



**Security Council**

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.2660  
12 February 1986

ENGLISH

---

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND  
SIX HUNDRED AND SIXTIETH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Wednesday, 12 February 1986, at 10.30 a.m.

President: Mr. ADOUKI (Congo)

Members:

Australia	Mr. HOGUE
Bulgaria	Mr. TSVETKOV
China	Mr. FAN Guoxiang
Denmark	Mr. BIERRING
France	Mr. BROCHAND
Ghana	Mr. GBEHO
Madagascar	Mr. RABETAFIKA
Thailand	Mr. KASEMSRI
Trinidad and Tobago	Mr. MOHAMMED
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Mr. SAFRONCHUK
United Arab Emirates	Mr. AL-SHAALI
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir John THOMSON
United States of America	Mr. OKUN
Venezuela	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 11.25 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): 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, India, the Islamic Republic of Iran, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Panama, Senegal, South Africa, Sudan, the Syrian Arab 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. Hucke (German Democratic Republic), Mr. Karran (Guyana), Mr. Verma (India), Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani (Islamic Republic of Iran), Mr. Azzarouk (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), Mr. Dos Santos (Mozambique), Mr. Icaza Gallard (Nicaragua), Mr. Garba (Nigeria), Mr. Samudio (Panama), Mr. Sarré (Senegal), Mr. von Schirnding (South Africa), Mr. Birido (Sudan), Mr. El-Fattal (Syrian Arab Republic), Mr. Foum (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 wish to inform members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Hungary, Lesotho, Pakistan and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Endreffy (Hungary), Mr. Van Tonder (Lesotho), Mr. Shah Nawaz (Pakistan) and Mr. Skofenko (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) 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 from the representatives of Congo, Ghana and Madagascar a letter dated 11 February 1986 which reads as follows:

"We, the undersigned, members of the Security Council, have the honour to request that during its meetings devoted to consideration of the item 'The situation in southern Africa' the Security Council extend an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure to Mr. Theo-Ben Gurirab, Permanent Observer of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) to the United Nations."

That letter has been circulated as Security Council document S/17815.

(The President)

If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Council agrees to extend an invitation to Mr. Theo-Ben Gurirab under rule 39 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

In due course I shall invite Mr. Theo-Ben Gurirab to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

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

The Council has before it document S/17817, which contains a draft resolution submitted by the Congo, Ghana, Madagascar, Trinidad and Tobago, and the United Arab Emirates.

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

Mr. BADAWI (Egypt) (interpretation from Arabic): Allow me first, on behalf of the delegation of Egypt and on my own behalf, to extend to you, Sir, sincere congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for February. I am particularly happy that the Council is considering the item on its agenda, which is the primary concern of Africa, under the presidency of a worthy son of Africa with whose diplomatic skills we are all familiar.

I should also like to offer congratulations to your predecessor, Ambassador Li Luye, the Permanent Representative of the People's Republic of China, for his skill when conducting the Security Council's work during January.

In recent years the Security Council has devoted many efforts to considering the numerous problems that beset the continent of Africa as a result of the aggressive racist policies of Pretoria. For example, last year the Council

(Mr. Badawi, Egypt)

considered South Africa's acts of aggression against its neighbours Botswana and Lesotho, its armed invasion of Angola, and the continued illegal occupation of the Territory of Namibia - not to mention the problems resulting from Pretoria's obstinacy in pursuing the racist policy of apartheid within its own borders.

However, this series of meetings is of special importance because the Security Council is considering the situation in southern Africa as a whole, thus placing in perspective the problems that beset that region, because all those problems result from one basic reason - the racist aggressive practices of the Pretoria régime.

The delegation of Egypt has stated on many occasions, including in this Council, that it believes that the aggressive policies of the Pretoria régime vis-à-vis the majority of the inhabitants of South Africa, its acts of aggression against its African neighbours and its obstinacy in illegally occupying Namibia are attempts to conceal the same fact - that is, that régime's obstinacy in applying the policies of apartheid, those hateful, ignominious policies that have been condemned by the entire international community and rejected by the black majority of South Africa. That racist régime's obstinacy in pursuing the policy of apartheid explains the violent and oppressive measures that have been taken against those inhabitants who have rejected it and demanded equal rights and human dignity. That policy also explains that régime's repeated acts of aggression against its African neighbours: that régime is trying to force the peoples of those States to accept or accommodate its policies, without helping their struggling brothers in South Africa. That is why we are forced to conclude that the Pretoria régime's fear that Namibia will gain independence is the fear that independence would become contagious; it might incite other African countries or other members of the international community to resist the racist policy of that régime.

(Mr. Badawi, Egypt)

That régime is deluding itself into believing that its policy of force and aggression against its neighbours will ensure that its borders are stable and secure. But that is not the case. That is why this Security Council debate is long overdue. It is time for the international community to dissipate that illusion and hold Pretoria responsible for the unrest besetting South Africa.

I have said it was high time for the Council to meet and discuss this problem. However, the Pretoria régime, as is usual when it is unable to stifle the resistance against it, has made some proposals in another effort to delude international public opinion and make people believe it really wants reforms. But even a quick consideration of those proposals - which were made by the President of South Africa on 31 January 1986 before a Parliament with a white majority - reveals that they are deceitful. According to these so-called reforms, there would be set up an advisory council that would include representatives of the black majority to consider South Africa's constitutional future. The word "advisory", means that that council would have no effective power. Likewise, the President of the Pretoria régime has ruled out implementation of the principle of universal suffrage within a united country. All this shows that South Africa is certainly not prepared to adopt steps that could lead to the elimination of the apartheid régime.

The following is quoted from the statement of the President of the Pretoria régime:

(spoke in English)

"In a world where freedom is becoming increasingly rare, our country today is a symbol of the expansion of freedom, of the upholding of freedom, of religion and free enterprise, sustained by equal rights."

(Mr. Badawi, Egypt)(continued in Arabic)

Can there be more blatant hypocrisy and distortion of truth? The régime's President, who boasts of being a champion of freedom and equality, is in fact the President of a régime which has adopted laws that deprive 24 million people of their basic freedoms - social, political and economic - citizens who have not committed any crime but that of having a black skin. What is meant by "freedom and rights" is the freedom and rights of the whites.



(Mr. Badawi, Egypt)

The President of the Pretoria régime then spoke of what he called the outdated concept of apartheid and said he would accept a State consisting of different regions and communities or a State for minorities. Does that mean that there would be an original concept, an innovative idea in the implementation of apartheid, which would be more acceptable to the international community?

I wish to quote another passage from the statement made by the Pretoria President, as follows:

(spoke in English)

"We accept unequivocally that the Republic of South Africa is part of the international community. We had no wish to isolate ourselves from the world, particularly not from Africa, of which we form an integral part."

(continued in Arabic)

In reply, we say that the only way to achieve that, if he really wants it, may be summed up as follows: eliminate the apartheid régime as a whole and allow all citizens of South Africa to participate in the political, social and economic life of the country on an equal footing; release the black leaders that have been arrested - in particular, Nelson Mandela - and start a dialogue with them as well as with all the other leaders, the genuine representatives, of the people of South Africa, to end the problems of that country; withdraw immediately from Namibia in order to implement Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and do not make that implementation dependent on other factors that have nothing to do with the framework of that resolution; stop acts of aggression against neighbouring African States.

The Pretoria leaders and representatives of the country abroad have spoken about the need for reform brought about through dialogue and not through violence. The Permanent Representative of South Africa spoke in his statement at the beginning of this discussion about the need to encourage the South African people

(Mr. Badawi, Egypt)

to begin such a dialogue. There is a constant demand for the start of such a dialogue. However, before it can begin Pretoria must recognize the basic principles, which are that it must give up the policy of apartheid and give equal rights to all citizens of South Africa in a unified homeland, not divided into mini-States. Only then can the South African Government expect approval from the leaders of the South African people for that dialogue, which will be a matter not of working out the principles but of implementing them properly. Only then can South Africa expect assistance from the Security Council and the international community as a whole to make that dialogue a success.

The Pretoria leaders and the representatives of the régime outside the country often speak of their fear that the international community will intervene in their internal affairs. They even say that their acts of aggression against the neighbouring African countries and the continuing occupation of Namibia seek to prevent or limit that foreign interference. But we reply that their régime's irresponsible actions, such as repeated acts of aggression and refusal to implement United Nations resolutions relating to Namibia's independence, are factors which will open the door to foreign interference in the internal affairs of the African continent and of southern Africa in particular. Those acts will expose our continent to the dangers of big-Power conflict and may give rise to a cold war in the region. It is precisely such a situation that the African continent has so far managed to avoid. Therefore, the Security Council still has a responsibility to meet with regard to South Africa. It is a clear, well-defined responsibility. The Council must end the apartheid régime in South Africa to remove the injustice that besets its people, end the illegal occupation of Namibia and help the front-line States meet Pretoria's aggression.

That responsibility stems from two factors. The first is the Security Council's role in the organization of contemporary international relations, because the Council is the forum responsible for the maintenance of international peace and

(Mr. Badawi, Egypt)

security. There is no doubt that the situation now prevailing in Southern Africa is very insecure and volatile. It holds many dangers, not only for southern Africa and the African continent as a whole, but also for international peace and security. That is why the Security Council should intervene, in keeping with the Charter, to end South Africa's manoeuvres, which are totally irresponsible.

Secondly, under the Charter the Security Council has a responsibility for ensuring compliance with its resolutions by States. In recent years the Council has adopted many resolutions calling upon South Africa to terminate the policy of apartheid and the occupation of Namibia and calling on it to refrain from launching acts of aggression against its neighbours. Despite all those resolutions, the apartheid régime is still alive and well, South Africa still continues its illegal occupation of Namibia and still commits acts of aggression against its neighbours. It is high time for the Council to exercise its prerogatives under the Charter to force South Africa to respect those resolutions.

The African peoples are still hopeful and look to the Council with hope to see what it will do about Pretoria's manoeuvres in southern Africa. We have every hope that the Council's decision this time will be balanced and commensurate with the gravity of the crimes committed by Pretoria against the people of southern Africa. We hope that the Council will send out a clear message and will stop tolerating Pretoria's refusal to comply with its resolutions and the delaying tactics Pretoria has been using in order not to implement the Council's resolutions.

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

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

Mr. GOLOB (Yugoslavia): There have been some signs of relaxation of tension in certain areas of international relations of late. However, the trends

(Mr. Golob, Yugoslavia)

causing grave concern continue to prevail. The situation is serious, since existing crises are not being resolved and new crises are emerging.

It is clear that we are faced with two choices: either mutual trust will be enhanced by positive steps towards a peaceful solution of crises or the international situation will keep moving to direct confrontation.

It would be superfluous to state that the non-aligned countries and an overwhelming majority of the membership of the United Nations strongly opts for the first choice. But there can hardly be any hope for the relaxation of international tensions without progress in resolving existing crises and preventing the outbreak of new ones.

(Mr. Golob, Yugoslavia)

A number of non-aligned countries - and not only in southern Africa - are exposed to all kinds of pressure. There is, as we all know, ever more frequent recourse to the threat or use of force. The theory of intervention is acquiring increasingly dangerous dimensions. There is a clear tendency on the part of some to assume the right to mete out punishment, a tendency that would make State terrorism the order of the day. Independence and sovereignty are on the line again and again.

This series of meetings of the Security Council on the situation in southern Africa is timely and necessary from the point of view of the situation in the subregion and from the point of view of its consequences for the international situation in general. Southern Africa is one of the areas of crisis with the longest and most tragic record, brought about by the evils of the twentieth century, which are so clearly and persistently contained in the policies of the régime in Pretoria. That régime relies on colonialism, racism, illegal occupation, exploitation, the use of force, aggression, police violence and disregard for human rights - and on apartheid, which stands for all those things combined.

The apartheid régime in South Africa has two equally ugly and repugnant faces: that of internal repression and terror and that of aggression and intimidation abroad. South Africa is attempting to destabilize the Governments of neighbouring non-aligned countries through aggression and sabotage, and through training and financing mercenaries and bandits and infiltrating them into the territory of those sovereign countries.

It continues to occupy a part of the territory of the People's Republic of Angola and carries out armed forays into other parts of that country's territory. It is using its mercenaries to prop up its aggression in Angola. It undertakes acts of political, economic and military destabilization against Mozambique, Lesotho and Botswana. It uses economic blockade and blackmail in an attempt to

(Mr. Golob, Yugoslavia)

coerce those countries into renouncing their right to give sanctuary to the victims of apartheid. It is trying to turn southern Africa into a region of bloc confrontation and is developing an enormous military potential, including nuclear technology for military purposes.

The list is long. The lives of peoples and countries are devastated, and events keep painfully repeating themselves. For days, weeks, years on end we have been told about Pretoria turning anew to aggression and naked force in order to dominate and dictate.

However, the thirst for freedom of the majority population of South Africa and the quest for independence and self-determination for Namibia cannot be done away with through those policies. The sovereignty of independent front-line States Members of the United Nations cannot and will not be knocked down by the use of force. Their people know better; the memory is fresh in their mind of another era, the era of colonialism.

The General Assembly, the Security Council, the Council for Namibia, the Special Committee against Apartheid, the Organization of African Unity, the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and other bodies have time and again considered these issues, condemned Pretoria and requested the implementation of United Nations resolutions and the United Nations plan for Namibia.

This helps strengthen the will of the people to fight, but it has not proved enough to sway Pretoria. But the centre of action is the will of the people to fight for their rights, and that is of essential importance. That will is seen dramatically, and it calls for increasing international support. That support is wide and growing. It is not only the Governments, but the peoples that call for an end to the injustice and aggression emanating from Pretoria.

(Mr. Golob, Yugoslavia)

International support is wide and its intensity is rising. Whenever the Security Council meets on southern Africa or on specific violations by Pretoria, that becomes increasingly manifest. We would wish all members of the Security Council, when deliberating on these issues, to keep in sight the decisions they have made through the years and the changing panorama of international support for the peoples of South Africa and of southern Africa as a whole.

The situation calls not for another weak attempt, but for a resolute push towards compliance with United Nations resolutions, implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia, support for the rights of peoples and of the sovereign, non-aligned front-line States, all of them legally constituted, and support for legitimate national liberation movements such as the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC) and the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania (PAC).

The aims of the majority population of South Africa, of the ANC, the PAC and SWAPO, and of the Governments of front-line States are entirely in keeping with the aims, programmes and frameworks that have been adopted, proclaimed and sought by United Nations resolutions, including the resolutions of this Council. Those movements have gained a status of recognition in the United Nations framework that gives them the opportunity to be heard and listened to. They enjoy the support of other African States and of non-aligned countries, as well as international support from a number of other countries.

There have been abortive attempts to impose linkages and internal solutions, and to use other strategems. This has brought about more suffering and destruction, but no solution. A solution can be found only by satisfying the legitimate aspirations of the peoples.

(Mr. Golob, Yugoslavia)

We feel that these are among the important facts to bear in mind when assessing the situation.

Against that background, it is expected of the international community, and the Security Council in particular, that they should launch concerted action to eliminate the power of apartheid and aggression once and for all. To do otherwise would amount to turning a blind eye to the tragic and gravely dangerous developments in the region, which could lead to a wider conflagration.

Calling for another push, we see no other option but to ask again for the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia, for comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter, for full support for and assistance to the front-line States and Lesotho, for a call upon Member States to refrain from all contacts with South Africa, and for more support for the movements that fully and comprehensively embody the will of the peoples they represent and lead, such as SWAPO, the ANC, the PAC and other forces for change within South Africa.

The Secretary-General, His Excellency Mr. Javier Pérez de Cuéllar, should be given support to continue his important role in resolving the problems of the region, particularly in the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia.



(Mr. Golob, Yugoslavia)

The sovereign and non-aligned countries of southern Africa need peace to be able to proceed with the solution of the problems of their economic and social development. The Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia will continue to render full moral, political and material support to the struggle of the countries and peoples and their liberation movements for independence, self-determination and freedom. This has always been one of the most important principles and goals of our foreign policy, and we are going to maintain it and act accordingly in the best tradition and principles of our peoples.

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

Mr. SAMUDIO (Panama) (interpretation from Spanish): Before making my first statement in this forum, I should like to congratulate you sincerely, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of February. Fate has chosen one of Africa's distinguished sons to guide the debate on the situation in southern Africa. This is a clear tribute to one of Africa's best men. With your skill, firmness and ability, you will surely lead these deliberations to positive results.

We should also like to pay tribute to the decisive leadership of Ambassador Li Luye, Permanent Representative of the Peoples's Republic of China, who, revealing his experience and wisdom, presided over the Council's deliberations in January.

The representatives who have spoken before me have discussed in great detail the problems besetting southern Africa and their causes. They have discussed how rights have been persistently violated with impunity; they have portrayed the mistreatment, discrimination, imprisonments, torture and loss of human life that have resulted from the terrible policies of apartheid imposed by the Government of

(Mr. Samudio, Panama)

South Africa against the oppressed inhabitants and neighbouring countries. Our country is familiar with such suffering, since we too lived under a colonial régime - one with a different name, but one whose results were the same. Hence we cannot fail to make known to all our complete repudiation of the racist policies of apartheid and our oneness with the peoples of Africa fighting for their sovereignty, territorial integrity and recognition as a nation like other nations, peoples who wish only to be free to forge their own destinies without any foreign interference or intervention and guided only by the wishes of their own sovereign peoples.

The struggles of peoples to win their freedom is the same, whether they take place in Africa, in Asia or in Latin America. That is why today we are speaking out in support of the people of South Africa, who are victims of the savagery of apartheid. We support the subjugated people of Namibia, who have been denied their independence and their chance to create a free, sovereign country free from colonialist tutelage. We support the front-line countries that are victims of the racist Pretoria régime's policies of aggression and destabilization.

Panama, as a member of the Contadora Group, is committed to a lasting peace in the Central American isthmus. We know the sacrifices and the price that must be paid in humiliation, mistreatment and even loss of life to obtain the final victory and the freedom the people so ardently desire.

A quarter century has passed since the adoption of General Assembly resolution 1415 (XV), the declaration on decolonization, and several years have elapsed since the adoption of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which called for the independence of Namibia. How, then, is it possible that the people of Namibia are still under the illegal domination of South Africa, in blatant violation of dozens of General Assembly and Security Council resolutions condemning South Africa and calling for elections leading to total independence?

(Mr. Samudio, Panama)

How can a country that is a founding Member of the United Nations and a signatory to the Charter refuse to abide by decisions of the General Assembly and Security Council and persist in its aggressive policies directed both against its own people and against those in neighbouring countries, thereby making itself responsible for the present state of affairs in southern Africa, which, if decisive political action is not taken immediately, could grow so serious that an outbreak of hostilities between countries could be imminent? Indeed, an increased loss of human life seems inevitable as political repression increases.

In 1985, 10 of the 21 resolutions adopted by the Security Council were on South Africa and its racist policies of apartheid, and this year alone the Council has already been convened twice to deal with the same subject. How then is it that such an evil policy continues to exist? To judge from the daily reports in the press, protests and incidents are on the increase. We therefore ask: Are we simply going to continue to meet to hear about whatever atrocity may have just taken place? Are we not going to take a firmer decision to show the South African régime that it must abandon those policies and sit down immediately with the black leaders to work out the steps to be taken to bring about the abolition of apartheid and the participation of those leaders, on an equal footing, in the country's political life?

Some delegations have stated that the Council must impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter against South Africa, to show it that its racist policies have made it an outcast that can no longer participate in the world economy and that its only hope for survival is to abolish apartheid - not simply to tinker with it or reform it, as it would have world public opinion believe it is doing.

Our country supports the continuation of economic sanctions against South Africa as a means to bring pressure upon it to come to the negotiating table.

(Mr. Samudio, Panama)

Consistent with such sanctions, we have ordered the closing of our consulate in South Africa and the cessation of all trade relations between our two countries. Similarly, the National Bank no longer deals in Krugerrand gold coins.

Our delegation is of the opinion that there is still time to make important political changes before violence jeopardizes the security and stability of the entire region. However, when we speak of changes, our premise is the total eradication of apartheid, not just changes in nomenclature or meaningless concessions disguised as substantive achievements.

(Mr. Samudio, Panama)

Here, of course, I am referring to President Botha's statement in the South African Parliament on 31 January, which was presented by the representative of South Africa in the Council at the beginning of our debate a few days ago as indicating significant reforms. In fact, they are just empty promises. A reading of that statement clearly reveals that the South African régime is still subjecting the black majority to domination, humiliation and inhuman, unjust and pitiless treatment.

To say that there has been an evolution in the union rights of the blacks, to speak of recognition of the permanence of blacks in urban zones and to discuss the titles they have there and the development of entrepreneurial rights is to fail to recognize flagrant violations of human rights, violations of the United Nations Charter and of all principles of humanity and self-respect, respect for life and for the rights of others.

We must be careful: there is no talk of change but of evolution - with no mention of how long this evolution will take. What this means is slow change, the very antithesis of revolution, which is violent change. And what can we say of the abandonment of the Prohibition of Political Interference Act, the Mixed Marriages Act and the relevant provisions of the Immorality Act?

Why not mention the effect that each and every one of those restrictions has had on the subjugated black majority? Today a hurricane is blowing through the country, but there are no guarantees that the régime will abrogate the corner-stone of apartheid, the Group Areas Act, which designates where each racial group shall live.

As a result of these racial policies, the most degrading state of subjugation has been imposed on the black majority of the country, which number 24 million and constitute 72 per cent of the total population.

(Mr. Samudio, Panama)

The representative of South Africa told us that

"no South African will be excluded from full political rights and that all should participate in Government and in the future of South Africa through their elected leaders". (S/PV.2652, p. 47)

That seemed to us to be a tremendous stride forward, but very quickly we realized that there had been no reference to the African National Congress (ANC), to the immediate, unconditional release of Nelson Mandela, to the political participation of the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania (PAC), to the dissolution of the Parliament, or to the so-called elections to choose a new integrated chamber made up of representatives of all races. There had been no reference at all to a new constitution which would once and for all remove the odious system of apartheid from the face of the world.

Reference was made to negotiations on "a democratic system of government which must accommodate all legitimate political aspirations of all South African communities". (S/PV.2652, p. 48) But what kind of change can there be, when legitimate political black leaders are not allowed to take part in the decision-making process or to sit down with representatives of the white minority and establish the bases for a government of national integration and when instead there are councils which lack authority and exist only to gain time and confuse world public opinion?

The end is near. Ever greater strides are being taken with regard to the apartheid leaders. Economic sanctions have hit the apartheid régime the hardest. Representatives have met in the front-line States to discuss their future in tomorrow's South Africa. We have been encouraged by meetings such as that held in Lusaka, Zambia, among the Foreign Ministers of the front-line States and the member States of the European Community, and we welcome the meeting of Foreign Ministers

(Mr. Samudio, Panama)

of countries of the Non-Aligned Movement held in Luanda, Angola, last September. There, without qualification, the immoral policy of apartheid was condemned and South African troops were asked to withdraw from Angola; there was a call for Namibian independence, for an end to the policy of destabilization of the front-line States and for a dialogue regarding the future of the country.

Now the Security Council must act. It must take action and turn expressions of good intentions into a resolution commanding unanimous support, putting an end to the violence and the loss of human life. Negotiations on a transition must begin. Such a transition can be brought about only if there is support from the Governments that make up the Security Council, which must bring their full political weight to bear.

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

Mr. RABETAFIKA (Madagascar) (interpretation from French): In view of the fine relations that exist between our two peoples and our two Governments, I should like simply but most cordially to tell you, Sir, that my country's delegation is very happy to see you presiding over the Council for the month of February. You have demonstrated your ability to deal with problems, your diplomatic experience and your decisiveness. We are sure that with your guidance the Council will successfully deal with the questions before it. To your predecessor, His Excellency Ambassador Li Luye, the Permanent Representative of the People's Republic of China, we would extend our gratitude for the courteous, remarkable and skilful manner in which he conducted our work last month.

This debate is coming to an end. It is one in which opinions have been and remain divided, but it has served to clarify positions. There are some who would like us to speak only from time to time, and separately, about Namibia, apartheid

(Mr. Rabetafika, Madagascar)

and southern Africa. For the past 15 years, or more precisely since the Council's meeting in Addis Ababa, there has been a subtle balancing act.

As the years have passed, we have allowed ourselves to be convinced that we should focus our attention sometimes on Namibia, to the detriment of the struggle against apartheid; sometimes on the situation in southern Africa, to the detriment of Namibia; and sometimes on alleged reforms put forward by the Pretoria régime, to the detriment of the mobilization of world public opinion.

This approach is all the more curious and strange since it is in line with the thinking of the Pretoria régime and has made it possible for some circles to put forward political analyses that spring from their intellectual tendency to link problems and to seek opportunistic solutions.



(Mr. Rabetafika, Madagascar)

If we inadvertently disregard these principles, people are quick to smile at our naivete and emotional reactions. And if we adhere to them, we are upbraided for our lack of realism and pragmatism. In short, we are condemned to lose the argument since we do not want to play according to the rules that seem to be to the liking of the racists in Pretoria. The problem is that we all claim to obey the same Charter and to be guided by the same considerations, but whenever South Africa in one way or another comes up for consideration everyone seems to be involved in an unequal struggle and to speak a different language.

This is a time for calm. We are told that a new era is in the offing in South Africa and much has been made of the statements by the Head of the racist State. Every five or six months Pretoria announces the enactment of new legislation and completely new scenery. The actors and the protagonists remain the same; there are few variations on the general theme; as for the outcome, we are left to think about that ourselves. Let me make just two points.

The Pretoria régime has supposedly said that it has gone beyond the outmoded concept of apartheid. It has not said that it would set aside the injustices of apartheid nor its dehumanizing policy of segregation. We could also use coded and ambiguous language and reply: If the present concept of apartheid is indeed outmoded in the sense that it no longer performs as expected vis-à-vis the African revolution, will Pretoria not replace it with a concept of equal value based on a distorted perception of human relations? We would then have a new form of apartheid that might even be advocated by those who today tell us that they want to combat apartheid.

My second point has to do with the division of power which is a pure fantasy. To the statement made by the African National Congress in Lusaka, which was reported to the Council, I would add the following: It is hardly thinkable that such a division of power could be equitable since Pretoria does not recognize

(Mr. Rabetafika, Madagascar)

universal suffrage and stated it has no intention of subscribing to the principle of "one man, one vote". Power can only be illusory since it will be exercised solely by and within a consultative council and the participation of Africans will suspect, to say the least, since they will be asked to abet a minority régime determined to perpetuate itself at their expense.

Africans are therefore supposed to cease all claims, all demonstrations and their liberation struggle and to submit in advance to the imposition of a badly defined statute and join in the building of a nation whose cornerstone would remain apartheid, although presented, it is true, in a more acceptable form to those who feared its dismantling.

On the other hand, the Pretoria régime will benefit from expressions of encouragement and satisfaction from several quarters, among which probably are the banking and financial world and those who have agreed to selective and voluntary sanctions as a final recourse.

This is the paradoxical situation confronting us, but the Council would be ill-advised to let Pretoria believe that we are prepared to go along with such a state of affairs without regard to our conscience and the Charter. Sooner or later we must speak of the arrest of 238,000 Africans in 1984 for having violated the Pass Laws; of the massacre of 1,100 more in 1985; of the banishment of political parties; of the forcible displacement of populations; of arbitrary detentions; as well as mass, flagrant and repeated violations of human rights. We can justifiably ask what the real significance of these reforms is when weighed against the violations of which Pretoria is guilty.

Pledges have been made, Africans have been served impossible dreams, and the racist régime thinks that since apartheid has now been reduced to a tolerable level, it can go on with its great ideological design, to deliver from evil the

(Mr. Rabetafika, Madagascar)

neighbouring sovereign States by imposing upon them, by force if need be, the concept of a "constellation of States" in southern Africa.

In this respect the Council has direct responsibility. The list of resolutions in which we have issued warnings, solemnly or not, to the Pretoria régime is already too long. In 1985 alone, we were forced to use the same strong language on at least five occasions, and we are now surprised that the front-line States should be disturbed that we have not followed through on our own resolutions.

Military attacks have been launched, mercenaries used, territories occupied, sanctions decreed in the form of a blockade, threats proffered, opponents openly encouraged to overthrow established régimes - all in the name of national security, self-defence and, for good measure, the struggle against international terrorism. Practically no neighbouring country has been spared. State terrorism has become the rule, and yet the Council is impotent. Are we still dealing with minor incidents which pose no threat to international or regional peace and security?

It is simply not right that a State should distort principles that have been enshrined in the Charter and engage in aggression with impunity. Yet we have been told that diplomatic action and countermeasures have been taken and that they have led to the Cape Declaration of 31 January last.

All well and good, but is it not true that the collective security offered to neighbouring States is accompanied by an ultimatum? And what about an Organization which has been convinced that it should renounce implementation of its own laws because other interests will undertake sanctions in its stead - sanctions temporarily that will be lifted without our being able to tell those same interests to bear in mind Pretoria's failure to respect the Charter and international law. By this reasoning it will no longer be impossible to say where international law begins and where the defence of special interests ends.

Mr. KASEMSRI (Thailand): First of all, I should like to convey, on behalf of the delegation of Thailand, our warm congratulations to you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of February. My delegation is confident that your proven wisdom, diplomatic skill and boundless energy will assist the Council in its deliberations on the important matter before it. Your country has been nobly engaged in the struggle for independence and peaceful development of nations on the great continent of Africa. It is therefore fitting that you should be presiding over the Council's proceedings on this matter. My delegation wishes to pledge its full co-operation to you in your task of guiding the Council through this eventful month.

Permit me also to express, on behalf of the delegation of Thailand, our deep appreciation to the President of the Security Council for the month of January, Ambassador Li Luye of the People's Republic of China, for the exemplary manner in which he conducted last month's business of the Council.

During the past year alone, almost half of the resolutions adopted by the Security Council have concerned the situation in southern Africa and Pretoria's acts of aggression against the neighbouring countries. The Pretoria régime, however, continues to pursue its policies of apartheid and aggression, in contravention of the United Nations Charter and rules of international law and in defiance of the relevant United Nations resolutions. Such policies and acts constitute persistent threats to the stability of sovereign neighbouring States and to international peace and security.

There are three main problems which confront the peoples of southern Africa. First, the indigenous African people in South Africa are still under the oppression of the apartheid system imposed through the most brutal means by the racist régime of Pretoria, in defiance of the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The South African

(Mr. Kasemsri, Thailand)

authorities resort to such heinous acts as wanton killing, arbitrary arrest and detention of dissidents and systematic indignities against the black people in the country. That has been the direct cause of the problem of refugees fleeing from the repressive régime.

Secondly, an escalation of hostile, unprovoked and persistent acts of aggression is being perpetrated or threatened by the Pretoria régime against the front-line and other States, in particular by invading Angola, Botswana and Lesotho, in violation of their sovereignty and territorial integrity. South Africa's uses of armed force against the neighbouring States have not only increased dangers to the refugees who have fled from apartheid, but also created the problem of refugees and displaced persons in the area in general.

(Mr. Kasemsri, Thailand)

Thirdly, the racist régime of South Africa continues to utilize the territory of Namibia as a springboard for sustaining its armed attacks against the neighbouring countries to weaken the unrelenting support of those countries for the Namibian people in their quest for self-determination, which should be linked only to the highest moral dictate and legitimate aspirations of peoples everywhere.

Pretoria's recourse to such acts against other States - outright invasion, commando raids, subversion, support of armed insurgency against legitimate Governments, economic pressure and threats, and other measures that constitute acts of international terrorism, all stemming from the abominable apartheid system - has long ago made the Pretoria régime an international outcast deserving of no support from any enlightened nation or Government.

Apartheid has thus become the scourge of not only the peoples of South Africa and Namibia but also of all the front-line and other States in the region. Any neighbouring country is subjected to constant threats of attack and aggression should it ever open its doors to the victims of apartheid. Such illegal actions, if permitted to continue, will further undermine international peace and security.

As for the right of all countries to give sanctuary to the victims of oppression, the Security Council has reaffirmed that right time and again. Moreover, my delegation deeply appreciates the humanitarian policy and continued willingness of the neighbouring States to carry the onerous burden of caring for the South African refugees fleeing from the apartheid system.

In conclusion, my delegation wishes to pledge once again that Thailand will stand with the Group of African States on these issues to assist in bringing about the complete dismantling of the repugnant apartheid system in the southern part of Africa, which is the root cause of the festering problems in that important part of the world. That is why my delegation is able to support the draft resolution contained in document S/17817 that is now before the Council.

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

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

Mr. GARBA (Nigeria): On behalf of the delegation of Nigeria I wish to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of February. We are reassured to see you presiding over the Council, which is charged with the maintenance of international peace and security. We are convinced that, with your skill and well-known diplomatic abilities, you will discharge your duties with merit and distinction.

Let me also seize this opportunity to pay tribute to your predecessor, Mr. Li Luye, for the unobtrusive manner and competence with which he directed the Council's affairs for the month of January.

Although the week of mourning set aside by the Government of the United States of America to lament the tragedy of the loss of seven brilliant persons and the shuttle Challenger is over, on behalf of the Nigerian delegation, I should like nevertheless to convey through you, Mr. President, to the delegation of the United States of America our condolences on the Challenger tragedy.

It is natural that a week after the opening of the debate on any agenda item, especially on one such as this, all the salient issues would have been debated, repeated and examined many times over. Yet we cannot stop. We must continue to speak out against apartheid, even if sometimes it means repeating ourselves. Otherwise, it is too easy to forget. And, as a perceptive columnist recently noted: "Even an oft-told story needs retelling when it is as cruel as apartheid."

In the year 1985, the Security Council convened nine times to consider South Africa's aggression against its neighbours. Representatives will recall that the same year opened with the Security Council considering an agenda item on South

(Mr. Garba, Nigeria)

African aggression. Again this year, we have started with the consideration of South African aggression. The South African State as it is today has become synonymous with aggression, violence, conflict, terror and destabilization.

The world rejects apartheid, but it is obvious to all that that rejection means very little and indeed has had very little effect. Even racist South Africa, through the medium of its so-called State President P.W. Botha, recently declared:

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

This Council and the international community know that that alleged rejection and abandonment of apartheid are only rhetorical. If apartheid has been abandoned, why are the bedrock principles of that heinous system untouched? Why have the South Africans not abolished the Population Registration Act, which racially categorizes, with the objective of racism, every South African not only from birth to death but also to burial-places for the dead? Why are the homelands policy and practice intact? Why is the Group Areas Act in force? Why is the so-called reformist President incapable of completely abolishing the hateful anathema of the Pass Laws? Why have political prisoners, such as Nelson Mandela, not been released?

Mention was made at the start of this series of Council meetings of "wheels of freedom that have started to turn". If, as alleged, reform is on the way, why are the black townships still occupied? Why do white racist police and terror squads hide in train cars to shoot down in cold blood unsuspecting blacks demonstrating for the right to self-determination? Why is the state of emergency still in force? Why is the apartheid State incapable of instituting the principle of one man one vote? Why are the front-line States destabilized and continuously subjected to aggression? Why does apartheid South Africa impose sanctions against neighbouring States and yet readily lobbies that sanctions should not be applied



(Mr. Garba, Nigeria)

against it? Why is Namibia still illegally occupied? Inevitably we are led to the conclusion that it is impossible to ameliorate an evil such as apartheid; it must be destroyed.

There are many more questions that we could ask, but our objective here is not so much to seek answers but to underscore for the benefit of the Western members of the Council, home countries of South Africa's international creditors, that nothing has changed in South Africa and so that the Council should seriously apply effective and concerted international sanctions against the white minority régime. Apartheid remains, and as at all times it is a crime against humanity.

Today southern Africa is situated on a tripod of conflict. The primary source of conflict is apartheid, which is the main cause of tension and regularly breeches the peace and security of that region. Of proximate importance is apartheid South Africa's direct and indirect intervention in the internal affairs of the front-line and other neighbouring States. Directly, South Africa raids those countries and subjects them to aggression. The provisional records of this Council are replete with debates and statistics on this matter. Indirectly, because of its strategic location, racist South Africa imposes both selective and comprehensive sanctions against those countries.

Thirdly, and of equal importance, are the South African support of subversive elements, such as Jonas Savimbi's UNITA and the MNRM, and the engineering of dissent within sovereign and independent African countries.

(Mr. Garba, Nigeria)

The explosive scenario has as a backdrop certain extra-continental factors that have equally contributed to an escalation of the situation as well as increasing the level of violence and destruction in the subregion. The repeal of the Clark Amendment has had a most incendiary input to the situation in the subregion. A discernible disposition in certain strata of government in the United States to aid UNITA will unquestionably enlarge the vortex of violence in southern Africa. The flouting of the arms embargo by certain Western countries and multinational corporations which have their bases in countries in the West is setting the pre-conditions for a racial catastrophic show-down in southern Africa.

We should like to remind the Council of certain salient considerations. It is often argued that when white South Africans are threatened they retreat to the laager. We know that this historic fact is no longer true. South Africa is vulnerable. Its economic links to the West and in particular its Western allies is the chink in its armour. If it does not abolish apartheid it will never have a respite.

The Organization of African Unity, the Non-Aligned Movement, the socialist countries and our few friends in the West have a sacred mission to destroy apartheid, however long it may take. My Government last week hosted the 45th session of the Liberation Committee of the Organization of African Unity. In concert with other African countries, we are perfecting new strategies to confront racist South Africa at all levels of the struggle, as a result of that successful meeting. If South Africa refuses to surrender voluntarily, it will be made to surrender, and it will surrender. We are confident that neither apartheid, the threat of a retreat into the laager nor its main supporters can prevail over the defiant determination of millions of men and women; it cannot prevail over the front-line and other neighbouring States, nor can it win against the international community or contain the progressive tide of history.

(Mr. Garba, Nigeria)

The Council must now decide whether it will be central in supporting the dismantling of apartheid or will continue to allow itself to be paralysed in inaction by pro-racist South African interests represented in the Council. The questions we ask again are simple.

Will the Security Council impose concerted, effective, mandatory measures against South Africa, taking into account the fact that South Africa has a steady and ready recourse to this instrument in terrorizing the front-line and other neighbouring States?

Will certain members of the Council continue to sustain policy positions that escalate the tension and conflict in the subregion - for example, by repeal of the Clark Amendment and a disposition to give aid to UNITA and other subversive elements in the region?

Why do certain members of the Council look the other way and permit their multinational corporations to supply the dangerous racist régime of South Africa with guns, thereby flouting Security Council resolution 418 (1977)?

When will certain Western members of the Council permit it to utilize instruments accorded it by the Charter concretely and genuinely to address itself to peace and security questions in southern Africa?

The Security Council can, and should without delay, apply comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter. In this connection, we call on the international community to support the forthcoming world conference on sanctions against racist South Africa. We firmly believe that a combination of the armed struggle, which is gathering momentum, and the imposition of comprehensive, mandatory sanctions will surely bring down the racist régime. As one of the front-line States, my country will ensure that the challenge against apartheid does not cease until the emergence of a free, independent and democratic

(Mr. Garba, Nigeria)

South Africa. We shall continue to support the indigenous majority of South Africa in opposing any ludicrous power-sharing arrangement with the racist régime.

The cause of the vast majority of the people of South Africa is just. Theirs is an inexorable force destined for victory, and we support them.

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

I propose to adjourn the meeting now. The next meeting of the Security Council to continue its consideration of the item on the agenda will take place this afternoon at 3.30.

The meeting rose at 1.00 p.m.