



Security Council

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.2656
7 February 1986

ENGLISH

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

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 7 February 1986, at 10.30 a.m.

President: Mr. ADOUKI

(Congo)

Members: Australia
Bulgaria
China
Denmark
France
Ghana
Madagascar
Thailand
Trinidad and Tobago
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
United Arab Emirates
United Kingdom of Great Britain and
Northern Ireland
United States of America
Venezuela

Mr. HOGUE
Mr. GARVALOV
Mr. FAN Guoxiang
Mr. BIERRING
Mr. RAPIN
Mr. DUMEVI
Mr. RABETAFIKA
Mr. KASEMSARN
Mr. GRANDERSON
Mr. SAFRONCHUK
Mr. AL-SHAALI

Mr. GORE-BOOTH
Ms. BYRNE
Mr. AGUILAR

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the Official Records of the Security Council.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, within one week, to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

The meeting was called to order at 11.55 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 Angola, Botswana, Ethiopia, India, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Senegal, South Africa, Sudan, the United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. de Figueiredo (Angola), Mr. Legwaila (Botswana), Mr. Dinka (Ethiopia), Mr. Verma (India), 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. 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 Algeria, Egypt, the German Democratic Republic and Yugoslavia 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. Djoudi (Algeria), Mr. Badawi (Egypt), Mr. Hucke (German Democratic Republic) and Mr. Golob (Yugoslavia) 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 Mr. Lesaoana Makhanda, to whom the Council, at its 2654th meeting, extended an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure.

I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. MAKHANDA: Allow me to begin, Sir, by extending to you my sincere congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of this Council for the month of February. We are confident that your personal qualities and undoubted diplomatic skills will greatly facilitate the efforts of this body to deal justly and effectively with all the issues that may be brought before it this month. May I also pay a tribute to your revolutionary country for its steadfast support of our just struggle.

I further wish to express my sincere and deep appreciation and admiration for the outstanding manner in which your predecessor, Ambassador Li Luye, from whose country's experiences we have learned so much over the years, guided the work of this Council in the month of January.

On behalf of the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania (PAC), the custodian of the genuine and true aspirations of the dispossessed, oppressed, discriminated-against but resisting people of Azania, permit me to express my organization's thanks to the members of the Security Council for urgently convening this very important series of meetings to discuss the explosive situation that continues to prevail in southern Africa. More important, however, is whether all the Council members will, after seriously discussing the matter, take concrete measures to put an end once and for all to the evil system of apartheid in South Africa, which is the root cause of that state of affairs in our region. Mr. Botha in his statement has assured this body that

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

But apartheid is not a concept: it is a system that has to be eradicated, dismantled. A concept is an abstract notion or idea. It would not take much to change it and impose a different meaning on the same structure, thus having the same evil under a different concept.

(Mr. Makhandia)

The southern African region has for a number of years now known no peace. The front-line and neighbouring States in the area have had their sovereignty and territorial integrity violated on numerous occasions through acts of aggression and, most recently, through threats by the Pretoria racist régime to use force against them. These threats to use force are aimed at one thing, and one thing only: destabilizing these developing nations and the region as a whole. In the words of my Chairman, Johnson P. Mlambo:

"Mr. Botha and his lieutenants are taking too seriously and to their own just peril their role as regional super-Power".

It was that mentality of the racist régime, which we had a chance to analyse thoroughly during our incarceration in the 1960s, that led us to adopt as a strategy a people's war and to vow to put it into operation when conditions were conducive to that.

In our position papers for the Organization of African Unity (OAU) we have always emphasized that our just struggle will and should be "home-grown" and that it would be irresponsible - nay, criminal - to use any of the front-line or neighbouring States as bases. That PAC position is contained in our paper "Guidelines for the OAU Strategy on Southern Africa". That effort is now evident everywhere inside occupied Azania; and it is going to escalate as long as the real issues of the national liberation and self-determination of the dispossessed and oppressed masses of our country are not addressed. About that we of the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania are absolutely confident.

We propose to prove to the Council that the front-line and neighbouring States have become "the king's whipping boys". A "whipping boy", in the old days, was one who was brought up as a companion of a prince or other noble youth, and punished in his stead for all his misdeeds.

(Mr. Makhanda)

Because of its continued inaction against the Pretoria racist régime, this august and revered body cannot escape the responsibility for the perception we are slowly forming that the Security Council indeed subscribes to the position of these States being used as the "king's whipping boys". In other words, the front-line and neighbouring States of our region are the scapegoats for the Pretoria régime's sins, with the connivance of some Council members. The Council cannot or would not punish racist South Africa, so it lets South Africa punish its neighbours for its misdeeds.

All those States have upheld the principles inscribed in the conventions on refugees of which they are signatories. They have done this in spite of the enormous costs to their fledgling economies, inherited from colonial times, and despite the hardships to the well-being of their own nationals. They have sacrificed and continue to sacrifice in this regard. For upholding, and being seen to uphold, these noble and lofty ideals of giving sanctuary and respite to the persecuted, the helpless, the homeless, the widowed and the dispossessed - for doing all these things, they are ruthlessly punished by such acts as the killing of their nationals, the violation and/or occupation of parts of their national territory, the arming and training of bandits to terrorize their nationals and sabotage their economies: all actions which are blatantly in violation of the Charter of the United Nations and the Declaration on principles of international law.

The "prince" - which in this case is racist South Africa - needs to be punished. It is the "prince's" misdeeds that we need to focus on.

Since the imposition of the so-called new constitution last August - a constitution which was drawn up by the oppressors and which entrenches apartheid -

(Mr. Makhandu)

the dispossessed and discriminated-against people have been heroically resisting. Their just and overwhelming rejection of the so-called new constitution won them world-wide acclamation and support, but bullets and detentions internally and massacres of protesters have become a daily occurrence in apartheid South Africa. At every mass funeral more people are killed by the racists. That there are daily killings inside apartheid South Africa is acknowledged by all. The question is: What is the root cause of these killings? Is it hooliganism, is it the work of trouble-makers, or is it the presence of the neighbouring States?

Going back a little further: On the twenty-fifth anniversary of the massacre at Sharpeville, which took place during an anti-pass campaign planned and organized by the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania, Africans in the Langa township of Uitenhage were calmly walking to attend a funeral of Africans killed by the racist "prince's" police, and these unarmed and innocent mourners were literally gunned down in cold blood.

(Mr. Makhanda)

A commission of inquiry set up by the régime itself has reported that the mourners in no way provoked the incident and that there was no justification on the part of the police to open fire on the unarmed and defenceless men, women and children. These findings are now public knowledge. They prove beyond doubt that the killings were deliberately engineered and executed by the régime's machinery, namely, the police and the army of the "Prince". In apartheid South Africa there exists State terrorism.

State terrorism has been applied by the racist "Prince" to perpetuate its diabolical system of apartheid, although publicly it claims it is using violence to "preserve law and order". The declaration of the state of emergency in some 36 areas last year inside apartheid South Africa, the "Prince" claimed, was to protect "law-abiding citizens". In the meantime, the régime has unleashed a reign of terror, in which no African feels safe from the enemy's trigger-happy police, from detention and banishment from ancestral lands. Today's issue of The New York Times contains an article referring to the same old policy of removing Africans from ancestral lands being carried out by the racist régime. I wish to read only a few paragraphs from the article which is by Alan Cowell, as follows:

"A South African civil rights group accused the white authorities today of embarking on the first forced removal of blacks in two years, an action that seemed to conflict with the Government's stated desire for changes in racial policies ...

"Last Friday, President P.W. Botha told Parliament that his Government wanted to share power with blacks through a proposed National Statutory Council, incorporating the leaders of the so-called tribal homelands.

(Mr. Makhanda)

"Referring to the authorities, Mrs. Walt [a white South African working for the civil rights movement] said, 'Their deeds make a mockery of their words.'"

Thousands have also been rounded up. Strict press censorship has been imposed.

The imposition of the state of emergency revealed two things. First, these areas have literally become operational zones as far as the national liberation movements are concerned. To date, since September 1984, whole communities have refused to pay their rents, and there is nothing the authorities can do to force them; they have tried and failed. This is particularly true of the Vaal Triangle, although it is now spreading to areas hundreds of miles away, such as Durban and the outlying townships. Secondly, the state of emergency was aimed not at dealing with the real issues or the root cause, but at giving powers to the racist régime to muzzle the international press.

As to the question of giving powers to the police to arrest at will under the state of emergency, there was nothing new, because there exist enough Draconian laws in the statute books of racist South Africa to imprison and incarcerate political opponents.

The pursuit of the innocent victims of apartheid, fleeing from all the diabolical acts I have mentioned, into neighbouring States for refuge is what the "Prince" calls "Eliminating the source of terrorism in our region" that phrase appeared in South African Press Release No. 25/85 of 30 December 1985.

This past Sunday, 2 February 1986, I received from our Chairman a message which I immediately communicated to the Secretary-General's office, informing him of 16 PAC refugees, including two widows and five children - all the children are under 10 years of age and one of them is only nine months old - whom the racist "Prince" had wanted out of Lesotho as of 11.00 a.m. GMT, 31 January. Less than

(Mr. Makhanda)

24 hours later, I received another urgent appeal from our representative in Lesotho, saying that six new arrivals had just been detained at the registration point and threatened with deportation, at the instigation of the racist régime. I should also mention here that the 16 were waiting to receive their monthly stipends from the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees in Maseru and were in no military base - if, indeed there is any. It boggles the mind as to how widows with such young children can be a "source of terrorism in the region".

That the situation inside - I emphasize "inside" - apartheid South Africa has reached a crisis of great magnitude and chaos should surprise no one. It is the inevitable result of the evil system of apartheid ruthlessly pursued by the Fascist colonizers of Azania. The root cause of all the problems in occupied Azania, in illegally occupied Namibia and in southern Africa as a whole is the policies and practices of the racist régime of South Africa. Without acknowledgement of this basic and fundamental fact, no genuine solution to the problem can be found. Moreover, there must be a recognition that it is the oppressed and dispossessed that constitute the vehicle for genuine change in Azania, and not the oppressors. Never in history have the oppressors abdicated of their own free will.

The Security Council has a responsibility to maintain peace and security. Why is there no peace in southern Africa? The answer is simple: because of the inhuman and discredited policies pursued by a bigoted racist minority. Hence the Security Council should recognize, and address itself to, this issue.

Our people know that in the final analysis we are our own liberators. We shall not shirk this responsibility. However, we believe that the Security Council also has a responsibility and a conscience. It cannot and should not allow a colonizing minority to subject a colonized majority to massacres, murders,

(Mr. Makhanda)

tortures, detentions, loss of nationality and eviction from their ancestral lands and homes. This the Security Council - or, rather, certain members - can ignore only at their own peril.

The Azanian people has truly proved beyond doubt that the unfolding, protracted revolution inside Azania is not a racial war, but a national struggle to liberate humanity from the scourge of exploitation, oppression and domination of man by man. As evidence, I wish to quote from an article by a Mr. Fourie that appeared in the Beeld, the major Afrikaaner paper, as follows:

"The PAC believes white South Africans should remain under black majority rule and believes the country should be called Azania."

In other words, our struggle is one whose objectives are, among others, to confirm the universal truth that man is made in the image of God, after His likeness, and that all men are therefore created and born equal with dominion only over the fish of the sea, the fowl of the air, and every creeping thing upon the earth. Even President Reagan himself acknowledges this fact. He has said, as reported in the Daily Challenge of 10 September 1985:

"The system of apartheid means deliberate, systematic, institutionalized racial discrimination denying the black majority their God given rights."

(Mr. Makhandia)

Before I conclude, Sir, allow me to appeal to you and all the other members of the Council please to save the lives of six Azanian patriots who were recently sentenced to death by the racist régime of South Africa for allegedly killing the Deputy Mayor of Sharpeville in September 1984 at the start of the current unrest. One of them, Theresa Ramashamola, is a young woman who is the sole breadwinner for her family, supporting a mother aged 50 and two younger sisters. The others are Mojalefa Reginald Sefatsa, Rid Malebo Mokeona, Oupa Moses Diniso, Duma Joshua Khumalo and Francis Dan Mokgesi. In the past two decades, over 100 members of the PAC have been executed. We hope and pray that this Council will not allow those patriots to suffer the same fate.

Death is ugly. It is therefore fitting that we join with our compatriots in offering our condolences to the American people and their Government on the painful loss of their gallant explorers.

I wish in conclusion to read out the words I uttered to this Council on 17 August 1984, only two weeks before the events of 3 September 1984, which were to set fire to Azania through its length and breadth:

"The South African representative's statement to this body yesterday [correctly] noted: 'Prejudice is not inclined to yield to reason ...' (S/PV.2548, p. 29-30). Since the new constitution is based on prejudice, it can therefore be assumed that it cannot be changed through reason. What then are the alternatives? To the oppressed, exploited, dispossessed and discriminated-against masses of Azania, the answer is obvious." (S/PV.2551, p. 41)

The international community has seen on television how the Azanian people have replied and continue to reply to bigotry. Let all of us exercise our God-given reason before lightning strikes some of us, as it did Saul on his way to persecute the innocent in Damascus.

(Mr. Makhandu)

Let me also express our abhorrence for Israel's piracy and terrorist methods against the Libyan flight that was hijacked after leaving the territory of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. The cause of the Palestinian people is the cause of all of us; it is humanity's cause.

The front-line and other neighbouring States are, if anything, the good Samaritans of this world. They should not be punished for their humane and godly deeds. On the contrary, the international community and this Council need to do more to help them.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I thank Mr. Makhandu for the kind words he addressed to me.

The next speaker is His Excellency Mr. Paul Lusaka, President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, on whom I now call.

Mr. LUSAKA (Zambia), President of the United Nations Council for Namibia: Allow me to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of February. Your personal competence and your experience in international affairs convince us that under your able guidance the current meetings of this Council to consider the situation in southern Africa will produce satisfactory results.

I wish also to pay a tribute, Sir, to your predecessor, His Excellency Mr. Li Luye, Permanent Representative of the People's Republic of China to the United Nations, for the efficiency and skill with which he presided over the deliberations of the Council, in particular in regard to another troubled part of the world, during the month of January.

During 1985 the Security Council met several times to consider the situation in southern Africa. It has continued its consideration of the situation in Namibia and the worsening situation inside South Africa itself. It has also continued its consideration of South Africa's acts of military aggression, destabilization and

(Mr. Lusaka, President, United
Nations Council for Namibia)

sabotage against the front-line and other States, namely Angola, Botswana and Lesotho. During 1985 this Council adopted no less than nine resolutions condemning the policies and actions of the racist régime.

During that period of almost continuous meetings of the Security Council, the situation in southern Africa has continued to deteriorate to the most dangerous level. The racist régime has defied the international community with ever greater arrogance by conducting cross-border raids, threatening invasion and continuing to occupy Angolan territory. Meanwhile, the brutality of the apartheid régime against its own people continues unabated and its intransigence vis-à-vis Namibia remains intact.

The Security Council is meeting today at the urgent request of the Permanent Representative of the Republic of the Sudan on behalf of the African States at the United Nations. The United Nations Council for Namibia, as the legal Administering Authority for the Territory until independence, welcomes the convening of the Security Council to consider the situation in southern Africa.

I wish on behalf of the Council for Namibia to express our deep appreciation to the Secretary-General, His Excellency Mr. Javier Pérez de Cuéllar, for his continuing and tireless efforts to secure the implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia and also for his commitment to regional peace in southern Africa. The Council for Namibia reiterates its unqualified confidence in the Secretary-General in his discharge of his duties on behalf of the United Nations and assures him of its continued support.

Last year we commemorated the fortieth anniversary of the establishment of the United Nations. Leaders from all over the world reviewed the triumphs and failures of our Organization. But with respect to Namibia we can only recount failed attempts by the Security Council to deal decisively and resolutely with South

(Mr. Lusaka, President, United
Nations Council for Namibia)

Africa. For those of us who have experienced colonial rule, this deficiency becomes all the more stark as last year we commemorated also the adoption of the Declaration on decolonization, General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 1960, which constituted the freedom charter of peoples under colonial rule. The Council for Namibia reiterates once again that special responsibility rests with the Security Council to act without any further delay to secure the implementation of its own relevant resolutions, in particular resolution 435 (1978).

(Mr. Lusaka, United Nations
Council for Namibia)

The Council for Namibia calls upon the Security Council, in particular its Western members, to give due attention to the events in southern Africa as they have evolved during the past several months. The oppressed people of South Africa have risen up with intensity and consistency. The actions taken are not every few weeks, but take place daily, simultaneously across the country, notwithstanding the régime's brutality. More sectors of the white community are calling for dialogue with the true representatives of the African majority. Even the corporate establishment now admits that apartheid is no longer good for business.

Members of the Council know only too well that in our continuing efforts to eradicate apartheid and bring about peace in southern Africa, the Foreign Ministers of the front-line States held meetings with the Foreign Ministers of the European Community in Lusaka, Zambia on 3 and 4 February 1986, to consider the situation in southern Africa. The Ministers reviewed in depth the current serious situation in the region and agreed on a joint communiqué, which I believe the office of the Secretary-General will issue as a document of the General Assembly and of the Security Council.

The communiqué adopted in Lusaka is a clear statement of principles that the African and European countries are unanimous in the fight against the apartheid system. Not only did the meeting condemn the apartheid system but also called for its complete eradication in all its manifestations.

We in the Council for Namibia feel that it is significant at this point in time that the meeting in Lusaka also pronounced itself unequivocally in support of the measures against the racist régime of South Africa by the EEC, the Commonwealth, the Nordic countries, the United States and other Governments and organizations and that in the event that these measures failed to achieve the desired result, further measures should be considered.

(Mr. Lusaka, United Nations
Council for Namibia)

It was significant, too, that the meeting in Lusaka condemned South Africa's continued illegal occupation of Namibia and reaffirmed that Security Council resolution 435 (1978) was the only basis for a peaceful solution to the question of the independence of Namibia. The Council for Namibia remains deeply committed to the implementation of this resolution because further delays in its implementation will only lead to the escalation of tensions and instability in southern Africa.

This body should condemn South Africa for its acts of destabilization of the front-line and other States in the region. I must report that we in the Council for Namibia have noted with satisfaction the fact that the communiqué to which I have just referred also considered as null and void the so-called interim administration in Namibia, which is in direct violation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). We cannot but commend the countries which participated in the Lusaka meeting for their continued rejection of South Africa's manoeuvres aimed at by-passing the United Nations. The linkage issue, which this Council has itself rejected, was categorically rejected too. Surely the Security Council cannot just end at that. South Africa should be made to understand that there is a limit to the Council's patience over its intransigence.

While still insisting on the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola, as a pre-condition for implementing the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, South Africa has repeatedly invaded Angola, in order militarily to assist UNITA, an insurgent movement which is seeking to overthrow the legitimate MPLA government in Angola.

"Constructive engagement", which was to define an agenda identifying a regional strategy, has clearly failed. The strategy was to build an overall framework for regional security, bring about an independent Namibia and encourage

(Mr. Lusaka, United Nations
Council for Namibia)

and coax positive change in the apartheid policies of South Africa itself. We have seen an evolving strategy of negotiations under the curtain of "constructive engagement". Needless to say, the transition from destabilization to diplomacy has not materialized.

We are indeed dismayed at recent news reports regarding the possibility of open assistance to UNITA by the very member State of the Council that has taken on the role of peace broker in southern Africa.

South Africa's actions, as a result of the policy of "constructive engagement", bring into question the interlocutor role. Has that Power used its intermediary role to promote peace, restrain Pretoria from committing violence against the people of South Africa and Namibia and its neighbours, or has it used its role to facilitate and institutionalize South Africa's regional dominance? The term, "regional security", has turned out to be a euphemism for Pretoria's regional domination. Has the honest broker become either the unwitting tool or an active agent of a régime of white supremacy?

Pretoria's southern African strategy has three components: first, "forward defence"; secondly, "destabilization"; and, thirdly, economic leverage. The first component of South Africa's strategy, "forward defence", involves illegal occupation of Namibia and military attacks, recently exemplified against Angola, Botswana and Lesotho, and threats of military attack against other front-line States. The second, "destabilization", involves providing support - such as arms, transport, logistics, communications, training and financing - to insurgent groups in the front-line States.

(Mr. Lusaka, United Nations
Council for Namibia)

To "destabilization" and "forward defence", Pretoria adds the policy of economic leverage, which it has on its neighbours - the goal being to create new political realities in the region, that is, to rebuild a political order more in keeping with the perceived needs of white rule.

The Southern Africa Development Co-ordination Conference (SADCC), in a recent overview of the economic situation prevailing in the region, calculates that since 1980, Pretoria's destabilization policies have cost the nine members \$US 10 billion, a sum appropriately described as "destabilization costs".

For months now, the rising tide of black protest in South Africa has made headlines around the globe. As the expressions of black anger have become more explosive, Pretoria's response of State repression has become more brutal. These dramatic events have largely overshadowed broader developments that have taken place in the southern African region - developments that reflect Pretoria's overall strategy for maintaining white rule within South Africa.

International acceptance or rejection of South Africa's actions must come from Governments which South Africa cannot control and which are subject to pressure from their own domestic constituencies.

Considered in this context, the events that have taken place in southern Africa and Western countries take on special significance. The cycles of black protest leading to violent repression and then more protests have stimulated campaigns and demonstrations in Western countries - the United States, the United Kingdom, and the Nordic countries - all aimed at forcing both Governments and corporations doing business with South Africa to exert economic and diplomatic pressure on Pretoria. These events have certainly served to derail Pretoria's campaign for international acceptability, which had looked so promising to the

(Mr. Lusaka, United Nations
Council for Namibia)

régime a little over a year ago. The very contradiction between the requirements of domestic political control, regional hegemony and international legitimacy that the southern African strategy was designed to resolve, has disrupted Pretoria's plans.

(Mr. Lusaka, United Nations
Council for Namibia)

The Council has clear obligations in respect to the maintenance of international peace and security; it is imperative that it respond credibly to situations where peace and security are imperiled, all the more so where its own authority is consistently being flouted. It has become increasingly clear that the effectiveness of the Council in dealing with its essential and definitive task is predicated on the interests and policies of some of its member States that are also South Africa's major trading partners and consider that régime a "geopolitical ally".

It has become self-evident that the predominant problem facing the international community is not how to bring about change in the attitude of the South African régime, but rather how to secure such changes in the policies of South Africa's major Western allies.

What the international community has witnessed is that South Africa's major Western allies publicly condemn and reject each of Pretoria's manoeuvres to perpetuate its illegal occupation of the international Territory of Namibia. However, the fear of the United Nations Council for Namibia, of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) and of the people of Namibia is that, notwithstanding public condemnation of the so-called interim government, of the extraneous and irrelevant issue of "linkage" and of the use of Namibian territory as a springboard to launch acts of sabotage, terrorism and military invasion against neighbouring African States, South Africa's powerful Western friends will restrain effective action by this Council.

This attitude on the part of the Security Council has contributed in large measure to bolstering and giving encouragement to the Pretoria régime in the very intransigence that it seeks to bring to an end. The body responsible for the

(Mr. Lusaka, United Nations
Council for Namibia)

maintenance of international peace and security is, by its inaction, giving comfort to the régime that poses such a grave threat to peace and security in southern Africa.

The United Nations Council for Namibia is firm in its call for the effective and comprehensive imposition of mandatory sanctions, under Chapter VII of the Charter against South Africa. The impact of mandatory sanctions would not only be economic, but would also deliver the required political message to Pretoria. The impact of such comprehensive sanctions on South Africa would in the short run mean a negative impact on the economies of the front-line States and the welfare of their people, but then to continue to allow the apartheid State to spread terror would perpetuate the most inhuman situation.

On 23 January this year, the offices of the National Council of Churches in Windhoek were destroyed by fire deliberately set by the agents of the illegal South African régime in Namibia. Earlier, on 18 January 1986, a bomb explosion at the Oshiganbo Lutheran High School in northern Namibia had caused extensive damage. On 27 January 1986, a peaceful festival in Katatura to mark the United Nations International Year of Peace was broken up by scores of South African police using whips and tear gas. There is no limit to the extent Pretoria will go to terrorize and repress those who struggle to live as free human beings within their own borders, in Namibia, and those who give refuge to their brothers and sisters seeking asylum in neighbouring countries.

The people of southern Africa experience on a daily basis what Nelson Mandela has written:

"You can see that there is no easy walk to freedom anywhere and many of us will have to pass through the valley of the shadow of death again and again before we reach the mountain top of our desires."

(Mr. Lusaka, United Nations
Council for Namibia)

The struggle for justice, freedom and peace is to avoid what Benjamin Moloise said:

"and tomorrow,
when the hardship comes,
Where shall we flee to?
Where will the future spring from?"

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I thank the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia for the kind words he addressed to me.

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

Mr. VERMA (India): My delegation had the opportunity yesterday of congratulating you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of February and of expressing our confidence in your ability to lead and guide it.

The Council is meeting to consider yet again the situation in southern Africa. Over the years the Security Council has devoted considerable time and attention to discussing the various facets of the deteriorating situation in southern Africa, a situation that poses a serious threat to international peace and security. Innumerable meetings of the Security Council have been convened to consider the policies of apartheid of the racist régime of South Africa, its continuing illegal occupation of Namibia against the will of the Namibian people as well as of the international community, and its aggressions against and destabilization of neighbouring, independent and peace-loving African States. In 1985 alone, out of the 21 resolutions adopted by the Council as many as 10 related to problems for

(Mr. Verma, India)

which the racist régime of South Africa was held responsible. This is reflective of the gravity of the situation prevailing in southern Africa and of the mounting international opposition against the policies and practices of the racist régime.

The policy of apartheid and the atrocities being perpetrated by the racist régime inside South Africa, exacerbated by the imposition of a state of emergency, the indiscriminate arrests, the police atrocities, the gagging of the press and the like, represent the convulsions of a sick and deranged system fighting to save itself from extinction. The brave people of South Africa are now awakened. The racist régime should know that no amount of terror or police brutality, or murder of innocent people, or arbitrary arrests and detentions without trial, or kidnappings or torture will be able to curb the indomitable spirit of the oppressed majority of the South Africans or check the relentless tide of popular resistance to apartheid. The racist régime has of late resorted again to the old tactics of divide and rule, seeking to sow disunity and discord among the ethnic population and among the different communities. The need of the hour is for all those who oppose apartheid to close ranks and to fight unitedly to vanquish that system.

(Mr. Verma, India)

The racist régime of South Africa continues to be in illegal occupation of Namibia in open defiance of the will of the international community. It is not only adopting all sorts of tactics to delay the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) but also daily increasing its aggression and atrocities against the people of Namibia. The Pretoria régime has proceeded to consolidate its illegal presence in Namibia and has intensified the militarization of the Territory, making it a launching pad for aggression against and destabilization of neighbouring independent African States. The establishment in Namibia of an illegal puppet administration in defiance of world opinion has further complicated the situation. As the Secretary-General of the United Nations stated in his report of 6 September 1985,

"there has been no progress in my recent discussions with the Government of South Africa concerning the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978)". (S/17442, para 12.)

The racist régime has also unleashed a policy of naked aggression and destabilization against all its neighbours. As such, Angola, Botswana and Lesotho, all independent and sovereign States, have repeatedly had to come before this Council to seek redress for unprovoked aggression by the racist régime.

The Conference of Foreign Ministers of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Luanda, Angola, in September 1985,

"condemned the policies and practices of State terrorism of the racist Pretoria régime against the front-line and other neighbouring States through acts of sabotage, training and infiltration of bandits and mercenaries in the sovereign territories of those States in an attempt to overthrow those countries' legitimate Governments.

(Mr. Verma, India)

"In this context, the Ministers reaffirmed the unconditional support of the Non-Aligned Movement towards the States and peoples of southern Africa and condemned, once again, the continued aggression of the racist régime of Pretoria against them." (S/17610, paras. 73 and 74)

In view of the fact that the Pretoria régime continued with its policies of destabilization of its neighbouring States by actively supporting mercenaries against the People's Republic of Angola, the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, in a communiqué adopted in New York on 30 January of this year,

"once again vigorously condemned the racist régime and its puppets for the continuing aggression against the People's Republic of Angola and the attempts to topple its legally constituted Government".

The killing of innocent people in Lesotho and Botswana and the large-scale destruction of their property by South African troops have repeatedly been denounced by the Security Council. In several resolutions the Council has asked the Pretoria Government to pay compensation for these misdeeds. The racist régime continues to flout the decisions of this Council.

The racist Pretoria régime has been announcing some so-called reforms from time to time. These are merely attempts to confuse and mislead world opinion. The obnoxious system of apartheid cannot be improved or reformed; it can only be abolished. Public opinion in the world is becoming increasingly aware of the dangers posed by the policies of the Pretoria régime. Public figures, parliamentarians, trade unionists, artists, students and growing sections of the press have raised their voices in outrage against apartheid and the repressive policies of the Pretoria régime.

(Mr. Verma, India)

The hopes that all of us have so frequently expressed that South Africa would comply with United Nations and Security Council resolutions have yet to be realized. With its customary arrogance, South Africa has repeatedly defied the call of the international community and moved on from one act of aggression to another, whether against its own people or against the neighbouring States. My delegation has always been convinced that comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter are the only effective answer to the racist régime's obstinacy. We hope that all members of the Council will come around to this realistic course of action.

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

Mr. DINKA (Ethiopia): May I first of all extend to you, Sir, my sincere congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of February. I have no doubt that the Council will benefit from your wisdom and wide experience.

I should like to take this opportunity to express the appreciation of my delegation to His Excellency Mr. Li Luye, the Permanent Representative of the People's Republic of China, for the able manner in which he conducted the affairs of the Council during the month of January.

My delegation has addressed this Council on numerous occasions and made its position crystal clear as regards the volatile situation in southern Africa and the challenges of apartheid which continue to confront the international community. I shall therefore focus on recent developments which in our view are indicative of the worsening situation in the region.

(Mr. Dinka, Ethiopia)

The popular uprising in South Africa that erupted several months ago has been spreading like wildfire throughout the country and is gaining momentum with each passing day. The majority of the African population has risen up in justifiable fury because its legitimate demands have been ignored for so long by the racist minority régime in Pretoria and its repeated plea to the international community systematically frustrated in the Security Council by some permanent members of this body.

The Fascist régime reacted to the mass uprising in a predictable manner: unleashing its war machine against the civilian population, it resorted to wanton terrorism on an unprecedented scale. Consequently thousands of schoolchildren and old men and women have been callously murdered. Indeed, as the Security Council is meeting today the senseless murder and brutalization of the African population in the land of their birth is continuing unabated.

(Mr. Dinka, Ethiopia)

Television viewers all over the world have witnessed with grief, consternation and helplessness how black children were gassed and killed by the Fascist troops in the streets of South Africa. Contrary to the expectation of the racists, however, the death of those martyrs contributed to the further strengthening of the indomitable spirit of the African majority in their struggle to regain their freedom and dignity in a democratic South Africa. Similarly, it has aroused the conscience of all men and women of goodwill throughout the world. Regrettably, however, one cannot confidently state that this ongoing holocaust in South Africa has had any consciousness-raising effect on some Western leaders. In fact, it is not inconceivable that the reverse may be true.

Nevertheless, the terrorist régime in Pretoria today is unable to stop the ever-increasing wrath of the black majority. Consequently, it is intensifying its frantic attempts at externalizing the problem - undoubtedly with the full approval and collaboration of its Western allies, particularly those permanent members of the Security Council which shield it from any concerted action by the international community through the use of their veto.

Pretoria's open defiance of the will of the international community and its repeated acts of aggression against Angola, Botswana, Lesotho and Mozambique, as well as the proved fact that it continues to organize, train, arm, finance and infiltrate mercenaries and bandits into Angola, Mozambique and Zimbabwe, can be understood only in that context.

We hope that the international community can and will reverse that dangerous trend. In this regard, we are encouraged by the unprecedented popular support in Western Europe and North America for the just cause of the masses of South Africa. But we are disappointed by the response of certain Western Governments to the popular demand of their own public. The vast majority in the West is demanding the isolation of the South African régime, not "constructive engagement" with

(Mr. Dinka, Ethiopia)

racism. They are demanding meaningful and forceful measures, but their Governments have determined to placate them with token gestures. Their demands for justice are thus being silenced by the cold calculations of greed and profit.

The efforts of the international community towards the peaceful decolonization of Namibia in accordance with Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) also continue to be frustrated by the terrorist Pretoria régime and its Western allies. South Africa has not only successfully torpedoed the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia but has also used the intervening period to strengthen its grip over Namibia by creating further illegal institutions in the Territory while continuing armed aggression against independent African States.

The massive militarization of Namibia and the creation of tribal armies are being accelerated. The so-called interim government is still in place in Windhoek, despite Security Council resolution 566 (1985) of 19 June 1985. South Africa and its Western allies are adding devious new elements to their vicious array of old tricks in order to delay the independence of Namibia. While the policy of "linkage" is still being invoked to sabotage the implementation of the United Nations plan and to subvert the sovereign Government of the People's Republic of Angola, the other side of the "linkage" coin has become more clearly visible in recent days. The image that emerges is no other than that of the equally counterfeit and discredited collection of bandits known as UNITA.

In such circumstances, it is only to be expected that the racist régime will remain as intransigent as ever. Indeed, my delegation is convinced that, given the nature of the interlocking interests between Pretoria and its Western allies, there will be no forward movement either in the process of implementing the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia or in the effort to effect the peaceful dismantling of the odious system of apartheid, unless the Security Council rises to the challenge and discharges its responsibility.

(Mr. Dinka, Ethiopia)

We have no doubt that the only way to exert pressure on Pretoria to accept the United Nations plan for Namibia and peacefully dismantle its apartheid system is the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter. There is no doubt also that such sanctions can be effective. The language of sanctions is the only language that the apartheid régime seems to understand. To defuse the pressure for sanctions talk of reform is already in the air. But we must all recognize that apartheid, based as it is on racism, exploitation and injustice, cannot be reformed; it must be eliminated.

I would be remiss in my duty if I concluded this brief statement without commenting on the latest development which is likely to affect the peace and stability of southern Africa and has therefore become a serious cause for concern in my country. The Government and the people of Socialist Ethiopia are profoundly shocked and deeply concerned by the reception the Reagan Administration has accorded to the mercenary bandit Jonas Savimbi, a surrogate of the apartheid régime, who is currently in the United States for the express purpose of acquiring weapons for his terrorist activities against the People's Republic of Angola.

What is most striking in this connection is the fact that the United States Administration welcomed this enemy of Africa in a presidential fashion knowing full well that the Assembly of Heads of State or Government of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), meeting at its Twenty-First Ordinary Session in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, from 18 to 20 July 1985, unequivocally pronounced itself on the matter by declaring:

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

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

(Mr. Dinka, Ethiopia)

We would therefore like to state emphatically that such unequivocal support for the terrorist Pretoria régime and its mercenary bandit is not only demonstrated disrespect for African leaders but also constitutes an unfriendly act against all the peoples of Africa. Similarly, it violates the principles of the sovereign equality of nations, territorial integrity and non-interference - principles which are enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations and in the Declaration on Principles of International Law governing inter-State relations.

Angola is a sovereign State Member of the United Nations and needs no seal of approval from anyone for its policies, domestic or foreign. Angola's sovereignty is not and cannot be on probation. It is inconceivable and presumptuous indeed in this day and age for any nation, no matter how powerful, to attempt to choose for another nation the socio-economic system under which its people should live or influence its choice of friends. No nation is that omniscient, infallible or omnipotent to engage in that sort of futile exercise. In any case, no self-respecting nation such as the People's Republic of Angola can accept the dictates of other nations, regardless of the sacrifices such an honourable stance might entail.

It is incumbent upon the Security Council, therefore, to call upon all States, including the United States, to refrain from taking measures which would constitute interference in the internal affairs of the People's Republic of Angola and threaten the security and territorial integrity of that country, and to cease forthwith any covert or overt assistance of any kind to the mercenary organization UNITA and the bandit, Jonas Savimbi.

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

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

Mr. ICAZA GALLARD (Nicaragua) (interpretation from Spanish): First, I wish to tell you, Sir, how happy my delegation is to see you presiding over the Council's work this month. We are convinced that your experience and your skill as a diplomat and the representative of a country that has set an example in the history of the struggle for just causes guarantee the successful conclusion of our work.

I also congratulate your predecessor, Ambassador Li Luye of the People's Republic of China, on the brilliant way in which he conducted the Council's work last month.

Through the United States delegation, I extend our condolences to the families of the seven astronauts who lost their lives in the recent accident that befell the space shuttle "Challenger".

Once again the Security Council is meeting to discuss the situation in southern Africa. And once again we must ask: How much longer will we have to meet on this question? How much longer will the situation in southern Africa remain a source of tension and concern for the international community? The reply to both questions is the same, and it is perfectly clear: until the brutal system of apartheid ceases to exist.

The growing internal repression, the policy of constant aggression against and destabilization of the neighbouring countries, the unlawful occupation of Namibia - in a word, the continuing situation of tension in southern Africa - are the result of the policy of apartheid practised by the South African régime, which, by its very nature, needs terror to survive.

(Mr. Icaza Gallard, Nicaragua)

For that reason, faced by the Pretoria racists' recent manoeuvres designed to delude the international community with talk about "reforms" - whereas the aim is simply to perpetuate the régime - this Council must take firm action. The international community must not think that it can "reform" apartheid; our sole, unchanging goal must be to eradicate this hateful system once and for all.

Apartheid is such an aberration that it not only persecutes and oppresses the black people within South Africa but even pursues them beyond their own frontiers.

The front-line countries and other southern African countries must constantly bear the brunt of South Africa's armed aggression, simply because they are doing their international and humanitarian duty vis-à-vis South African refugees fleeing apartheid and seeking elsewhere what they cannot find in their homeland.

Apartheid, spawned by imperialism and bearing a close kinship to Zionism, shares with them the notion that its boundaries extend as far as its power permits. On the basis of that notion, attacks such as the recent criminal action against the headquarters of the Palestine Liberation Organization in Tunis are carried out thousands of miles from Tel Aviv; airspace and territorial waters are violated; an "aerial police force" is established which arrogates to itself the right to intercept and divert aircraft, in complete defiance of the laws and treaties governing aviation; Namibia is occupied and all the countries of southern Africa are destabilized. Consistent with the imperial view that an entire continent is Washington's backyard, the destabilization of popular Governments in Latin America is regarded to be a right.

It is clear that the brutal policies of the Government in Pretoria have been allowed to continue and have even been encouraged by those who, in brazen defiance of United Nations resolutions, maintain commercial, financial, military and diplomatic relations with that régime.

It must be admitted that pressure for effective international action against apartheid has grown. Some large Western countries have begun to take measures to

(Mr. Icaza Gallard, Nicaragua)

limit their relations with South Africa, and, although even stronger action is required, they have expressed their support for the imposition of mandatory sanctions against South Africa. Despite all that, United States co-operation at all levels with the apartheid régime continues practically unchanged, as does the hypocritical policy of "constructive engagement".

The apartheid régime could not exist, the unlawful occupation of Namibia could not continue, there could not be constant threats of military action against the front-line countries, thousands of men, women and children would not have to become martyrs in South Africa simply because they wish to live in dignity, the explosive situation that the Council is dealing with today would not exist, if not for the support and blessing of the United States Government for Pretoria's actions.

Our peoples, the South African and Namibian peoples and all the peoples of southern Africa, the Palestinian people, the Central American peoples are all well aware of who the common enemy is. In southern Africa it has taken the name "Botha"; in Angola it is called "Savimbi"; in the Middle East the name is "Zionism"; in Nicaragua they are called "contras" - but the origin, the brains and the ploys used all stem from what is known as "imperialism".

On the one hand, the United States receives with honours criminals such as Savimbi and the former guards of Somoza who lead the contras; it repeals the Clark Amendment and authorizes millions of dollars to be spent in killing our peoples; it gives the name of "freedom fighters" to the assassins of our women and children. On the other hand, the United States says that it cherishes justice and peace and it sets itself up as the policeman for human rights and freedoms. What and whom is the United States really defending? Pitted against the efficient propaganda and the values the United States asserts before the cameras is the wrenching reality of the people of South Africa living under apartheid, Savimbi's ties with Pretoria,

(Mr. Icaza Gallard, Nicaragua)

the plunder and killing by the Somozista guards paid by the Reagan Administration to overthrow the legitimate Government of Nicaragua.

Economic sanctions are in fact "working" in Nicaragua, because in Nicaragua the people are in the Government, and that is viewed as a terrible threat to the United States. The argument used not to impose sanctions on South Africa - that is, that the people would be hurt the most - is but an excuse to continue supporting the Pretoria régime. That is nothing but a clumsy manoeuvre. Since when have the South African and Namibian peoples benefited from economic opportunities provided by the racist minority? Since when has Washington been so concerned about the welfare of the South African and Namibian Blacks?

Mr. Icaza Gallard, Nicaragua)

Faced with injustice, repression and discrimination, the peoples are rebelling. Nicaragua is the living proof of the fact that when a people decides to be free, to rise up and march forward, there is no force that can stop it. The South Africa and Namibian peoples, under the leadership of their heroic vanguards, the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC) and the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), to which we reiterate our solidarity, have set off on the path to their liberation. Nobody and nothing can stop them.

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

In view of the lateness of the hour, I intend to adjourn the meeting now. The next meeting of the Security Council to continue consideration of this agenda item will be held on Monday, 10 February 1986, at 10.30 a.m.

The meeting rose at 1.20 p.m.

