



## Security Council

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.2661  
12 February 1986

ENGLISH

---

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND  
SIX HUNDRED AND SIXTY-FIRST MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Wednesday, 12 February 1986, at 3.30 p.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  
Venezuela

Mr. WOOLCOTT  
Mr. GARVALOV  
Mr. FAN Guoxiang  
Mr. BIERRING  
Mr. RAPIN  
Mr. DUMEVI  
Mr. RABETAFIKA  
Mr. KASEMSARN  
Mr. MOHAMMED  
Mr. OLEANDROV  
Mr. AL-SHAALI  
  
Mr. GORE-BOOTH  
Mr. ROSENSTOCK  
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 4.25 p.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): In accordance with the decision taken at the 2652nd meeting, I invite the representative of Togo to take a place at the Council table.

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

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): In accordance with the decision taken at the 2652nd meeting, I invite the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia and the other members of the delegation of that Council to take a place at the Council table.

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

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): In accordance with decisions taken at previous meetings, I invite the representatives of Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Botswana, Cuba, Egypt, Ethiopia, the German Democratic Republic, Guyana, Hungary, India, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Lesotho, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Senegal, South Africa, Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the United Republic of Tanzania, 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. Djoudi (Algeria), Mr. de Figueiredo (Angola), Mr. Legwaila (Botswana), Mr. Velazco San José (Cuba), Mr. Badawi (Egypt), Mr. Dinka (Ethiopia), Mr. Huckle (German Democratic Republic), Mr. Karran (Guyana), Mr. Endreffy (Hungary), Mr. Verma (India), Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani (Islamic Republic of Iran), Mr. Van Tonder (Lesotho), Mr. Azzarouk (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), Mr. Dos Santos (Mozambique), Mr. Icaza Gallard (Nicaragua), Mr. Garba (Nigeria), Mr. Shah Nawaz (Pakistan), Mr. Samudio (Panama), Mr. Sarré (Senegal), Mr. von Schirnding (South Africa), Mr. Birido (Sudan), Mr. El-Fattal (Syrian Arab Republic), Mr. Skofenko (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic), Mr. Fom (United Republic of Tanzania), Mr. Golob (Yugoslavia), Mr. Ngo (Zambia) and Mr. Mudenge (Zimbabwe) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received a letter from the representative of Tunisia in which he requests to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite 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 Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Karoui (Tunisia) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council Chamber.

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

The first speaker is Mr. Theo-Ben Gurirab, the Permanent Observer of the South West Africa People's Organization to the United Nations, to whom the Security Council, at its 2660th meeting, 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. GURIRAB: It gives me great pleasure, on behalf of the Central Committee of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) of Namibia, to congratulate you, Sir, most warmly on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of February. We are confident that the Council will benefit from your able stewardship and wide experience. You hail from a country which, even if it is not a front-line State in a technical sense, is nevertheless in the forefront, rendering material assistance and political support to the struggle of the Namibian people, through SWAPO, their sole and authentic representative. Suffice it to say that, in the very near future SWAPO, with the assistance and co-operation of other friendly countries and the United Nations, will establish a technical secondary school in your great country to train our cadres in relevant fields in preparation for future responsibilities in an independent Namibia. I wish you great success in discharging your heavy responsibilities during the days ahead, and no less for the amicable conclusion of this debate.

Allow me also, with the Council's kind indulgence, to express the appreciation of the SWAPO delegation to Mr. Li Luye, the Permanent Representative of the People's Republic of China, for his outstanding leadership of the Council during the month of January.

(Mr. Gurirab)

The tragedy that befell the American people with the demise of the space explorers on the Challenger was a common tragedy of humanity. As a people whose entire history is marked by continuing colonial violence, including massacres and perpetual suffering, we know only too well how devastating and complete the loss and sadness are that come with the death of loved ones. Through the United States delegation, we send our condolences to the bereaved families.

It is quite late in the debate. I know that at this stage virtually everything worth mentioning on the issue has already been said eloquently and convincingly by speakers who have preceded me; in other words, the case has already been made. It will soon be up to the Council to decide on the merits of the case.

You, Mr. President, and the other members of the Security Council will understand if I insist on speaking at this late stage. The item under consideration is "The situation in southern Africa". My country, Namibia, is one of the central problems in that situation, the other two problems being the evil system of apartheid itself and the Botha régime's policy of aggression and destabilization against the front-line and other neighbouring African States. That is why we in SWAPO felt it imperative that we put on record the viewpoint of the oppressed but resisting Namibian people we have the honour of leading as their national liberation movement at home and abroad.

They are happy that the Council is seized of the critical situation in our region; they are encouraged to hear strong sentiments of support reiterated here by representatives of States that have always championed our cause; but, above all, they are awaiting decisive action that will bring liberation, justice, peace and co-operation to southern Africa. That is the ultimate goal that all of us in the region wish to see realized, and the sacrifices that our peoples are making are not

(Mr. Gurirab)

in vain. The victory is certain, but meanwhile the enemy is still engaged in manoeuvrings and stubbornly refusing to heed the handwriting on the wall.

Why are we here once again before the Council, devoting so much of our precious time and our energies to the apartheid régime and its sordid criminal record in southern Africa, rather than putting our heads together in a genuine search for practical ways and means of uplifting our spirits and constructively contributing to improving the human condition - that is, by ending war, poverty, disease, hunger, illiteracy and the exploitation of man by man? As long as we have the Bothas of this world and those who aid and abet them, I am afraid we are going to have to return time and again, putting our complaints before the Security Council and asking for enforcement measures provided for in the United Nations Charter.

The reasons that prompted the convening of this series of meetings have been set forth by you, Mr. President, at the outset, and by preceding speakers. In particular, the permanent representatives of the front-line States and the spokesmen of the national liberation movements have presented factual and up-to-date accounts on the Botha régime's policies and practices associated with the repugnant apartheid system, State terrorism, illegal colonial oppression and various forms of destabilization, subversion and economic strangulation throughout southern Africa.

The statement made by the representative of the racist Pretoria régime on the first day of this debate was entirely devoid of sincerity and truth. Like his master's speech of 31 January 1986, his statement was a mere repetition of the customary cynicism and obfuscation. We reject their nefarious utterances with the contempt they deserve, especially in the light of the revelations made by

(Mr. Gurirab)

Mr. Slabbert, former leader of the white opposition, about South Africa's true intentions - namely, that the promises made in that statement of 31 January 1986 were intended to deceive the black majority, on the one hand, and to win favours from the Western bankers who were expected to meet in the near future to consider South Africa's debt problems, on the other.

(Mr. Gurirab)

In recent weeks threats by the racist Pretoria régime against its peaceful neighbours, economic blockades, military invasion and occupation and other repeated acts of aggression have increased in frequency and assumed greater intensity. That is why we have come back to the Security Council. That militarist behaviour is a clear violation of the United Nations Charter, the tenets of international law, decisions of the Security Council and resolutions of the General Assembly as well as the letter and spirit of all the seminal conventions and protocols on peace and security and human rights of the United Nations. Of course, not only is it an outright violation of all that, but this reckless behaviour on the part of the apartheid régime also poses a serious threat to peace and stability in the region and to international peace and security.

African leaders and spokesmen predicted years ago that the situation in our region would go from bad to worse and that the ensuing violence would result in the loss of many lives, not only of blacks but of whites, destruction of property and a marked diminution of whatever remains of trust and confidence between the races.

Others have confirmed that ominous forecast. Robert McNamara, the former United States Secretary of Defense and former President of the World Bank, for one, made a prophetic observation a few years ago during his visit to South Africa. The ruling Afrikaner clique was incensed by his remarks, but what is happening today on the ground in Botha's apartheid State, and the reaction of the international community to that situation, attests to the correctness of his observation.

But, of course, not everybody sees it in that way. The racists, their capitalist collaborators and those who continue to rely on military intervention to continue the plunder of raw materials world-wide are preoccupied with mineral rights over human rights, profits over freedom.

How can we as African people forget the Atlantic slave trade, the Middle Passage, the Triangular Trade, colonial conquest, theft and the bondage of Africa



(Mr. Gurirab)

and its children? This is more than a holocaust. We need to invent a new terminology to chronicle this complete destruction of African lives and the negation of our history. Shall we ever know how many Africans died through it all? And what about the price tag on the stolen wealth and profit expropriated over the centuries by Western Europeans and North Americans? We seek co-operation, because the Western States and their companies are uninvited guests in Namibia, but they have no moral claim to be our saviours.

This is hardly a mere recitation of ancient history, nor is it an absurd melodrama being played to the gallery. Namibia is not free. To us, it is still one continuous agony of the killings of innocent men, women and children. It means the massive militarization of our country, the vicious police and the endless chain of murder squads being unleashed on the Namibian patriots by the agents of the racist régime of Pretoria. This is continuing, while Namibia's natural resources are being plundered by racist South Africa's firms and by transnational corporations from Western Europe and North America. Namibians are dying and suffering daily at the hands of the racists and their mercenary agents. They, the racists, draw inspiration from the same general source as their predecessors who organized the Atlantic slave trade and brought the colonial system of imperialism to Africa - namely, the Judaic-Christian ethic, Western civilization and capitalism.

While the Boers are killing us off, improving in this regard on the shortcomings of the German butchers of Imperial Germany, the plunder of Namibia's natural resources continues unabated. Our independence is being delayed indefinitely in order for this programme to be continued, regardless of the cost in human lives.

I invite all those who are interested in finding out about the extent of the plunder that is going on in Namibia to look at the reference book on major transnational corporations operating in Namibia, published by the United Nations

(Mr. Gurirab)

last year and prepared by the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia, on behalf of the United Nations Council for Namibia. Similarly, I ask representatives to look at the proceedings and final documents of the hearings conducted last fall by the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations on such corporations operating in South Africa and Namibia. Those corporations are there to enrich themselves, not for the welfare of the Namibian masses.

Namibia is a resource-rich country. It is endowed with abundant natural wealth, including uranium, diamonds, copper, lead, zinc, coal and manganese and other strategic metals, as well as agricultural and fishery products. Of course, the recent discoveries of offshore oil and natural gas and gold deposits in Namibia will bring more, not less, suffering and impoverishment of our people. The richer they become, the poorer we become.

This has been one continuous colonial legacy in Namibia from the times prior to 1884, and particularly since the Berlin Conference for the scramble for Africa.

The racists and their capitalist collaborators will, naturally, continue to fabricate falsehoods to justify their crimes, in hopes of perpetuating domination and exploitation. The linkage pre-condition, which is today the primary stumbling-block to our freedom, is such a falsehood. From nowhere, the United States Administration and the Botha régime have linked our independence to the withdrawal of the Cuban internationalist forces from the People's Republic of Angola.

We are called, by those very same people, terrorists and many other things for daring to fight to liberate our own country. We are called terrorists for daring to talk about the massacres of our people, about the plunder that is going on and about the hypocrisy of the West. We are not terrorists; we are freedom fighters, in the noble tradition of our forebears, such as Morenga, Maharero, !Nanse, otherwise known as Witbooi, Mandume, Kutako, Goresseb and many others who dared to rise up in opposition to colonial conquest and exploitation.

(Mr. Gurirab)

For our part, we are determined to forge ahead with the struggle. Armed struggle will continue to be the mainstay of our patriotic struggle. The combatants of the People's Liberation Army of Namibia remain firm in their resolve to implement in the field the decisions and instructions of the Central Committee. We are very serious about liberating our motherland - through the ballot or through the bullet.

We remain ready to implement Security Council resolution 435 (1978), but for now the enemy has left us with no alternative but to intensify the armed struggle. At this juncture, I wish to renew our confidence in and readiness to co-operate with the Secretary-General in his tireless efforts to expedite the independence of Namibia on the basis of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

In his New Year message, the President of SWAPO, Comrade Sam Nujoma, proclaimed 1986 as the year of general mobilization and decisive action for final victory. That is our resolve; the struggle will be further intensified on all fronts, at home and abroad, in fields including the political, military and diplomatic.

The International Year of Peace, 1986, is also the twentieth anniversary of the launching of the armed struggle by SWAPO in Namibia, on 26 August 1966. It happens also to be the twentieth anniversary of the termination of racist South Africa's Mandate over Namibia by the General Assembly on 27 October 1966. Let us together ensure that 1986 should be the year of the long-delayed independence of Namibia. To that end, binding sanctions imposed by the Security Council under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter will complement our own efforts aimed at fostering the speedy realization of that cherished goal.

Now, I should like to say a word about the puppets of the so-called interim government in Windhoek, Namibia. I do not wish to say much beyond recalling what one commentator has said about them:

(Mr. Gurirab)

"All that the puppets have been able to do over the past six months ... is to improve their own standard of living. They have done this remarkably well. From a status of paupers a few months ago, their standard of living has risen to an annual personal income of up to 60,000 rand, handsome pay indeed for doing no work at all."

What a scandal! It is amazing: Millions of dollars are being spent through a dubious public relations firm in Windhoek called Transnational Consultancy, hired by the puppet administration ostensibly to look at "the overall co-ordination of the foreign consultancy operation". The co-ordinator is one Sean Cleary, who until June 1985 was the South African political operative in the office of the so-called Administrator General in Windhoek. He is busy setting up or reorganizing propaganda offices in Washington, London, Paris and Bonn to sell the puppet group abroad in the major Western States as the legitimate government of Namibia. Both the racists and their puppets are doomed. Our people know who they are; their days are numbered. What a waste of money!

Let me associate myself with the strong sentiments expressed throughout this debate in connection with the Angolan renegade, Savimbi, and his UNITA mercenary bandits. Savimbi is a loser; he is a terrorist; he is a traitor; he is a Pretoria mercenary; he is an opportunist; he was and continues to be a witting advocate of collaboration with the forces of colonialism and imperialism. Finally, Savimbi has betrayed the African revolution and is truly a factor in the continuing delay of Namibia's independence. Those who befriend him and are willing to give him military and financial support are enemies of Africa, and they are directly responsible for prolonging the suffering of my people.

We stand with the MPLA Worker's Party, the Government and the fraternal people of Angola. Africa, and all the world's peoples that love peace and uphold justice,

(Mr. Gurirab)

stand behind the Angolan people in their struggle to defend their sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence. That is consistent with the decision taken at the summit conference of the Organization of African Unity held in July 1985 at Addis Ababa, following the precipitous repeal of the Clark Amendment.

The non-aligned members of the Security Council have submitted a draft resolution which is constructive and balanced. I hope it will be adopted unanimously with a view to sending a serious and categorical message to Pretoria.

In the meantime, the struggle continues; the victory is certain.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I thank Mr. Gurirab for the kind words he addressed to my country and to me personally.

Mr. AL-SHAALI (United Arab Emirates) (interpretation from Arabic): Today the Council is considering an important matter, a matter rightly considered to be the greatest challenge to mankind of our times. Racism is rooted in the theories and philosophies of the Dark Ages and attempts to impose them upon the modern world. Any adjective we might use to describe the crime of apartheid would understate the reality of the tragedy in southern Africa.

We believe that proper consideration of this question should begin right here in the Security Council, in the framework of the concepts of the United Nations Charter, concepts accepted by society as an alternative to war and disputes. As we commemorate the fortieth anniversary of the Organization, and of this Council, the world, we believe, is fast sliding towards acceptance of perilous ideas. It tends to avoid its responsibilities; it leaves the door wide open, inviting the parties to international disputes to solve their problems on their own.

(Mr. Al-Shaali, United Arab Emirates)

We believe there is a grave tendency for the Council to wash its hands of its responsibilities and to leave States to deal with their problems bilaterally. This is reminiscent of the situation that prevailed prior to the Second World War, when, owing to the inability of the international community, as represented therein, to deal with international problems and disputes, the League of Nations collapsed, leaving the door wide open to the settlement of those problems and disputes by armed struggle. One of the most dangerous of the concepts that emerged in political thinking after the Second World War was that which distinguished between regional and global conflicts and considered regional wars phenomena that could be contained or neutralized as long as they did not affect urban or industrial centres in developed countries. That concept has resulted in hundreds and thousands of people being killed, maimed or displaced in the countries of the third world. Unfortunately, it continues to be regarded as natural in the developed countries.

The dire situation in southern Africa, in all its dimensions, is an embodiment of that concept, a phenomenon that some continue to refuse to comprehend or to grant its due importance. The problem in southern Africa can be described as a triangle. The base is the apartheid régime, and the two sides are the occupation of Namibia and the destabilization of the neighbouring African States. The base of the triangle is a system whose proponents have given a name that is very hard to translate into any other language. The word is "apartheid," literally, "apartness," the separation of those who are white from those who are not. That word was created on 26 March 1943, when its proponents used it to baptize their philosophy. The word was uttered for the first time in the South African Parliament on 25 January 1944 when Dr. Malan, the then-Prime Minister of South Africa, described the State he envisaged as a State designed, in his words,

(Mr. Al-Shaali, United Arab Emirates)

(spoke in English)

"to ensure the safety of the white race and Christian civilization by the honest maintenance of the principle of apartheid and guardianship."

(continued in Arabic)

The philosophy of apartheid is based on the concept that the people of South Africa do not and cannot constitute one society with one nationality. That people is made up of groups of whites and non-whites. The members of the white minority, the "civilized group" according to the philosophy, must live in their own districts and enjoy the country's wealth and all rights. The non-white majority must live in their own segregated areas and they must be the slaves of the white minority. Such beliefs were summed up by a former Prime Minister of South Africa, Verwoerd, when, speaking in Parliament on 25 January 1963, he stated:

(spoke in English)

"We want to keep South Africa white. Keeping it white can only mean one thing, namely, white domination - not leadership, not guidance, but control and supremacy."

(continued in Arabic)

That is the historical background of the philosophy of apartheid, the dimension of which is still being ignored in some quarters. Based on that logic of discrimination, the law calling for the geographical distribution of the population on the basis of colour was adopted in 1913; the so-called "White Spots and Black Spots" legislation was passed in 1966; the law setting up the bantustans took effect in 1951; and in 1983 the so-called constitutional amendments were adopted, amendments that deny the black majority's right to vote and to participate in Government.

(Mr. Al-Shaali, United Arab Emirates)

Here, we must take a closer look at the so-called constitutional amendments, because they have benefited from a huge amount of propaganda. We should clarify the truth about them. We believe them to be a consolidation of the apartheid régime. The truth of the matter is that the tricameral Parliament contains not even a single representative of the blacks of South Africa, who represent 73 per cent of the population - 23 million people out of a total population of 31 million. That Parliament has 128 white members who represent the white population that totals no more than 15.3 per cent of the population. There are 85 representatives for the coloureds and 45 for the Indians.

In implementing its policy of repression to impose the new régime, South Africa carried out a forced displacement of the black majority. We recall the mass displacement of blacks to the bantustans, when, in 1948, three and a half million blacks were uprooted and scattered in remote desert regions to clean up for the whites. On 14 February 1984 the police evacuated the population of the village of Mogoba to an arid area 200 miles away. As a result of such actions, the white minority now controls 87 per cent of the territory of South Africa, including the arable land, mines and factories. Some 12 million blacks live in difficult circumstances in the suburbs of white cities, while the remainder of the black population live in bantustans that lack everything but the suffering of their populations.

All this is taking place in the framework of a police régime that has the right to decide whether any opposing organization is legitimate or not, the right to imprison anyone, to ban newspapers, to arrest eyewitnesses and anyone else, all without trial or legal process, under a number of discriminatory laws, including the Terrorism Act of 1967, the Law on Subversive Organizations, the Law of Rightful Assembly and the 1982 internal security laws.



(Mr. Al-Shaali, United Arab Emirates)

History has shown that expansionism and apartheid go hand in hand. The territory set aside for the white settlers, once limited to 6,000 acres in the Cape peninsula, was expanded to encompass 472,359 square miles of South Africa, in addition to 318,099 square miles of Namibia. And now we come to the first side of the triangle. Under the pretext of protecting white civilization, the Government of South Africa is plundering the resources of Namibia. It is imposing the apartheid régime through puppet political parties. It is forcing thousands of Namibians to abandon their villages and towns to facilitate the process of so-called white development. The Government has exiled Hereros to the desert and confiscated the land of the Namas for the use of white farmers. It bombed villages in Ovamboland to displace their inhabitants and forced them to work for a pittance in the mines and farms of the whites.

The second side of the triangle is the policy of destabilization being pursued by the South African Government against its neighbours, and the constant threat used against those States to strangle them economically, to force them to succumb to the policy of apartheid and to prevent them from giving refuge to those fleeing the agony of apartheid. It is difficult to touch upon every facet of such practices and acts of aggression, but let me cite a few examples. In August 1975 the Government of South Africa dispatched more than 6,000 troops to invade Angola to prevent the establishment of an independent Government by the Angolan liberation movement. That act led Angola to request assistance from abroad.

(Mr. Al-Shaali, United Arab Emirates)

In 1977, 1981 and 1983, the army of South Africa, as well as its agents, carried out repeated attacks against Angola. The Government of the apartheid régime deployed an army of occupation in southern Angola, killing thousands of citizens, destroying roads, hospitals, schools and the infrastructure. The Government of the apartheid régime trains, arms and finances the puppet UNITA bandits on a large scale. The latest operations of those bandits were the car bombings of 18 January of this year.

According to official reports of the United Nations the destruction resulting from the acts of aggression by South Africa against the countryside of Angola has cost \$7 billion (The Economist, 16 July 1983). Likewise, in Mozambique, in January 1981, bandits of South Africa attacked Maputo, killing 13 people. In May 1983 South Africa attacked Maputo again, using its air force, destroying a factory and killing six people under the pretext of pursuing members of the African National Congress (ANC). In December 1982 South Africa attacked Maseru, the capital of Lesotho, and killed 42 persons, of whom 12 were Lesotho nationals and 30 refugees. The same act was repeated on 20 December 1985, when the forces of South Africa slaughtered six citizens of South Africa and three of Lesotho.

The series of aggressions continues against Mozambique, Lesotho and Zimbabwe through systematic campaigns of terrorism and sabotage, through the destruction of vital installations such as railways, pipelines and power lines and the terrorizing of civil servants, foreign technicians and teachers, as well as the sabotaging of transport networks, in particular, the obstruction of the Port of Beira and the Beira pipeline in Zimbabwe. South Africa has committed such acts through the use of agents and mercenaries. It has established four training camps within South Africa where 5,000 former troops of the infamous army of Ian Smith are being trained.

(Mr. Al-Shaali, United Arab Emirates)

The human mind cannot conceive of the existence of such a situation when mankind is on the threshold of the twenty-first century. However, regrettably that is the situation in southern Africa. The international community has collectively condemned the apartheid régime and its crimes against the people of South Africa and its neighbouring States in 22 resolutions of this Council since it first met to consider the situation in southern Africa in April 1960, after the Sharpeville massacre. That condemnation has also been expressed in 18 resolutions of the General Assembly. Those resolutions are not in themselves sufficient to deal with the situation and to put an end to the crime against humanity in that part of the world. What is needed most is their implementation. They require those States which continue to pursue a policy of understanding and reasoning with the Government of South Africa to abandon it and to slam the door on conciliation through the adoption of clear measures to bring pressure to bear on the Government of South Africa, and, through a complete boycott, to make it abandon its racist policies.

The United Arab Emirates, like other non-aligned countries, declares anew its firm condemnation of the policy of apartheid and the policy of destabilization of neighbouring States pursued by the Government of South Africa. We also condemn the occupation of Namibia. While the United Arab Emirates affirms its complete support for the fighters for freedom and justice in southern Africa, it declares that the return of stability to southern Africa is inextricably linked to termination of apartheid.

The international community as represented in this Council is called upon to adopt all necessary measures to put an end to the tragedy in South Africa. This

(Mr. Al-Shaali, United Arab Emirates)

cannot be done but through the adoption of appropriate measures, among them the application of Chapter VII of the Charter to bring the racists in South Africa back to their senses.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The next speaker is the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. EL-FATTAL (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic):

Mr. President, I thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak before this Council, which is meeting once again to consider the persistence of the Pretoria régime in its policies of oppression, racism and colonialism directed against millions of our African brothers who continue to struggle and to face up to the colonialist presence and racist policies in the southern African region. We participate in this debate to express our deepest concern vis-à-vis the situation prevailing in southern Africa and the policy of racial segregation imposed on the proud people of southern Africa, that people in revolt.

The situation has been worsened by the acts of aggression of South Africa against neighbouring States, its threats to continue such acts and to besiege and apply pressures on their peoples, and its sabotaging of economic and social infrastructures. The reason for all this is that those States are committed to providing a safe haven - a principle accepted internationally - to those who have been oppressed and dispersed by the racist régime and those who are in danger because of their opposition to that régime.

Serious threats, dangerous threats, compel us and our African brothers to return to the Security Council and ask it to consider the continued deterioration

(Mr. El-Fattal, Syrian Arab Republic)

of the situation in southern Africa, which requires the Council to live up to its responsibility to save the region and the world as a whole from serious repercussions and complications.

Fully half of the many meetings of the Security Council last year were devoted to considering the situation in southern Africa and to deterring continuing acts of aggression by South Africa and its abhorrent racist régime. The other half of those meetings was devoted to considering the Israeli aggression against the Arab nation and the continuing occupation by the Zionists of the lands of Palestine, Syria and southern Lebanon.

Since March of last year the world has been following the explosive situation inside South Africa and the escalating revolution against the régime of racial segregation. That is a revolution by all sectors of the population in South Africa. It is a revolution against injustice, colonialism, exploitation and slavery. It is a revolution aimed at defending the integrity of the land.

The policy of racist South Africa has led to the death of 1,100 martyrs in the last 17 months. The situation in southern Africa can be summed up as follows:

First, the abhorrent apartheid régime continues most ferociously to apply racial segregation. It continues its racist and oppressive practices, despite the fact that the international community considers apartheid a crime against mankind and racial segregation as an evil and a stain on the conscience of mankind. The policy of racial segregation of the South African régime is a source of tension and instability. It is a threat to peace and security not only in that country and region but throughout the world.

(Mr. El-Fattal, Syrian  
Arab Republic)

The international community in general and the Security Council in particular, by their very responsibilities are responsible for eradicating that régime - which is indeed a crime against humanity.

The current painful situation prevailing in South Africa is that that régime denies and excludes the majority from participating in decision-making. The massacres continue unchecked. Last year the only development we witnessed was the escalation of violence and oppression in South Africa accompanied by political and propaganda manoeuvres aimed at spreading the fallacy that apartheid is open to reform. However, in effect apartheid cannot be reformed. Apartheid must be dismantled. Apartheid must be eliminated and thrown on the garbage heap of history.

In the continuing noble struggle by the majority against oppression and exploitation and the denial of its right to the full exercise of self-determination, those opposing racial discrimination have been arbitrarily thrown into prison without trial. They have been subjected to barbaric massacres, in addition to death sentences handed down to the freedom fighters, resulting in thousands of victims during the past 12 months. All those who dare to call for justice and equality - thousands of schoolchildren, women, workers and scholars - have been subjected to the sadistic practices of the Pretoria régime. The Reuters news agency reported on 5 January 1986 that of the 11,000 Africans who were detained last year 11 died while in the custody of the security forces. It is clear that the list of martyrs among those detained will grow longer because of the arrogance of that régime and its supporters.

The crime of racial discrimination is indeed not limited to the African continent. As a matter of fact, the logic of Zionism as a concept is just as dangerous and as racist as apartheid. To a large extent it is the real reason for the struggle in the Middle East, just as racial discrimination and segregation is the real reason for conflict and tension in South Africa and the region as a whole.

(Mr. El-Fattal, Syrian  
Arab Republic)

Secondly, there is the illegal occupation of Namibia. The Pretoria régime, openly supported by the United States of America, continues to place stumbling-blocks in the path of the Namibian people regaining its usurped rights, in particular its rights to freedom, independence and the integrity of its land, in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which includes the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia.

The Pretoria Government has aborted all efforts to implement the United Nations plan by raising issues that are totally extraneous to resolution 435 (1978). We have in particular linking the withdrawal of the Cuban forces - which are in Angola legitimately - with the withdrawal from Namibia of racist forces occupying the land by force, stifling in every possible way the aspirations of the Namibian people and usurping its land, people and natural resources through the fiercest means.

Thirdly, we have the continuing acts of aggression against neighbouring States, as well as the destabilization of those States. Developments in southern Africa have taken a most serious turn owing to Pretoria's escalation of acts of destabilization against neighbouring States and attempts at undermining their security and safety. This is clearly reflected in the continued complaints by Botswana, Lesotho and Angola to the Security Council. In the most recent period, those practices reached their peak, because Pretoria has arrogated to itself the right to invade neighbouring States or to threaten invasion if those States continue to provide the right of refuge to those fleeing the heinous policies of apartheid. The racist régime has undertaken many acts of aggression against neighbouring States, destroying homes, bridges and infrastructures and causing chaos and upheaval in those States so as to prevent them from supporting those who oppose the policies of apartheid.

(Mr. El-Fattal, Syrian  
Arab Republic)

The long series of acts of oppression perpetrated by that racist régime against neighbouring States to impose its hegemony on southern Africa is indeed aimed at two particular objectives: first, to perpetuate the apartheid régime, which allows them to enslave Africans in southern Africa and pillage the riches of its peoples; secondly, to weaken the neighbouring States in southern Africa to prevent them from supporting the liberation of Namibia and implementing the relevant Security Council and General Assembly resolutions.

World imperialism has chosen to prolong the struggle in order to maintain the puppet régime in South Africa. It has resorted and will continue to resort to impeding any serious international effort and to preventing the application and imposition of comprehensive sanctions. Washington, which supports the racist régime in Pretoria by every means, remains committed to the policy of "constructive engagement", which has proved to be a failure. What is the visit to the United States capital, by the ringleader of highwaymen and bandits, Savimbi - the warmth with which he was received, the money he was promised - but undeniable proof of this collusion with and unlimited support for those who create chaos and instability and attempt to impose hegemony on the region as a whole? Instead of imposing sanctions against South Africa the United States of America is now denying Angola the right to exploit its own national oil, which generates income of \$2 billion annually. All that is done in support of South Africa; it is done through starving the people of Angola and the occupation by bandits of parts of that great country. Washington is thereby committing an act of aggression against an independent sovereign State. It is a most dangerous turning-point in the region clearly demonstrating that the United States of America insists on involving itself overtly in opposing the people of Angola.



(Mr. El-Fattal, Syrian  
Arab Republic)

The Security Council must condemn and totally reject the plans and policies of Pretoria and Washington and the acts of aggression committed against neighbouring States. The Security Council must unmask the specious pretexts used by Pretoria and Washington in their violations of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the front-line States. The Security Council must take a decisive stand; it must condemn South Africa; it must reflect the international community's rejection of those practices. The Security Council must decide to impose the sanctions provided for under Chapter VII of the Charter, since this is the only way to make South Africa understand, just as it is the only way to make Tel Aviv understand.

The Syrian Arab Republic pays tribute to the victims of racist oppression in South Africa. We also stand in admiration of the heroic struggle by the people of Azania - the children, the youth, the women and the elderly - against the racist killers and the bands supported by the racist régime. We stand by the side of the people of South Africa just as we stand by the side of the people of Palestine. We consider the struggle against those two régimes as a struggle against a joint enemy - the enemy that has usurped land and attempted to profane Holy Places and freedoms. We are convinced that victory will come to those who are struggling to regain their legitimate rights. This is a position of principle. However, international imperialism attempts to undermine our struggle. We know, just as the African people know, that this joint struggle is a struggle for destiny. We shall either survive or perish; but survive we will, because this is the logic of history.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The next speaker is the representative of Afghanistan. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. ZARIF (Afghanistan): I wish first of all to express my delegation's satisfaction at seeing you, Sir, presiding over the Security Council this month and to state how confident we are that your able hands will guide the work of the Council towards the achievement of the long-awaited results.

We wish also to place on record our appreciation of the manner in which Ambassador Li Luye of China performed his duties as President of the Council during the month of January.

May I also thank you, Mr. President, and, through you, the Council for having invited the delegation of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan to participate in the discussion of the situation in southern Africa.

Repeated recourse to the Security Council to lodge protests against and seek reparations for the consequences of mischievous and illegal actions on the international plane seems to be the most logical way of dealing with situations that pose a danger to international peace and security. Some may think, however, that such recourse is a hapless act, a reflection of despair at the culprit party's mustering greater economic and military might. Nevertheless, it is undeniable that recourse to the Security Council for justice is totally in conformity with the provisions of the United Nations Charter and is thus not only legal, but also appropriate.

A brief glance at the Security Council's records indicates that such an approach has from time to time delivered us from the outbreak of violence and tension in different parts of the world. With every measure of success in this regard, the faith and trust of the international community, particularly its weak and oppressed members, in the Security Council have substantially increased.

(Mr. Zarif, Afghanistan)

Regrettably, however, there is another process in action which is diametrically opposed to the trend I have just mentioned: The repeated failure of the Security Council to live up to the expectations of the international community by finding appropriate solutions to some of the most volatile and explosive situations has unquestionably diminished the importance and effectiveness of the Security Council, as well as placing greater emphasis on individual and collective self-defence measures. Although such a shift would appear to be totally natural, it has not necessarily been combined with a reluctance by Member States to refer to the Security Council issues that are fraught with danger to international peace and security.

The balance, it seems, has long since tilted in favour of resort to national and regional means. Use of force has become inevitable, and hotbeds of tension and armed-conflict situations have drastically proliferated.

One of the outstanding examples of situations that have remained unresolved is the situation in southern Africa, where a complex of issues has plunged the region into a permanent state of tension and hostility.

For the umpteenth time, the Security Council is seized of the situation in southern Africa. Needless to say, the Security Council has just as frequently adopted resolutions on that situation. But what has apparently emerged out of the many years of discussing this issue and taking decisions is a reduced hope and possibility of a peaceful solution. Inside South Africa the abhorrent apartheid system has escalated the repression and suppression of persons from among the vast majority of South Africans by killing, torturing or gaoling them, or by forcibly relocating them into bantustans; in Namibia, the Pretoria forces of occupation and colonial administration have tightened their illegal hold on the Territory, in arrogant defiance of Security Council resolution 435 (1978); the racist Pretoria

(Mr. Zarif, Afghanistan)

régime has drastically increased its armed aggressions and acts of political and economic destabilization directed against the front-line and neighbouring States of Angola, Mozambique, Zimbabwe, Botswana and Lesotho.

While considering each facet of the situation in southern Africa, the Security Council not only has condemned South Africa's acts of banditry and lawlessness, but has also set deadlines for the implementation of its resolutions aimed at solving the problems. It has become evident time and again that the outlawed régime of South Africa is in no way inclined to comply with the Security Council resolutions.

There is no question that it is mainly South Africa's intransigence and stubbornness which are responsible for the continuation of the appalling situation. But there is little doubt either that South Africa could not resist the moral, political and economic pressure of the nations of the world were it not blessed with the full support of United States imperialism and some of its allies. Through its disgraceful policy of so-called constructive engagement, the United States Administration has criminally allied itself with the horrendous policies of the Pretoria régime and has justifiably earned the deep wrath and indignation of the overwhelming majority of nations. The Washington Administration, which serves virtually as a guardian of the inhuman apartheid system, not only has failed to heed the calls of the international community for the application of necessary sanctions against South Africa, but has spared no effort to compensate for any damage to South Africa's economic and military machinery that may have resulted from the imposition of such sanctions by other nations. While greater awareness of the apartheid evil by world public opinion has led to an increased demand for the immediate eradication of this abominable phenomenon, the United States has tried to provide a protective cover for the racist régime and devise intrigues which may prolong its shameful survival. One such ominous tactic became known to all when

(Mr. Zarif, Afghanistan)

the infamous South African stooge, the renegade Savimbi, was accorded red-carpet treatment by Washington officialdom, which went so far as to insult the founding fathers of this nation by upgrading South Africa's hound of war to the level of freedom fighter. The desperate effort by the masters of the White House to win a semblance of recognition and legitimacy for that servant of racism and imperialism can in no way alter the reality that he, like those of his kind in the rotten ranks of counter-revolutionaries in Afghanistan, Nicaragua, Kampuchea and elsewhere, is no more than a traitor and a paid mercenary at the service of imperialism.

Just as the policies and practices of the South African régime have their roots in the institutionalized racism and class structure of the system, the alliance between South Africa and the United States Administration has at its core the identity of political philosophy and ideology.

(Mr. Zarif, Afghanistan)

Our strong condemnation of the apartheid system, Pretoria's occupation of Namibia and constant acts of aggression against the front-line States goes also to the United States for its criminal complicity in perpetuating the present state of affairs in southern Africa.

The Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, as part of responsible, concerned, democratic and progressive humanity, expects the Security Council to act with a sense of urgency and adopt effective measures under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter with a view to forcing South Africa to comply fully with the previous verdicts of the international community pertaining to the elimination of apartheid, the independence of Namibia, and the cessation of all acts of aggression and interference against the front-line States.

Here we wish to reiterate our complete solidarity with the valiant peoples of South Africa and Namibia under the leadership of their heroic national liberation movements, the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC) and the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), and with the peoples and Governments of the front-line States in their struggle against the policies and practices of the racist Pretoria régime.

Those members of the Security Council that prevent the Council from discharging its responsibilities under the Charter will inevitably have to shoulder the blame for the grave consequences of the unabated continuation of the situation in southern Africa.

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

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

Mr. SKOFENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): Allow me at the outset to congratulate you, Sir, the representative of a friendly country, to the post of President of the Security Council. We are sure that your great diplomatic and political experience will guarantee fruitful work by the Council in February.

I should also like to express thanks to the Permanent Representative of China, Ambassador Li Luye, for his competent guidance of the Council in January, which was a very busy and difficult month for the Council.

Last year more than a quarter of all Security Council meetings were devoted to various aspects of the situation in southern Africa. Several resolutions were adopted with the purpose of preventing a deterioration in the situation in the region which has become truly explosive.

Inside South Africa the racist Pretoria régime stubbornly refuses to eliminate the shameful system of racial oppression and is intensifying its policy of terror and repression. Faced with unprecedentedly large and intense opposition by the oppressed majority of the country, the apartheid régime has started to dodge, to manoeuvre and to talk emptily about "progressive reforms" and a "peaceful solution" to the problem. However, those tricks can deceive no one. The Pretoria régime's attempts to create the appearance of change in its internal policy has been strongly rejected by the African countries, the General Assembly and the Security Council. We fully share the point of view that apartheid cannot be transformed; it must be completely and finally eliminated.

In the face of a worsening domestic political crisis, the racist régime in South Africa has embarked upon military adventures, openly resorting to threats, blackmail and aggression against the neighbouring independent African States. And here we see the especially pernicious effect of the support which is given to Pretoria by certain Western Powers, primarily the United States of America.

(Mr. Skofenko, Ukrainian SSR)

For 10 years now South Africa has been waging a constant war against independent Angola. As a result of incursions, bombings and the sending of armed saboteurs, many thousands of completely innocent persons have died, hundreds of towns and villages have been destroyed, and vast material damage has been inflicted costing untold billions of dollars.

The terrorist group UNITA is the spearhead of racism and imperialism against Angola. It is an organization of mercenaries. This manifestation of armed banditry is inspired from outside and is carried out thanks to foreign support. For a long time Pretoria, although supplying UNITA with everything necessary, verbally disowned it. But when under the blows of the Angolan Army the UNITA group seemed on the verge of collapse South Africa rushed to its rescue. The racist régime has stated openly that it has given, and intends to continue giving, all-round assistance to UNITA. Moreover, protecting their puppets, the South African militarists have frequently invaded Angola. In this case the United States preferred to remain in the shadows. But now in Washington obviously the idea has occurred to them that they can cast off their camouflage. In conditions where it is becoming increasingly difficult for Pretoria to carry out its policing functions in the region, the United States has switched to open interference in Angola's internal affairs.

As is well known, last summer the United States Congress repealed the Clark Amendment, which prohibited the Administration from supporting anti-governmental groups in Angola. The repeal of the Clark Amendment has been condemned by the Assembly of Heads of State or Government of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and the Conference of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the Non-Aligned Countries. The declaration adopted on this matter by the Assembly of Heads of State or Government of the OAU states:



(Mr. Skofenko, Ukrainian SSR)

"Any American covert or overt involvement in the internal affairs of the People's Republic of Angola, directly or through third parties, will be considered a hostile act against the Organization of African Unity."

(A/40/666, AHG/DECL.3 (XXI))

In this connection, attention is drawn to the conspicuous nature of the visit to the United States of Savimbi, the ringleader of UNITA, whom official Washington received at the highest level. It is not difficult to guess what negotiations were about with that mercenary of the racists, since Savimbi himself has stated that he will request more financial assistance and modern weaponry to increase terrorist activities. Those are some of the forms that the United States policy of "constructive engagement" with South Africa actually takes.

In committing aggressive acts against Angola, Botswana and other independent African States, Pretoria behaves as if the norms of international law do not apply in southern Africa. The racist régime ventures to demand that the Government of Lesotho return South African refugees who are there in accordance with the relevant conventions and protocols on refugees, and to exert severe pressure it has closed its borders with Lesotho. As a result the people of Lesotho are suffering from serious difficulties and deprivations owing to acute shortages of food, petroleum products, medicines and other essential items.

(Mr. Skofenko, Ukrainian SSR)

Pretoria's high-handed behaviour, openly flouting the norms of international law, is creating a serious threat both to the South African refugees and to those countries which, in full conformity with the generally recognized conventions on this question, are granting them political asylum. At the same time, it is a genuine threat to peace and international security as a whole.

The Security Council must strongly condemn the policy of the South African régime, which, through the systematic use of military force, is striving to maintain and perpetuate the racist colonial system in the southern African region and is thwarting a political settlement of the Namibian problem, destabilizing neighbouring African States, forcing them from their independent line and subjecting them to its diktat.

The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic reaffirms its solidarity with those who are courageously fighting against apartheid and for freedom and independence. We call for the immediate, unconditional release of Nelson Mandela and all other political prisoners incarcerated in racist prisons. It is time to make the Pretoria régime heed the voice of the international community, time to take against South Africa truly effective measures, including comprehensive mandatory sanctions, under Chapter VII of the Charter.

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

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

Mr. ENDREFFY (Hungary): At the outset, let me congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for February. Your experience and abilities are guarantees that the current meetings of the Council will produce satisfactory results. I wish also to pay tribute to your predecessor, Ambassador Li Luye, Permanent Representative of the People's Republic of China, for the effective manner in which he presided over the deliberations of the Council during January.

The situation in southern Africa has been a threat to regional and international security for quite some time now. In 1985 the Security Council adopted no fewer than nine resolutions in connection with various elements of the subject before us, and devoted half of all its meetings to it.

We regret to state that since last year the situation not only has not improved, but, on the contrary, has further deteriorated. In South Africa there has been no change in the policy of apartheid; if there was any change at all, it was in the increase in violence against the population. In the last 17 months more than a thousand people have been killed in incidents related to protests against apartheid. It is increasingly clear that the régime cannot cope with the internal crisis, which is, incidentally, of its own making. The latest talks about "reforms" do not alter this picture. The promises and token gestures do not even begin to address the basic issue: equal rights for the black majority. We wish to add our voice to those who support the just demands of the black majority and to say with them that the evil system of apartheid cannot be reformed; it must be abolished.

There has been no change for the better in the conduct of Pretoria in the international field, either. It continues the illegal occupation of Namibia and

(Mr. Endreffy, Hungary)

uses every pretext to delay the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), such as establishing arbitrary linkages with issues completely unrelated to that resolution. We deplore those practices.

And, if all that were not enough, Pretoria - disregarding the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States - follows the policy of aggression and destabilization against all its neighbours. We have all witnessed how Angola, Botswana and Lesotho have had to come before the Council time and again to seek redress of the aggression by the racist régime, and we also know of, and condemn, the indirect intervention by the Pretoria régime through its proxies, such as the discredited traitor, Savimbi, whose bands, as everyone knows, are financed and equipped by Pretoria.

As can be seen from those facts, the details of which are too well known to be repeated, the conduct of South Africa both within and outside its territory is a threat to international peace and security. Had it not been for the support given to South Africa by some of its major partners, it could not have defied the will of the international community for so long.

It is not our view alone that a change in that regard is an absolute necessity. There have been various measures taken against the racist régime by certain countries, or groups of countries. Though we support those measures and sanctions, it seems that they are not enough. The gravity of the situation calls for more - for mandatory sanctions. In that respect, the Security Council has a special responsibility to act, since only increased international pressure will deliver a clear message to Pretoria - that the patience not only of Africa, but of the entire international community is running out. We want to see, and the sooner the better, the eradication of the shameful system of apartheid in South Africa, and the emergence of a just, non-racial democratic society; the independence of Namibia; and peace and tranquillity in the southern part of Africa.

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

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

Mr. SHAH NAWAZ (Pakistan): Let me first offer my congratulations to you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for February, and express my confidence that you will continue to guide the Council in its work with the same skill and distinction as have been the hallmark of your presidency since its very beginning this month. Your presidency of the Security Council is a source of special gratification to me, because Pakistan, which has a deep and abiding interest in the welfare and security of the African countries and a historic commitment to African causes, enjoys close ties of friendship and co-operation with your great country. Indeed, it is most appropriate that important developments in southern Africa at this stage should be considered by the Council while it is presided over by such a distinguished diplomat from that continent as yourself.

(Mr. Shah Nawaz, Pakistan)

I take this opportunity also to express our gratitude to His Excellency Mr. Li Luye, Permanent Representative of the People's Republic of China, for his brilliant leadership of the Council last month.

South Africa is close to an important turning-point in its history, as the struggle by its black majority population to regain fundamental human freedoms and dignity enters a decisive phase. The convening of the Security Council at this critical juncture places a heavy responsibility on this world body to take positive action to hasten the collapse of the last institutional refuge of colonialism and racial discrimination, and to help eliminate a serious menace to regional and international peace and security.

In reviewing the situation in southern Africa, many speakers who have participated in the Council's debate have highlighted its three main aspects, namely Pretoria's policy of apartheid, its illegal occupation of Namibia, and its policy of aggression against neighbouring States. In our view, these are three facets of one and the same evil, which springs from the repellent philosophy and system of apartheid. Pretoria's continued stranglehold over Namibia and its brazen attacks on neighbouring States to assert its military diktat in the region are manifestations of its determination to protect apartheid and preserve the political and military dominance and exclusive economic interests enjoyed by the white minority. Isolated and fearful that the edifice of apartheid will crumble before the rising tide of international and domestic antipathy and anger, a nervous Pretoria has intensified its acts of internal repression and external aggression.

At the same time, in an attempt to deflect growing international criticism of its abhorrent policies and to mitigate international outrage at its inhuman practices, the racist régime of South Africa has announced a make-believe programme of reforms to phase out apartheid.

(Mr. Shah Nawaz, Pakistan)

As all of us know, that programme began more than a year ago with a politically bankrupt attempt to associate the Asian and Coloured populations with the country's derelict political system. Pretoria's object in doing this was to drive a wedge between the Asian and Coloured populations on the one hand and the black majority of the country on the other. After a frustrating year of abortive experimentation, which provoked determined protests and political action by the oppressed majority, Pretoria has now resorted to dressing up its manoeuvres in the clothes of reform. Recently, President Botha, on behalf of the Pretoria régime, announced steps which are said to include the development of black trade union rights, the introduction of freehold title to blacks in urban areas and the annulment of the Prohibition of Political Interference Act and the Mixed Marriages Act. With those steps, President Botha claimed apartheid had become outdated. The basic reality of apartheid, however, remains unchanged. The evil system will not disappear with a mere disavowal or through superficial concessions to the black population which still preserve the essence of the doctrine and practice of apartheid.

The hollowness of Pretoria's claim that its racial policies were being changed was exposed soon enough, when Pretoria's Education Minister asserted that he would never let blacks into white public schools, and when the international press reported forced evictions of black families from Uitvlage, north of Pretoria, and their relocation to predesignated areas.

Pretoria's cosmetic reforms retouch the face of apartheid in order to make it look less disagreeable, but they protect and preserve its ugly core. If Pretoria is serious about abandoning apartheid, it should begin by discarding the basic laws that sustain the racist political structure. The first to go must be laws that draw distinctions between man and man on the basis of race and colour, such as the

(Mr. Shah Nawaz, Pakistan)

Group Areas Act, which tells people where they can or cannot live according to their colour, and the Population Legislation Act, whereby every South African is racially tagged for his entire life. Above all, the dismantling of apartheid requires affirmative action to ensure equal political rights in an integrated democratic system which rejects racial discrimination. That objective cannot be achieved with vague and ambiguous promises of "power sharing", which is no more than a euphemism for the continuation of the supremacy of the white minority and the negation of the fundamental principles of universal equality.

A most insidious aspect of apartheid is the creation of black townships and homelands. Segregation of the indigenous population on the basis of race and colour, the usurpation of its property rights and forcible occupation of its lands are the outstanding features of a racist colonialism which has resolved to perpetuate itself. Proponents of apartheid hope to accomplish more than mere segregation of the black population. They want to remove that population to racially marked regional entities and retain for the white minority the vastness of the rich South African territories. Pretoria shows no sign of relenting on this scheme of squeezing the majority population into predesignated homelands. Correspondingly, the dismantling of those homelands has become a primary demand of the anti-apartheid forces within and outside South Africa.

Pretoria's programme of reforms does little to diminish the rigours and brutality of apartheid. It is targeted at placating those Western countries whose support is critical in sustaining the existing economic and military structure in South Africa and protagonists of the policy of "constructive engagement", which has been exploited by the South African authorities to gain time for a desperate attempt to camouflage and perpetuate policies which continue to be based on racial discrimination.



(Mr. Shah Nawaz, Pakistan)

Apartheid is a pernicious policy and an inhuman system which cannot be reformed. The only way to eradicate it is to destroy it. It will be destroyed not by those who have created and sustained it, but by the long-suffering people of South Africa who have stood up to challenge it and who have the courage and the resolve to pay the price of dismantling and uprooting it. The freedom struggle in South Africa has gained irreversible momentum. The time is not far away when its cherished goal will be achieved under the inspiration of Nelson Mandela, the leader of the African National Congress, who remains a respected symbol of the South African people's yearning for freedom, dignity and equality. The leadership in Pretoria should be able to read the writing on the wall in the interest of the very white population of South Africa which it claims to guide and protect.

Pretoria's heedless commitment to apartheid has bred deep fears and a siege mentality, which are manifested in its increasingly aggressive behaviour. It has maintained a stubborn stranglehold on Namibia and has intensified attacks against its neighbours. It has procrastinated over the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), which outlines a United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia based on the blueprint prepared by five Western countries more than eight years ago. It has rejected every Security Council and General Assembly resolution and every international effort seeking the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia's independence.

While maintaining its illegal control of Namibia, South Africa has resorted to relentless attacks against all its neighbours for their opposition to apartheid and for their sympathy for those struggling against that inhuman system. These attacks are designed to keep South Africa's neighbours destabilized and to shield apartheid from a perceived threat from outside. Angola, Botswana, Lesotho and Mozambique have been frequent victims of this predatory policy despite genuine efforts by some of those countries to coexist peacefully with South Africa.

(Mr. Shah Nawaz, Pakistan)

Continued attacks by Pretoria on its neighbours and the impasse over Namibia's independence provide yet another proof of the irrelevance of the policy of "constructive engagement" to the resolution of the problem created by Pretoria's defiance of international opinion and its contempt for the resolutions of the United Nations.

(Mr. Shah Nawaz, Pakistan)

In order to fulfil its commitment to the independence of Namibia, to the security of southern Africa and to help the people of South Africa to gain their freedom and their rights as equal human beings, the Security Council must devise measures to resolve the South African problem in its entirety. Pretoria's aggressive behaviour towards its neighbours is intrinsically linked with its untenable policy of apartheid inside the country. The Security Council is therefore called upon to address both those aspects of the South African problem in the discharge of its duties as the guardian of international peace and security.

Given the intransigence of South Africa, the time may have come for the Security Council to consider setting a time frame for the independence of Namibia, to assume full responsibility for its realization and to apply mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter in order to ensure an early collapse of the inhuman and anachronistic system of apartheid.

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

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

Mr. VAN TONDER (Lesotho): Let me begin this short statement by congratulating you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month. With your experience, knowledge and diplomatic skills, the success of the work of the Security Council on the issue before it is assured. In the same vein we also congratulate your predecessor, the Permanent Representative of the People's Republic of China, for the able manner in which he handled the work of the Council during the month of January. We also thank you, Mr. President, and the Council, for having allowed us to speak in the Council today.

Lesotho's geopolitical situation in southern Africa is unique. To be one of the least developed among the developing countries, and also the only country

(Mr. Van Tonder, Lesotho)

totally surrounded by another country - South Africa - is an unenviable situation. This already difficult position is further exacerbated by the vulnerable socio-economic interdependence that also has adverse effects on Lesotho, a small country in the middle of a bigger, more powerful and highly developed economy. The resultant polarization of development in Lesotho, which is also a colonial legacy, in favour of the more-developed economy in South Africa and the stark realities of our land-locked position, leave Lesotho with very hard and limited choices.

Nevertheless, as His Majesty King Moshoeshoe II declared on 27 January, Lesotho will continue to pursue an independent foreign policy geared towards defending its existence as a sovereign, independent and non-aligned State, projecting its image as an active member of the community of nations, and shall resist any attempts to reduce it to a subservient status of whatever nature. It is pursuant to those goals that Lesotho cherishes the principles of the United Nations, the Organization of African Unity and the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries.

Lesotho adheres to those organizations and their principles because Lesotho, a defenceless nation in a difficult part of the world, relies on them for protection. That is why, when Lesotho was attacked, Lesotho brought the matter to the appropriate organ of the United Nations - the Security Council. That is why, when an economic blockade was imposed on Lesotho, Lesotho appealed to the Secretary-General and the international community for intervention. However, the appeals could not yield any of the intended results. The attacks and blockades continued with greater intensity. We nevertheless wish to continue to seek protection, comfort and relief from isolation because, be it as it may, we still have hope in those organizations and, somehow, we do not feel alone and vulnerable under their wings. In view of the developments in southern Africa, however, and in view of Lesotho's experience with pressures from South Africa, we want to be

(Mr. Van Tonder, Lesotho)

reassured that we have placed our faith in the right places in order that we can continue in our faith and hope and so that we can continue to seek comfort and protection in peace and during trying times.

His Majesty King Moshoeshoe II also stated:

"Lesotho will remain the traditional and historical hospitable host of refugees from political persecution and continue to abide by the international conventions of which it is a signatory."

The bulk of the refugees in Lesotho - if not all of them - come from South Africa. The flow is continuing as a result of the violence of apartheid in South Africa. South Africa has not been happy about Lesotho's providing refuge to South African refugees, who are labelled by South Africa as terrorists, and Lesotho is therefore said to be guilty of harbouring terrorists. This humanitarian gesture by Lesotho has invited the wrath of South Africa. Lesotho has twice been attacked by South Africa. The attacks have claimed the lives of both Lesotho nationals and South African refugees. We have been subjected to acts of destabilization, threats of more attacks and economic blockades. All this has been done by South Africa to coerce Lesotho to refrain from providing asylum to South African refugees.

When the pressures by South Africa increased in intensity we appealed to the international community to persuade South Africa to acknowledge the problem, which is apartheid, not Lesotho. Lesotho's cries were all in vain - cries in the wilderness. Lesotho had no choice but to move some of the refugees, in collaboration with their liberation organizations and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, for relocation in other countries of asylum, in the interests of the refugees' personal safety and security and the national interest of Lesotho. Lesotho thanks the fraternal countries that accepted those refugees from Lesotho.

(Mr. Van Tonder, Lesotho)

As stated earlier, the refugees have not stopped coming into Lesotho. That means that the danger is still hanging over Lesotho and refugees that are in the country. The plight of the South African refugees is therefore a live question for Lesotho, one we feel should be addressed by the Security Council in the context of the agenda before it.

Lesotho does not invite refugees to come into the country. They come because they feel compelled to do so by the conditions in their own country. Lesotho, however, has obligations to welcome them when they do come and not to return them to South Africa. No refugee will be returned by the Lesotho Government to a country from which he has fled. The acceptance of the refugees by Lesotho will, however, be in accordance with Lesotho's long-standing policy that its territory shall not be used as a springboard for attacks on its neighbours by anybody.

We have not, however, lost hope that the international community will press for the abolition of apartheid in South Africa, that it will find ways and means to protect the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of the southern African States. We have not lost hope that the international community will press for the unconditional independence of Namibia, in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978), and press for the withdrawal of the South African military in Angola.

(Mr. Van Tonder, Lesotho)

In our view, the root cause of the problems both in South Africa and in the region is apartheid alone. If apartheid were dismantled there would be no refugees. Attacks, threats of attacks, destabilization and subversion by South Africa against the neighbouring independent States in the region will not solve the problem in South Africa, because the problem is not in the neighbouring States; the problem is in South Africa, and it is apartheid. Lesotho, for its part, is committed to a peaceful coexistence with its neighbours and can only hope that they will reciprocate.

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

Given the lateness of the hour, I propose to adjourn the meeting now. With the agreement of the members of the Council, the next meeting of the Security Council to continue consideration of the item on the agenda will take place tomorrow, 13 February 1986, at 10.30 a.m.

The meeting rose at 6.25 p.m.

