



Security Council

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.2658
10 February 1986

ENGLISH

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND
SIX HUNDRED AND FIFTY-EIGHTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Monday, 10 February 1986, at 4 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. HOGUE

Mr. TSVETKOV

Mrs. SHI Yanhua

Mr. BIERRING

Mr. RAPIN

Mr. GBEHO

Mr. RABETAFIKA

Mr. KASEMSARN

Mr. MOHAMMED

Mr. OLEANDROV

Mr. AL-SHAALI

Mr. GORE-BOOTH

Mr. REED

Mr. PABON

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 4.55 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 Algeria, Angola, Botswana, Egypt, Ethiopia, the German Democratic Republic, Guyana, India, the Islamic Republic of Iran, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Senegal, South Africa, Sudan, 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. Djoudi (Algeria), Mr. de Figueiredo (Angola), Mr. Legwaila (Botswana), 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. Sarré (Senegal), Mr. von Schirnding (South Africa), Mr. Birido (Sudan), 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 letters from the representatives of Afghanistan, Cuba, Panama and the Syrian Arab 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. Zarif (Afghanistan), Mr. Velazco San José (Cuba), Mr. Samudio (Panama) and Mr. El-Fattal (Syrian Arab Republic) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

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

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

Mr. DJOUDI (Algeria) (interpretation from French): The primary purpose of the Charter of the United Nations is

"To maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace".

(Mr. Djoudi, Algeria)

union militants, students and clergy and the massacres of women, children and old people in black townships. The use of force reached its peak with the imposition last summer of a state of emergency in more than 36 districts.

The state of emergency, indeed, continues to reveal the desperation of the proponents of apartheid, who are faced with fast-moving events and aware that they are unable to control them. It has also revealed the firm resolve of the black African populations to persist in their just struggle despite the heavy sacrifices they must make each day.

Given that heroic resistance, the leaders in Pretoria are having increasing recourse to delaying tactics aimed principally at misleading public opinion as to the true nature of apartheid. Thus, after the stunning defeat of the so-called constitutional reform, which was categorically rejected by the black majority and rightly declared null and void by the General Assembly and the Security Council, the Pretoria régime is now back on the offensive with proposals for so-called new reforms.

Such so-called reforms cannot be granted any credibility and must be denounced and condemned without reservation. For, let it be said once again, apartheid cannot be reformed; it must be eliminated. That is a truth that the leaders in Pretoria and their allies will be forced to recognize, sooner or later.

The Namibian people is the other major victim of South Africa's racist and colonialist policy. The establishment of a so-called provisional government in Windhoek, which was declared null and void by the Security Council and the General Assembly, is yet another obstacle to the implementation of the United Nations Plan for the speedy accession of that Territory to independence. It also demonstrates the Pretoria leadership's determination to consolidate its illegal occupation of that Territory and to continue the scandalous exploitation of its natural resources.

(Mr. Djoudi, Algeria)

Even more serious, Namibia is now an integral part of South Africa's strategy to create a cordon sanitaire to protect the white minority régime and to serve as a springboard for its acts of armed aggression and terrorism against neighbouring States. Its independence continues to be linked illegally to totally extraneous issues, a linkage regularly denounced by the General Assembly, the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries.

Furthermore, Security Council resolution 566 (1985) continues to meet with the intransigence of the Pretoria régime. That intransigence, which is the direct consequence of the support and impunity certain countries continue to guarantee to South Africa, has led it to broaden the scope of its aggression. Thus in less than a year more than five countries have on numerous occasions been victims of acts of aggression carried out against their territorial integrity by the racist forces. Many pretexts, all of them equally fallacious, have been advanced to justify those savage attacks designed to violate the solidarity of the front-line countries with the struggling South African and Namibian peoples and to impose South African diktat in the sub-region.

Those acts of aggression are and remain unjustifiable violations of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of sovereign African States Members of the United Nations. We once again denounce and condemn those criminal acts here, and we hail the heroic resistance of Angola, Mozambique, Botswana and Lesotho in the face of South Africa's subversive schemes. We also reaffirm here once again for those countries, as well as for the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) and the African National Congress (ANC), the legitimate representatives of the struggling Namibian and South African people, my country's total solidarity with their just combat against the hateful system of apartheid and the colonialist and warlike policy of those who uphold it.

(Mr. Djoudi, Algeria)

The financing of and assistance to mercenaries, in whatever form, as well as recourse to their use, are acts of interference in the internal affairs of sovereign States and serious violations of international law and the spirit and letter of the United Nations Charter and the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly; they are, for that reason, greatly to be condemned.

However, the use of mercenaries has always been one of the facets of the political morality of the Pretoria régime, both in southern Africa and outside it. Angola and Mozambique, in particular, have for some years been confronted with criminal acts of sabotage and destabilization against their territorial security and their economic infrastructures carried out by mercenaries who have been trained, armed, financed and led by the racist Pretoria régime.

Although it shows that outlaw régime's determination to employ any means, including the violation of its own international commitments and the breaking of its own word - as was clearly to be seen in the case of the Nkomati accords - to achieve its ends and impose its hegemony on neighbouring countries, the use of mercenaries in particular increases instability in the region and further aggravates the threat to international peace and security.

The international community and the Council have a duty to denounce and firmly condemn the use of mercenaries, whatever the reason, and to furnish to the countries that are its victims the assistance necessary to defend themselves against the attacks of the South African régime and the mercenaries in its pay.

Analysis of the current situation in southern Africa inevitably leads one to observe that there has been a noticeable increase in South Africa's aggressiveness and its stubborn persistence in its arrogant intransigence in the region. That aggressiveness and intransigence are the direct consequence of the multifaceted support and guarantees of impunity the Pretoria régime continues to get from

(Mr. Djoudi, Algeria)

certain countries. In those circumstances, it is right and urgent that those countries heed the voice of all of Africa, which calls upon them to respect independence and non-alignment by abandoning any compromise with Pretoria. No one should be fooled by the racist régime's claims to be the representative of some civilization or by its desperate attempts to distort a great people's struggle for freedom and dignity by attempting to involve it in East-West ideological competition.

(Mr. Djoudi, Algeria)

In coming before the Security Council Africa is once again acknowledging the importance of this body and its faith in its ability to take steps that might restore international peace and security. The seriousness of the situation in southern Africa obliges it to meet its responsibilities and to make full use of the powers available to it. The Council should not disappoint the hopes placed in it by all peoples, especially those who are direct victims of the odious system of apartheid. Nor should it continue to permit those who uphold that system to go on perpetrating their crimes with impunity.

While they can be positive, individual piecemeal sanctions have shown their limits. Their impact on the economic and military power of South Africa remains insignificant, if it has not been totally negated by the wide-ranging co-operation some countries still give the racist régime. Furthermore, these piecemeal sanctions have not at all changed the attitude of South Africa, which remains characterized by inflexibility at home, aggression and hegemony throughout the region and defiance and arrogance internationally.

The imposition of global and binding sanctions is therefore imperative in the present circumstances and remains the only way to hasten the fall of the apartheid system and to put an end to the suffering and the tragedy that have so often been the lot of the peoples of this southern subregion.

Mr. TSVETKOV (Bulgaria) (interpretation from French): For several decades now the situation in southern Africa has caused grave concern in the international community. The reason is obvious. It is the policy of apartheid and the racial segregation and discrimination of the Pretoria Government. This policy has long been called a crime against mankind and has been categorically condemned. In this day and age, when men are venturing into outer space to conquer it, it is unfortunate that there still exists on earth a State wedded to archaic and inhuman

(Mr. Tsvetkov, Bulgaria)

notions that smack of mediaeval slavery, of fascist racist criminal doctrines and the most extreme form of imperialist colonialism.

Apartheid has not been turned into a State policy and system merely on the whim of a handful of fanatic whites. It is the repressive reaction of South Africa's ruling classes to the just liberation struggle of the oppressed people. It has become the primary instrument used by the white minority to perpetuate the dependence and pitiless exploitation of the inhabitants of the country who are not white. Today South Africa is a country in which all human rights have been brutally violated and where widespread terror holds sway. The reports coming out of the country could not be more shocking. Hundreds of thousands of people, whose only crime is that they have protested against the inhuman policies of apartheid, have been killed, tortured and cruelly mistreated by the racist régime. More than 1,000 people have been killed since the beginning of 1985, and with each passing day the grim statistics grow. Hundreds of thousands are rotting in prison and innumerable victims have been persecuted as a result of racist policies that have become official policy.

The Security Council and the international community have responded to this tragedy. Many decisions and resolutions have been adopted by the United Nations on the subject. As far back as the carnage in Sharpeville in 1960 the Security Council adopted resolution 134 (1960), which with wisdom and foresight stressed that if the tension in South Africa continued, the situation in the area would inevitably endanger international peace and security. Today we have seen that warning become a particularly menacing reality. Southern Africa has indeed become an extremely dangerous powder keg which could explode in a moment, with disastrous consequences for the region and the entire world. This problem must, then, be

(Mr. Tsvetkov, Bulgaria)

considered in the most serious and responsible manner possible, with a view to taking concrete effective decisions to stamp out the savagery of the apartheid régime.

A suitable decision by the Security Council is particularly urgent because events in southern Africa have become increasingly dangerous to peace and security throughout the world. The leaders of Pretoria have been feverishly and savagely crushing mass demonstrations while at the same time announcing certain so-called reforms, which are nothing but a safety valve for social and political tension. The so-called reforms, including resounding statements regarding the elimination of certain racist provisions of the law, are merely cosmetic touches designed to delude public opinion as to the true nature of the system of apartheid. Manoeuvring desperately, the racist régime has been trying to save the foundations of the racist State system, which its advocates have demagogically been calling part of the political traditions and specific nature of southern Africa.

The acts of repression and the manoeuvring of the racists will not stop the popular resistance. As the representative of the African National Congress (ANC) has most responsibly stated, the people of South Africa are determined to eliminate from the face of southern Africa the odious régime of apartheid. The international community unanimously supports the aspirations of the millions of indigenous inhabitants of the country, who want to have a worthy and rightful place and to be on an equal footing with others in their own country and in the international arena.

Backed into a corner, the régime has been seeking a solution to its grave problems by expanding abroad and conducting armed terror against independent neighbouring countries. The illegal occupation of Namibia has continued for decades, and one of its consequences has been the bloody conflict between the colonizers and the national liberation forces. It is not by chance that the

(Mr. Tsvetkov, Bulgaria)

problem of Namibia has become one of the most urgent in the international arena. In accordance with the apartheid laws, savage treatment is the daily fare of the people of Namibia. The racists brazenly demonstrate their scorn for the Security Council decisions regarding the granting of independence to Namibia contained in its resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978). They create their own puppet bodies, declare states of emergency and set up closed military bases where they prepare attacks on the People's Republic of Angola.

(Mr. Tsvetkov, Bulgaria)

The hostile and aggressive acts committed by South Africa against this young Republic and other neighbouring countries has created a truly explosive situation in the southern part of the continent. South Africa continues illegally to occupy southern areas of the People's Republic of Angola in complete scorn of all Security Council decisions. Material and all other forms of assistance to the puppets under Savimbi and the Pretoria mercenaries continue to flow. At the same time, Pretoria has been engaged in subversive acts against the legitimate Government of Mozambique. Punitive raids have been regularly carried out against Zimbabwe, Botswana and other countries in the area, the sole result of which has been numerous innocent victims and much destruction. A recent example of this brutal violence against a sovereign country has been the imposition of a blockade against Lesotho a few weeks ago. This policy of State terrorism is resounding proof that apartheid and aggression are but opposite sides of the same coin. It is particularly ominous that the racist régime has acquired nuclear capability, which it might use in the near future as its ultima ratio to protect its criminal power.

It is only logical to ask: How is it possible for one solitary country in the world, whose population and power are only average, to trample underfoot the will of the international community, intimidate with impunity its neighbours and kill its own people, while at the same time alerting the whole world with its reckless policies?

The answer is well known: some imperialist forces still regard South Africa as the bastion of their own economic and strategic interests in that part of the world. Those forces count on South Africa to hold back by fire and sword the overwhelming wave of national liberation movements so that it can guarantee the vast profits of their monopolies and play the role of policeman controlling all traffic between the Atlantic and Indian Oceans. South Africa and its friends are

(Mr. Tsvetkov, Bulgaria)

tireless in their intrigues to foster plans aimed at forcing the free African countries to return to being victims of colonial plundering.

How else can we assess the visit to the United States of the puppet Savimbi and his contacts with highly placed individuals, including the President of the country? His visit is particularly significant against the background of the Declaration of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) in July 1985, clearly stressing that any interference in the internal affairs of sovereign Angola would be considered an overtly hostile act against all Africa. Today the people of the world expect the major Powers to take a constructive and responsible approach to the most urgent international questions, and to curry favour with a criminal can only be considered as open defiance of the South African peoples and as encouragement to the racists and all South African mercenaries and anti-government forces in their subversive actions against the legitimate Governments of sovereign countries. That is how the visit was seen by the Co-ordinating Bureau of Non-aligned Countries and the Group of African States in the United Nations. Unfortunately that reflects the global orientation of the policy of "constructive co-operation", which ensures supplies of material resources and guarantees freedom of action to the Pretoria Government.

Faced with the unpredictable, grave consequences the dangerous exacerbation of the situation in South Africa can have for international peace and security if it is not rectified, my country believes that it is high time for the Security Council to adopt effective measures with regard to the problems now under consideration at the request of the African Group. Certain countries should evince wisdom and set aside their traditional political and commercial considerations and respond to the overriding need of mankind: to eradicate the tumor of apartheid and racism from our modern civilization.

(Mr. Tsvetkov, Bulgaria)

To this end, comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter must, first and foremost, be adopted against South Africa. The Council must also issue an outright warning to the racist authorities: failure immediately and mediately to cease once and for all acts of repression and massive killings, subversive activity, whether overt or covert, against other countries and giving assistance to paid killers, such as Savimbi, will oblige the Council to take the necessary action to put an end to their high-handedness and eliminate a constant source of tension and potential war for Africa and the whole world.

In conclusion, the People's Republic of Bulgaria unreservedly supports the heroic struggle of the peoples of southern Africa against the acts of violence and oppression of racism. We shall continue to give support to and stand by Angola, Mozambique, Zimbabwe and other independent countries that are threatened by the military machine of South Africa. We shall continue to remain in complete solidarity with the people of Namibia which, under the leadership of their sole, legitimate representative, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), have been engaging in an historic struggle for the triumph of their inalienable right to freedom and independence.

On behalf of my country, I take this opportunity to express our admiration and complete support for the great sons of southern Africa who have been waging a tireless struggle to rid themselves of the racist yoke in their country.

Mr. MOHAMMED (Trinidad and Tobago): I wish to offer my sincere and warm congratulations to you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council. We are confident that with your well-known diplomatic skills you will discharge your responsibilities with great credit to your country.

I also take this opportunity to pay tribute to your predecessor, the Permanent Representative of the People's Republic of China, His Excellency Mr. Li Luye, for

(Mr. Mohammed, Trinidad and Tobago)

the very competent manner in which he conducted the proceedings of the Council during the month of January.

Under the agenda item before us this Council is called upon once again to consider the situation in southern Africa.

The three main interrelated aspects of this situation are: first, the existence of the abhorrent system of apartheid with its gross violations of human rights and fundamental freedoms of the majority of South Africans; secondly, the illegal occupation of the Territory of Namibia by the practitioners of apartheid; and, thirdly, the deliberate policy of the apartheid régime of destabilizing neighbouring States. These three aspects of the situation in southern Africa singly and jointly represent the gravest threat to international peace and security on the continent of Africa today.

(Mr. Mohammed, Trinidad and Tobago)

The internal situation in South Africa has deteriorated dramatically since September 1984, when the present cycle of violence began. More than 1,100 persons have been killed over this period. During 1985 some 3,500 persons were detained, of whom about one third are still to be released. But those startling figures describe only part of the picture. The ferocity of Pretoria's security forces has always been notorious. The state of emergency declared on 20 July 1985 has, by making these forces unaccountable for their conduct, allowed excesses of unspeakable extremes to be carried out. Unarmed men, women and children have been shot dead with increasing frequency. The mistreatment of prisoners has become even more widespread. Arbitrary arrest and detention without trial are the order of the day. In these circumstances it is not surprising that the Pretoria régime took steps to prevent these excesses from being publicized abroad by imposing a ban on the foreign press - and this from a régime which is forever boasting of its "democratic" credentials.

The reprehensible and odious system of apartheid still exists despite the outrage of the international community. A juridical examination of apartheid shows that the system is clearly an international crime. Indeed, various General Assembly resolutions point in that direction.

The people of South Africa have shown that they will no longer accept the abominable system of apartheid. While we sit here in this Council Chamber and equivocate over whether sanctions are effective, whether they will hurt those they are supposed to assist, the South African people continue on a daily basis to make the supreme sacrifice of their lives in order to hasten the demise of apartheid. Real reform in South Africa will come only when apartheid is abolished and when the minority régime is made to negotiate with the true leaders of the South African people - many of whom, like Nelson Mandela, are in prison or have been forced underground or into exile. The international community in general, and the

(Mr. Mohammed, Trinidad and Tobago)

Security Council in particular, has a crucial role to play in hastening the advent of political, social and economic reform in South Africa by applying comprehensive sanctions against South Africa.

With regard to the apartheid régime's illegal occupation of Namibia, the reluctance of the Pretoria régime to relinquish its hold over the Territory is a matter of record. The Council, by numerous resolutions and in particular resolution 435 (1978), has declared Pretoria's occupation of Namibia to be illegal, and has even endorsed a plan under that resolution whereby the Namibian people would be able to assert their right to self-determination. Nevertheless, the régime has sought to introduce matters extraneous to the issue. The history of South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia is one of intransigence. At every turn a stumbling block has been placed in the way of the Namibian people's attempt to free themselves of racist Pretoria's machinations, suppression and illegal occupation.

The Security Council must demand of South Africa its immediate and unconditional implementation of Council resolution 435 (1978).

The third aspect of the present situation in southern Africa is the apartheid régime's deliberate policy of destabilizing its neighbours, the front-line States. To achieve the destabilization of those States, the full weight of the apartheid régime is utilized. Economic, political and military pressure is brought to bear on the front-line States in order for the South African régime to maintain its illegal stranglehold on Namibia and to continue its abhorrent system of apartheid.

The illegally occupied Territory of Namibia has been used as a springboard for full-scale invasions of Angola since the first days of its independence in 1975. Military raids have been frequently carried out against Botswana and Lesotho to force them to stop offering a haven to refugees fleeing the internal oppression by South Africa. Military and economic pressure is used to coerce these vulnerable

(Mr. Mohammed, Trinidad and Tobago)

and defenceless neighbours into signing security pacts with Pretoria. Bands of surrogates are trained, armed and given logistical support by South Africa to carry out widespread sabotage of the economy and infrastructure of its neighbours. Pretoria's destabilization policies, which violate the sovereignty and territorial integrity of its neighbours, are a real threat to international peace and security and have been repeatedly condemned in various resolutions of the Security Council. It is therefore surprising that a permanent member of the Council is at this moment contemplating giving assistance to one of those surrogates to help him violate resolutions which that member has supported.

The Security Council must unequivocally seek to end the situation in South Africa, which constitutes a serious threat to international peace and security. To achieve peace in the region four objectives, as demanded by the Council, must be met. First, the system of apartheid must be abolished and political prisoners of the apartheid régime freed. Secondly, South Africa must end its illegal occupation of Namibia. Thirdly, South Africa must put an end to its policy of destabilizing its neighbours. Fourthly, South Africa must immediately implement pertinent Security Council resolutions.

But the history of South Africa's conduct in modern international relations is one of intransigence and disregard for the principles of international law, United Nations resolutions and the will of the international community. It would be foolhardy to expect that the apartheid régime would take the four steps I have just mentioned without some form of pressure being brought to bear against that régime. In fulfilling its Charter responsibility, the Council must once again resolve that the apartheid régime remedy the situation in southern Africa. My delegation therefore considers that the time is opportune for the Council to address the problem seriously and utilize the mechanisms contained in Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter.

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

Mr. GBEHD (Ghana): A little over a month ago, the Security Council considered Lesotho's complaint that South African forces had invaded its territory and indulged in the cold-blooded murder of South African refugees residing there. The international community and the Council deplored South Africa's illegal and savage act of aggression against Lesotho.

Today, African countries are again petitioning the Council for action against the same Pretoria régime because its manifold actions endanger international peace and security in that region. To the political purist, the present request might perhaps appear to be one too many. But the fast deteriorating situation in South Africa and southern Africa, and considering that the Council has responsibility for preventive action to pre-empt armed conflict between States, my delegation submits that the African complaint is not only appropriate but also urgent.

At the end of the debate on Lesotho's complaint against South Africa, the Security Council adopted resolution 580 (1985), which called upon South Africa to desist from the use or threat of use of force against neighbouring or other sovereign States which are also Members of the United Nations. Although no armed aggression has occurred since then, we have all been witnesses to threats uttered by the racist régime against its neighbours, especially Botswana, Zambia, Angola and Zimbabwe. There have been open threats to take military action against those countries because, as South Africa explains, they continue to harbour South African refugees.

We know that at the heart of the problem between South Africa and its neighbours is the continued existence of apartheid, which the Council has denounced on numerous occasions. South Africa's actions are calculated, therefore,

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

to coerce front-line States into expelling those persons who are most committed to the fight against apartheid. Whatever the attitude of the racist régime is to the African National Congress, however, that attitude does not entitle the régime to invade or threaten military action against its neighbours. Such threats, which South Africa has already demonstrated on several occasions that it can carry out, are contrary to Article 2 (4) of the Charter, which states:

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

South Africa, relying on its military strength and the protection of its powerful friends, continues to ignore that essential principle of the Charter.

Secondly, the African delegations are beseeching the Council to take preventive action to maintain peace and security in southern Africa, because the situation in South Africa itself, which influences the region as a whole, continues to worsen as the two main races, white and black, continue inexorably on a collision course. Hardly a day goes by now without a black life being lost to the violence of the apartheid régime. Reports abound with news of South African security forces shooting men, women and children for demonstrating in the streets against the oppression and exploitation of apartheid. These deaths, which are far in excess of a thousand in the past few months, may not be predominantly white lives, but the Ghana delegation begs to submit that they cannot be valued any less than those of the white race. The urgency of the request of the African countries, therefore, relates also to the increasing and senseless loss of lives as the Pretoria régime seeks to protect a system that this very Council has described as a "crime against the human conscience".

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

The third reason for the concern of the African delegations relates to the coercive measures that South Africa recently embarked upon against its neighbours. We recall all too well the economic strangulation that South Africa recently applied against Lesotho, because the Government of Lesotho had continued to honour its international obligation by receiving refugees from apartheid South Africa. Quite apart from the need to uphold the principle of giving protection to refugees, it must also be emphasized that the political and economic coercion of other sovereign States contravenes numerous conventions and resolutions of the United Nations and cannot in any way be considered as promoting peaceful and friendly relations among countries.

Fourthly, the Council is being asked to pre-empt breaches of international peace and security by taking appropriate action against South Africa. South Africa's actions to protect apartheid involves unmitigated violence against its neighbours and must be halted before the subregion is engulfed in serious armed conflict.

The Council is also asked to consider urgent action in southern Africa as a whole, but especially in Angola, because of the new threat posed by the promised aid to the rebel leader Jonas Savimbi to fight the lawfully constituted and sovereign Government of the People's Republic of Angola. The proposed aid to Savimbi is unethical and politically callous, no matter which way one looks at it, for it should be clear to those who promise the military, not humanitarian, aid to the rebel leader that such aid can only be an instrument of further death and destruction in Angola. Is that really what we want for people on both sides of the political divide in Angola, or should we as United Nations Members rather be committed to a peaceful resolution of the military impasse in that country? My delegation believes that we should all throw in our lot with the path to peace.

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

Finally, the African delegations are before this Council to request it to act resolutely in defence of the Charter. My delegation hardly needs to instruct anyone that all Member States, in accordance with Article 25 of the Charter, "agree to accept and carry out the decisions of the Security Council". Not only has South Africa arrogantly refused to carry out resolutions of the Council for so long but it has even gone further to use violence against its neighbours, thereby endangering international peace and security. Africa rightly asks this Council: How many more months or years must pass and how many more lives must be sacrificed in southern Africa before the United Nations lives up to its own purposes and by its own principles?

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

In responding to the requests of the African delegations, the Council must, in my delegation's view, look at the sum total of the unfolding events in southern Africa. The situation in apartheid South Africa itself continues to harbour ominous threats to South Africans, as well as their neighbours. Hardly any day passes, as members of the Council are fully aware, without mass arrests, detentions and repression under the so-called emergency laws, in spite of resolution 569 (1985) and several other appeals in the past. The state of affairs amply demonstrates that the racist régime remains wedded to apartheid and will continue to ignore, with contempt, the views of the international community for as long as it can.

The Ghana delegation is aware that some supporters of the Pretoria régime have rushed to accept the contents of the speech made in Parliament on 31 January 1986 by President Botha, but we ask Council members to take a harder look at the proposals, when their deceitful intention will be more than apparent. President Botha announced in that statement that passes would be replaced by yet other identity cards, that the present Presidential Council would be replaced by a National Council, inevitably loaded once again with apartheid cronies, both black and white, and that Nelson Mandela would be exchanged for Soviet citizens and one South African prisoner now being held in an Angolan prison - a crafty way of introducing super-Power disagreements into the steps needed to eradicate apartheid. These cannot be genuine proposals, as many colleagues on the Council have already affirmed, and cannot represent the true wishes of the people, unless and until the so-called reforms have been discussed and approved by the genuine representatives of the black majority in addition to other ethnic groups.

There is a genuine fear in the front-line States today of military and economic aggression by South Africa, because South Africa itself has made it clear

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

in so many words that that will happen. It has superciliously requested its neighbours to sign joint security treaties with it, saying "Otherwise, our security forces will have no alternative but to engage, in our own interests, in cross-border actions against the enemies of South Africa." If that is not a threat of the use of force, what is?

Lest anyone be lulled into thinking that the proposal for joint security treaties has merit, let me remind the Council that the front-line States have rejected any collaboration with the apartheid régime, for the simple reason that if the régime remains jaundiced in its views on fundamental human, political and economic rights and on equality it is not likely to respect international treaties that it signs with black-governed States. Where is the proof to the contrary? Has not the United Nations itself advised against collaboration with the racist régime, as a means of increasing pressure on it to give up apartheid?

The political situation in Namibia also remains in stalemate. There is no evidence that the independence of that country is anywhere near. A framework for Namibia's independence, as set out by the Security Council in its resolution 435 (1978), remains unimplemented. Arrogantly, the racist régime tells us that it will not co-operate in the application of resolution 435 (1978) unless Cuban troops are withdrawn from Angola. In effect, the independence of Namibia would come only on South Africa's terms - that is, unless the arrangements which independent and sovereign Angola has made for the protection of its territorial integrity and security are re-ordered to suit the racist régime, Namibia cannot hope to be independent. And yet South Africa's presence in Namibia is illegal, and with it Namibian lives continue to be lost as Namibians struggle to be free.

Last Wednesday, 5 February, we were treated to yet more sweet-tongued rhetoric by the representative of the apartheid régime. With great emotion he described African States and the international community generally as deliberately out to

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

persecute a reasonable and penitent South Africa. South Africa's record on negotiations to end apartheid and to grant independence to Namibia are, however, too well known to make its recent pronouncements credible. Barely hours after Botha's statement that ostensibly acknowledged that apartheid was wrong and outdated, South African security forces were again shooting peaceful black demonstrators in the streets, and black families were again being forcibly removed to the so-called homelands. The immediate and serious denunciation of Pik Botha by the State President, for admitting that it was conceivable that South Africa would have a black President in the future, should expose the true beliefs and intentions of those who now govern South Africa.

The Council has listened very carefully to representatives of African States and others on the vexed question of the deteriorating situation in southern Africa as a whole. The Council has also listened to the representative of South Africa, and it is up to it to determine whether the situation in South Africa is serious enough to merit its attention, or whether the complaints are, as the South African representative described it, a mindless vendetta against his country. The Ghana delegation considers that a clear case for concern has been established, and the Council should not turn its back on the dead, the dying and the victims of threats of aggression. The only point at issue, in our view, is how the Council should now act.

My delegation believes that the Council should again call upon the South African régime to cease immediately the murder and maiming of innocent citizens, as these acts are only helping further to inflame an already tense situation in the country. South Africa should be reminded of the Council's earlier demand that it totally lift the state of emergency that it declared last year and proceed to hold an urgent and constructive dialogue with the genuine leaders of the black majority, in order to reach acceptable modes for establishing a non-racial, democratic

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

society in the country. Those are not new recommendations, but South Africa needs to be reminded again that they constitute the only peaceful alternative to the armed struggle against apartheid, which history shows the oppressed will surely win.

Furthermore, the new phenomenon of economic coercion by South Africa in the subregion must be strongly deplored, because it violates the purposes and principles of the United Nations and contravenes the conventions governing friendly relations between countries. The Council is thus under an obligation to help preserve the sovereignty of South Africa's neighbours.

The measures I have outlined are, we believe, the correct actions to take in the matter. However, we all know that South Africa has a long and undisputed record of contempt for the Council's decisions. The Council, therefore, will be faced either with taking other measures to ensure compliance with its decisions and therefore improve the situation in the subregion or failing to act decisively and thereby allow the situation further to deteriorate. The Charter and the interests of international peace and security counsel firm and decisive action, which, in our view, the Council should not shirk.

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

In my delegation's view, the only peaceful way to make the racist régime in Pretoria abide by the norms of the United Nations is to increase international pressure on it. That pressure is best exerted by the imposition of comprehensive mandatory economic sanctions against South Africa. In deference to the patience of the Council, I shall not go through the arguments in favour of sanctions. Suffice it to say that the time period granted for the régime to end apartheid or face comprehensive mandatory sanctions is fast running out. The least this Council can do now is to remind South Africa of the deadline.

The Ghana delegation still believes that the long-term interests of South Africa and southern Africa generally would be better served by quick change through peaceful processes. But that is not likely to be the case if South Africa and outside Powers continue to fuel dissent by providing moral and material assistance to the racist régime and to the rebel leader Savimbi. We owe it to the Government of the United States, a permanent member of the Security Council and therefore a trustee of international peace and security, to tell it reluctantly but truthfully that we are ashamed and saddened by the moral and material help it is now involved in offering the rebel Savimbi. A permanent member, in our opinion, should not peddle the instruments of death and destruction in Angola or, for that matter, in any country that suffers internal conflict. That example, if not denounced and discouraged, will mark for all of us the beginning of the end of the Security Council and the United Nations as credible instruments of peace. I know it will be quickly pointed out to me that others are currently doing the same, but which is the more logical road to peace: to exacerbate conflict militarily, or to seek an international consensus against those who, for selfish reasons, proliferate the instruments of war?

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

In conclusion, I would urge the Council to live up to its responsibility by unanimously condemning all actions that threaten international peace and security in southern Africa. As far as my delegation is concerned, we are prepared to play a constructive part in that endeavour, but we will not be party to any action - or inaction - that can only give political succour to the racist régime, undermine the sovereignty and territorial integrity of southern African countries and continue to hold Namibians illegally under the domination and exploitation of South Africa.

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

Mr. RAJAIE-KHORASSANI (Islamic Republic of Iran): Mr. President, I thank you and the other members of the Council for having invited me to participate in the deliberations of the Security Council. The issue is a most serious one for you, Sir, particularly because, as a son of Africa, you have great concern and interest, both personal and official, with regard to the problem. Your position is a courageous one. I hope that the results of these deliberations will be satisfactory to you and the other participants who look forward to success for the oppressed people of Africa, particularly the southern part of Africa.

Today, the Security Council is again discussing the agony of South Africa. In this mourning ceremony the Council's deliberations are focused on a well known shameful part of the record of Western man, an ugly stain that has brought the greatest embarrassment to the family of mankind.

Previous speakers have already given elaborate accounts of the faces of South African terrorism perpetrated by the racists of Pretoria for the perpetuation of the diabolical system of apartheid. Using the excuse that they are preserving law and order, the racist agents of Western imperialism have been murdering innocent

(Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani, Islamic
Republic of Iran)

oppressed people in the absence of the international media. The reign of terror ruthlessly pursued by the fascist colonizers of Azania, or South Africa, has been well explained, and there is no need for further details. Moreover, some members of the Council whose embassies in Johannesburg are still quite active, in mockery of the international will, do not really need information about the situation in South Africa or in southern Africa. Professional diplomats know how to feign innocent ignorance of what their own Governments have been pursuing in that part of the world.

I would therefore focus on another aspect of the tragedy which in my delegation's opinion deserves more attention. As members of the Council know, the many incidents of State terrorism carried out by the Pretoria racists are the fruits and not the roots of the problem. It is those very fruits which have up to now debilitated this Council, preventing it from taking effective and constructive measures to bring that painful, tragic situation to an end. The root is the vampire of international zionism and imperialism.

It is important to expose some aspects of that vampire just to make sure that the criminal acts of the Pretoria régime are not treated in isolation or detached from their original sources and supply routes. It is true that speakers before me have taken due note of the warm welcome the President of the United States has extended to Savimbi. That warm and mutual understanding between the United States Administration and a professional traitor and official agent of the apartheid régime not only demonstrates once again the foreign policy of the United States but also shows the degree to which the leadership of a super-Power can reduce its moral status to the lowest of the low in order to refresh a malicious mutual allegiance to a sinister and inhumane alliance.

(Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani, Islamic
Republic of Iran)

Members of the Council have seen the report submitted to the House Intelligence Committee. President Reagan is proposing probably \$15 million in covert assistance to the traitors, to the enemies of mankind. Everyone knows that covert assistance in these contexts can often mean military assistance. My Government strongly condemns such immoral and sinister alliances and strongly believes that a great nation such as the United States, with such a brilliant record of achievement, deserves a more ethical consideration. It should also be remembered that in this abyss of decadence and vulgarity the United States Administration is not alone. The other Western allies of Mr. Savimbi who, like the United States Administration, have chosen the material gain of their multinational and transnational corporations over all human values, this multinational gang, constitute the whole machinery of international Zionism and imperialism. The United States Administration is only in the forefront, while the South African régime and the Zionist base of terror occupying Palestine constitute the instruments or the agents of this global vampire.

It is not therefore at all surprising to see all the inconsistencies and double standards and fallacies of the foreign policy of the United States when those two agents are threatened. For instance, when the issue of certain nations' and/or certain countries' support for the victimized people of Palestine or Libya is raised, the United States is the precursor for the carrying out of sanctions, even when its allies disagree. But when the same sanctions are proposed against South Africa by the entire world, including many of its Western allies, the United States rejects them. In the latter case the United States believes that sanctions are counter-productive and usually wrong, whereas in the former case, in spite of the open opposition of the whole world, sanctions are declared morally justified and

(Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani, Islamic
Republic of Iran)

effective, although the American residents of the victim country rightly oppose the decision of their own President.

The United States demands that American firms and oil companies stop their activities in Libya and imposes every economic restriction on them to make them obey the commands of the President, whereas the American multinational companies have all the support and co-operation of the United States Administration and banking system. Yet the United States has strictly prohibited any loan to the American Oil Company in Angola through its subsidiary, Gulf Oil, although it does an annual business of \$2,000 million. Why this strange discrepancy? The answer is that the economy of Angola is to be smashed. Now, in South Africa, on the one hand, and in Libya or Angola, on the other, those companies are making a lot of material gain. Why must they stop in Libya and Angola, and why must they continue in South Africa and Namibia? In the United Nations we know that every bully will justify whatever lawless and oppressive policies it follows.

When the issue of the freedom of Nelson Mandela is raised, the criminal régime of South Africa links it to the internal affairs of another country - as in a spy swap - just in order to divert public opinion in the United States from the issue of the long-overdue release and illegal captivity of Mandela. This also shows the alliance and co-operation that exists between the policies of the United States and those of the South African apartheid régime.

Violence for political ends is always condemned as terrorism by the United States Administration, regardless of the cause, whereas Savimbi's terrorism is not only justified but strongly supported by the United States. For the United States, he is a freedom fighter. Strange, is it not? State-supported terrorism by the United States and the Zionist régime is justified, while the freedom fighters of Palestine, like the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), who have global as

(Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani, Islamic
Republic of Iran)

well as international recognition, who have never occupied anybody's property and who struggle only for the liberation of their own homeland, are called terrorists.

President Reagan calls his support for the counter-revolutionaries and terrorists like Savimbi and the remnants of the Somoza régime "assistance to freedom fighters". Is Savimbi, the agent of Mr. Botha, really a freedom fighter? This cannot be true unless the term "freedom fighter" is used in the sense of fighting against freedom, not for freedom.

Why is it that the smallest military operation of the Palestinians and Lebanese Muslims is always misrepresented and over-magnified in the United States media, whereas the events in South Africa are always underplayed and always treated perfunctorily? The late widow of the late Klinghoffer is a national hero whose passing away entails a special television programme, whereas the everyday, heinous atrocities of the South African racists are only occasionally brought to the television screens just in order to support a claim to impartiality.

Skyjacking is always a crime, except when carried out by the Zionists - or, occasionally, by the United States itself. These are some of the double standards that the masses all over the globe are observing. The United States is not at all embarrassed openly to declare its interventions in the internal affairs of Haiti, the Philippines or elsewhere. In other words, what Governments usually shy away from and seem to be ashamed of, the arrogant Powers are regrettably proud of. We therefore believe that, in order to do justice to the issue of southern Africa, the international body should always put the whole scenario into perspective. It is imperative to do so, because without elevating international pressure against those without whose support apartheid cannot survive, the tragedy of southern Africa will not end.

(Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani, Islamic
Republic of Iran)

As for the recent political manoeuvres the Pretoria régime has conducted to deceive the whole world and to gain more and more support from international Zionism, it has, fortunately, become evident that, with the resignation of the opposition party and the open alliance of Mr. Botha with the racist conservative party, the reformist gestures of the Pretoria régime were only a sham, hypocritical deceptive attempt to pacify the oppressed masses. Indeed, the truth is, that the only road to freedom for those masses is through military and militant struggle because the apartheid régime cannot in any way be a party to any negotiation.

I should like to quote just a few lines from a recent article appearing in the Financial Mail of 31 January 1986, which reads as follows:

"Last week, for example, a report published the results of a readers' survey which showed 55 per cent of the respondents" - and 94 per cent of them were white - "favoured statutory apartheid. Eighty-eight per cent believed scrapping apartheid would not solve South Africa's political and racist problems."

This is the attitude of the white criminals ruling an entire hijacked nation. And, therefore, to hope for peaceful or reformist solutions is simply wrong. It is contrary to reason.

We are confident that the oppressed nations of South Africa and Namibia, which have suffered the harshest policies of a racist minority, will never cease their struggle until they achieve complete equality and freedom.

My Government condemns all the racist and oppressive policies of the South African régime and declares total support for the oppressed majority of South Africa and the people of Namibia. We particularly condemn the destabilizing policies of the apartheid régime against its neighbours, especially Lesotho, Botswana, Mozambique, Zimbabwe and Angola.

(Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani, Islamic
Republic of Iran)

As for the United States robotic foreign policy, we sincerely believe that the United States leaders must show more respect for moral and human values. National interest cannot be defined simply in terms of money. Even if money were everything - and definitely it is not - the United States would still need a respectable image in the eyes of other nations. For how long will the whole world remain an aloof spectator to the successive vetoes against the oppressed and in support of the racist colonizers and the Zionist usurpers? It is a fact that the victimized people of South Africa are going to achieve victory sooner or later, and we pray sooner. Does the United States need friendly and normal relations with the incipient and popular régime in South Africa or is it going to blame the Russians for not being able to normalize its relations with those people? The United States Administration just cannot explain all its failures in terms of Russian influence or the spread of communism or super-Power rivalry. In order not to be obliged to resort to such unacceptable explanations, United States officials need to show some concern for the cause of those oppressed people now before it is too late - but it is probably already too late.

We therefore support an unequivocal and clear application of Chapter VII. We request all those who denounce racism and the racist policies of the apartheid régime to carry out comprehensive sanctions against it.

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

Mr. KARRAN (Guyana): Permit me first of all, Sir, to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of February. My delegation is confident that with your mature wisdom and diplomatic skill you will guide the work of the Council successfully during this month.

(Mr. Karran, Guyana)

Let me at the same time pay a special tribute to your predecessor, His Excellency Mr. Li Luye, Permanent Representative of the People's Republic of China, for the very efficient and responsible manner in which he guided the work of the Council during the month of January.

May I also express my delegation's thanks and appreciation to the Council for permitting me to participate in the Council's consideration of the situation in southern Africa, a situation that has serious implications for international peace and security.

Representatives of African States have had cause to come before this Council on numerous occasions during the course of the past year to complain about aggression by South Africa against the States of southern Africa. Most recently, it was the People's Republic of Angola. We are well aware that the blatant acts of aggression which engendered Angola's complaints in particular, still continue unabated, and furthermore, that the evil system of apartheid, the root cause of the violence, death and misery in the region, is constantly finding renewed strength.

We the members of the Non-Aligned Movement and all justice-loving members of the international community have now come before the Council, not so much out of frustration as out of shock and outrage felt at the new manoeuvres affecting the region as exemplified in the open embrace of a terrorist group trained and financed by racist South Africa to fight its proxy wars.

(Mr. Karan, Guyana)

This latest affront adds yet another chapter to the injustices done to Angola and other States of the region which have dared to oppose apartheid South Africa and its systematic attempts at the subjugation, domination and exploitation of the black majority of the region.

Having been thwarted in its attempts to destroy the People's Republic of Angola at birth, Pretoria has chosen to elevate destabilization and invasion to the level of "good-neighbourliness", a policy that it has extended to other States of the region, subjecting the Governments and peoples to various types of pressure and intimidation in an attempt to rob them of their hard-won victories in the anti-colonial struggle. With the same evil intentions with which it indulges in the senseless mass murder of its own black citizens who have peacefully agitated for the restoration of their inalienable rights, in the same manner South Africa has financed and equipped dissident groups in the wanton destruction of economic infrastructure and similar activities.

The undeniable fact is that all roads to dissident camps in the region lead to South Africa, which has arrogated onto itself the right to intervene militarily in all States of the region. Make no mistake about such actions, for despite the spurious and ridiculous terms under which they have been disguised Pretoria is engaged in nothing less than blatant acts of State terrorism, which has been declared as inadmissible and rejected as contrary to the principles of the Charter, and in particular in violation of the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention and Interference in the Internal Affairs of States and the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations. Furthermore, it was against such forms of terrorist activities that this Organization so categorically pronounced itself during the recent fortieth session.

(Mr. Karan, Guyana)

The racist régime of South Africa continues to be in illegal occupation of Namibia in open defiance of the will of the international community. South Africa has continued to erect new barriers to freedom in Namibia, notwithstanding the fact that the framework for a settlement of the question already exists in Security Council resolution 435 (1978). Namibians have seen their right to freedom made hostage to East-West power politics and their future linked to extraneous issues as Pretoria seeks to stifle their legitimate aspirations to self-determination, freedom and independence. Having failed to stop the forward march to freedom in southern Africa, the racist régime has resorted to terror and violence in a vain attempt to maintain its control over Namibia and create a haven for apartheid in that region of Africa.

We have agreed that the countries of the region need a régime of peace and stability so that they can devote themselves fully to the task of nation-building. Those who have chosen to sustain and unleash terrorist groups against the countries and peoples of the region cannot therefore be acting out of concern for those beleaguered countries. Let us not be fooled by the nature of the support granted to groups such as Jonas Savimbi and his band. It is designed to provoke a situation that could present a pretext for further invasion in the name of an "anti-communist struggle" and to convince all those who can be swayed by such propaganda about the justness of that cause. In the meantime apartheid is strengthened, a country is destabilized and a people becomes locked in a bloody conflict with each other for generations to come.

In the face of such manoeuvres, we cannot, we should not, remain silent. Angola in particular is held to ransom, the gains of independence gradually being snatched away to serve the selfish ends of those whose ideological pursuits are valued more highly than the freedom and well-being of the Angolan people.

(Mr. Karran, Guyana)

Aggression must not receive permissible status simply because South Africa and its puppets have chosen to disguise it in terms that find favour with certain Governments.

Guyana feels that the Security Council has a clear responsibility to protect the territories of Angola, Botswana, Lesotho, Mozambique, Swaziland, Zambia and Zimbabwe, as well as their innocent nationals, from the viciousness of the racist régime in South Africa. It is time that the Council took positive action to ensure the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) so that Namibia could attain its independence. This body has time and again called on States to cease all forms of collaboration with the racist régime in Pretoria. Providing financial, military and other assistance to South Africa's puppet groups is nothing but a new way of circumventing the arms embargo against that country and of disguising financial support for the apartheid régime. The only consistent response of the Security Council as the main guarantor of international peace and security is to unequivocally condemn the recent manoeuvres of the racist régime which have serious implications not only for the countries of southern Africa but also for the stability of the world as a whole.

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

There are no further speakers for this meeting. The next meeting of the Security Council to continue consideration of this agenda item will be held tomorrow, Tuesday, 11 February 1986, at 11 a.m.

The meeting rose at 6.40 p.m.