-statement. And if there is anything far-reaching about what P. W. Botha did, it is that it drove my country deeper and deeper into darkness. Only in that sense was that statement far-reaching.

We have on several occasions asserted that the conspicuous reluctance of a certain handful of inordinately powerful Western nations to join the rest of the international community in resolute action against apartheid is bound to be seen by the Pretoria racist régime as permission to continue and escalate its criminal and murderous career against the people of South Africa, Namibia and the entire region of southern Africa as well as beyond it.

In the interim period the Pretoria racist régime has imposed and intensified a reign of terror against the Namibian and South African people, hoping to eradicate their native yearning to be free. Yet despite widespread and spreading apartheid State terrorism, the arbitrary arrest and detention without trial of patriots by the thousands, despite the assassination of over a thousand men, women and children in the last year alone, particularly since the state of emergency was declared, despite rigged treason trials, far from cowering into submission the South African people through mass united actions on all fronts, continue to

(Mr. Mnumzana)

escalate their struggle for a free, united, non-racial and democratic South Africa. As they make apartheid more and more unworkable, as they steadily corrode the racist régime's power to impose its illegal rule, the terrorists of Pretoria have responded with more and more blind fury. But the flaw of that fury is its blindness. The racist régime is deliberately blind to the historic fact that 334 years of foreign domination, white minority racist rule and apartheid have schooled our people, if that were ever necessary, in the truth that nothing is more precious than freedom, however high the price. In short, it refuses to countenance the fact that there is no just and lasting alternative to freedom. It thus refuses to acknowledge the fact that apartheid, particularly in its intransigence, is the fundamental problem in South Africa, Namibia and all of southern Africa. It refuses to realize that attempting through military muscle to impose itself as the solution can only compound the problem to the point at which all of southern Africa is plunged into a catastrophic bloodbath with global consequences.

(Mr. Mnumzana)

Having failed, despite the severest campaign of State repression and terrorism, to reverse the advance of our all-round liberation struggle, the butchers of Pretoria are now preparing to redouble their efforts to impose a pax apartheid on the whole region of southern Africa in a Fascist search for lebensraum. Opening the third session of the Eighth Parliament of the racist Republic of South Africa on 31 January 1986, P. W. Botha had occasion to say:

"I once again extend a hand of friendship to our neighbours. Let us come to an agreement on the specific rules of the game regulating the conduct of neighbours towards one another, rules that are honoured by all civilized nations. These include the withdrawal of foreign forces from the region, the peaceful settlement of disputes, regional co-operation on common problems, an unequivocal ban on support for violence across national boundaries and tolerance in the region".

Further on he said:

"Should this offer by the Republic of South Africa be ignored or rejected, we would have no choice but to take effective measures in self-defence to protect our country and population against threats."

P. W. Botha in typical manner is inverting reality and using that perverse inversion as a pretext to threaten more aggression against neighbouring States. The truth, however, remains obvious: apartheid is the fundamental problem, the menace to peace and security, the obstacle to progress and the antithesis of freedom in southern Africa. If apartheid is threatened, that threat is posed by the struggle of the South African and Namibian people for their freedom, and by definition that threat is domestic and not external.

Furthermore, the Pretoria racist régime, directly through its regular assassins or indirectly through its various gangs of mercenary bandits, is exclusively responsible for all acts of cross-border violence and for the illegal

(Mr. Mnumzana)

and military occupation of Namibia and parts of other countries in the same manner that it is currently occupying black townships and waging war against our people.

If the butchers of Pretoria were honest in their "proferring" of the olive branch to the neighbouring States, they would offer that olive branch first and foremost to the Namibian and South African people. Instead the Pretoria racist régime continues to visit death and destruction and every other conceivable woe on our people.

The meaning of Botha's offer to the neighbouring States is clear: the Pretoria racist régime intends to escalate further its campaign of destabilizing the neighbouring States through acts of heightened military aggression, intensified economic blackmail and sabotage as well as stepped-up political subversion. The Pretoria régime intends to subject these countries to this cruel fate quite simply because these countries remain steadfast in their commitment to carrying out their obligations under international law to give sanctuary to the victims of apartheid. Surely this is no less than an attack on international law itself.

In the name of international law, in the name of the sacred principle of territorial integrity and national sovereignty, in the name of the right of nations to self-determination, in the name of peace, freedom and progress, apartheid should not be allowed to pass. The international community should with one voice, through this supreme body of the United Nations, send an unequivocal warning to the Pretoria racist régime that the crimes of apartheid against the people of Namibia, South Africa and the front-line States, as well as other neighbouring States, cannot go unpunished.

At this time the ANC would like to pay tribute to all those States of southern Africa for their principled and heroic commitment to freedom and the upholding of international law. We reaffirm our militant solidarity with all of them and assure

(Mr. Mnumzana)

them that we shall honour their courageous sacrifices by destroying apartheid sooner rather than later.

Finally, we reiterate our solidarity with the struggle of the fraternal people of Namibia, led by the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), as well as with the struggle of the Palestinian people, led by the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO). Our solidarity goes also to all peoples everywhere struggling for a free, just, peaceful, abundant and prosperous future.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I thank Mr. Neo Mnumzana for the kind words he expressed to me.

The representative of Togo has asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply, and I now call on him.

Mr. KOUASSI (Togo) (interpretation from French): The representative of the racist régime spoke of falsification, hypocrisy, the distortion of reality and farce to deny that there were any grounds for convening the Council. I believe that my delegation, as well as the other representatives of Africa who have spoken this morning, have adequately explained and analysed the reasons that led us to call for this convening of the Council.

That representative referred also to the speech made recently by Mr. Botha and emphasized his achievements since he came to power. I must say that Mr. Botha and his representative have vivid imaginations. However, the international community is not gullible. The international community, which speaks through the General Assembly and the Security Council, has adopted many resolutions condemning South Africa for its apartheid policy, illegal occupation of Namibia and acts of aggression against neighbouring States.

In that statement of its representative South Africa has yet again provided us with proof of its continued determination to turn a deaf ear to the voice of wisdom.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): 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 held tomorrow, Thursday, 6 February, at 10.30 a.m.

The meeting rose at 1.30 p.m.