



Security Council

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.2654
6 February 1986

ENGLISH

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

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Thursday, 6 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. LI Luye
Mr. ULRICH
Mr. SCHRICKE
Mr. GBEHO
Mr. RAKOTONDRAMBOA
Mr. KASEMSRI
Mr. MOHAMMED
Mr. OLEANDROV
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 11.45 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 a 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 a 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. Yane (Botswana) 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 a decision taken at the 2652nd meeting, I invite the representatives of Ethiopia, Mozambique, Senegal, South Africa, Sudan, United Republic of Tanzania and Zambia to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

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

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Angola, Botswana, India, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Nicaragua and Zimbabwe 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. de Figueiredo (Angola), Mr. Legwaila (Botswana), Mr. Verma (India), Mr. Azzarouk (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), Mr. Chamorro Mora (Nicaragua) and Mr. Mudenge (Zimbabwe) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received a letter dated 5 February 1986 from the Acting Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid, which reads as follows:

"I have the honour to request the Security Council to authorize me, under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure, to participate, in my capacity as Acting Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid, in the Council's discussion of the item entitled 'The situation in southern Africa'."

On previous occasions, the Security Council has extended invitations to representatives of other United Nations bodies in connection with the consideration of matters on its agenda. In accordance with past practice in this matter, I propose that the Council extend an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure to the Acting Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

In due course I shall invite the Acting Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

(The President)

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

"The undersigned members of the Security Council have the honour to request the Council, in accordance with rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure, to invite Mr. Lesaoana Makhanda, Deputy Chief Representative of the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania to the United Nations, to take part in its consideration of the item 'The situation in southern Africa'".

That letter has been issued as document S/17794.

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

There being no objection, it is so decided.

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

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

The first speaker is His Excellency Mr. Serge Elie Charles, Acting Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. CHARLES (Haiti), Acting Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid (interpretation from French): Mr. President, at the outset we should like to thank you most sincerely, and through you the other members of the Security Council, for allowing me to participate on behalf of the Special Committee against Apartheid in the discussion on the situation in southern Africa, the gravity of which cannot be overstated.

(Mr. Charles, Acting Chairman, Special
Committee against Apartheid)

We should also like to extend to you, Sir, with our best wishes for success, heartfelt congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month. As a true son of the People's Republic of the Congo, a country traditionally committed to the struggle against colonialism and racism, we are convinced that you will spare no effort in seeking ways and means likely to put an end to the horrendous policy of apartheid, the overriding cause of the plight of southern Africa.

We feel bound to express our deep appreciation and sincere gratitude to your predecessor, the Permanent Representative of the People's Republic of China, on the outstanding manner in which he discharged his responsibilities last month.

Last year the Council adopted several resolutions condemning the racist régime of Pretoria for its premeditated, wanton acts of aggression against neighbouring States and its use of illegally occupied Namibia to perpetrate armed attacks against Angola, part of the territory of which it is still occupying. None of those resolutions, nor any of those adopted previously, have been implemented. Quite the contrary. The racist régime is brazenly pursuing its policy of aggression and destabilization against neighbouring States, whereas repression against the black majority, which is demanding its human and basic political rights, is worsening.

A week ago, Mr. Botha, who himself called apartheid an outmoded concept, made a statement that certain Western circles deemed to be important and encouraging, in which he reiterated his promises of change while blaming world public opinion for playing down the steps and initiatives of his Government. But what are those reforms announced in such grandiloquent but very vague terms?

When one examines it, Mr. Botha's statement in substance reveals nothing new, apart from the fact that it confirms, if confirmation were necessary, the hypocritical nature of the régime. While he claims he wishes to negotiate with

(Mr. Charles, Acting Chairman, Special
Committee against Apartheid)

representatives of the various racial groups in order to arrive at a new constitutional arrangement based on a democratic system of government, he denies the very existence of the black majority, which constitutes no less than 72 per cent of the population. Mr. Botha talks of a single citizenship for all South Africans and at the same time mentions a minority nation and rights, not singly of citizens but of groups and communities. He accepts the idea of a single republic of South Africa, but at the same time he wants to keep the so-called national homelands and bantustans. Instead of the democratic principle of one man, one vote, Mr. Botha offers to establish a statutory national council consisting of representatives of his government and the so-called self-governing states set up by the régime as well as elements from the black communities and groups of interest which are doubtless to be chosen by the régime since Mr. Botha has chosen not to negotiate with the true leaders of the liberation movements, of "revolutionary chaos", and has called them instigators of "revolutionary anarchy".

Furthermore, that body, whose members will certainly be handpicked, will only have as its sole task to give its views on questions of common interest. The pass laws that have been so strongly condemned will not be rescinded, but, having revealed themselves to be costly and obsolete, they will simply be replaced by something else to ensure what he calls "orderly urbanization".

At the same time Mr. Botha complains that he is not taken seriously by the international community. However, he is not shy in offering to release Mr. Nelson Mandela, the recognized leader of the black people of South Africa, in exchange for the release of the terrorists of the racist army captured during a raid into Angola. It is hardly surprising that the representatives of the liberation movements of South Africa have not given any importance to Mr. Botha's

(Mr. Charles, Acting Chairman, Special
Committee against Apartheid)

latest statement, which might be called mere verbiage. In truth, Mr. Botha was not addressing himself to the black population but rather to international bankers in order to obtain a rescheduling of South Africa's enormous debt upon the expiry of the present moratorium on 31 March. He was trying to stem the campaign for sanctions that is gaining ground in those countries that so far have been giving material and political support to the régime.

(Mr. Charles, Acting Chairman, Special
Committee against Apartheid)

The Special Committee against Apartheid entirely disagrees with those who see in Mr. Botha's words and in his Government's actions hope for peaceful change. The truth is that the apartheid system contains no self-correcting mechanism. Its purpose is to maintain white domination. We have always said that it cannot be reformed; it must be eliminated. Violent by its very nature, it continues to rely on the use of force and brutality for its survival. Not a day passes without a procession of misery, humiliation of every kind, pointless suffering and even death. Indeed, the only part of Mr. Botha's speech that needs to be taken seriously is his threat to neighbouring countries.

The struggle for liberation of the oppressed majority in South Africa and Namibia are closely bound up with developments in southern Africa. As one country after another threw off the colonial yoke and white minority rule, the racist régime felt itself encircled. It has viewed the emergence of each independent neighbouring State and the example of racial coexistence offered by some of them as a threat to the concept of white domination.

This is what led to the restructuring of its regional policy in a vain attempt to stave off the inevitable.

On the one hand, intervention by the apartheid régime in southern Africa in the form of military incursions, assassinations and economic destabilization and, on the other hand, offers of economic "co-operation" through a "constellation of States" and proposed land cessions are features of this policy, better known as "total strategy", whose ultimate objective is to create a constellation of States in southern Africa formally or informally tied to South Africa through a range of joint economic projects and security arrangements. In the short term this policy seeks to cut off support in the region for the liberation struggle of the peoples of South Africa and Namibia. The strategy has involved a huge build-up of

(Mr. Charles, Acting Chairman, Special
Committee against Apartheid)

military force and the development of new types of military capabilities directed at neighbouring States, not to speak of covert action by South African security and intelligence agencies as well as the use of "private" corporations in support of the racist régime's objectives.

Pretoria thus hopes to safeguard and perpetuate white domination by extending its hegemony to the whole region. All of South Africa's neighbours have been subjected to either threats or blatant acts of aggression perpetrated by direct military raids or by "dissident elements" recruited, trained, equipped, financed and directed by the Pretoria régime. In tandem with these efforts the racist régime has deliberately sought to destabilize the political and economic systems of its neighbours with a view to overthrowing their governments because they oppose apartheid. How else can one explain the training and equipping of the insurgent elements of UNITA, the Mozambique National Resistance Movement (MNRM) and the Lesotho Liberation Army (LLA) accompanied by innumerable acts of sabotage carried out by South African agents in Angola and Mozambique?

This policy is inherently dangerous to the interest of peace and stability in southern Africa and detrimental to the international effort for the elimination of apartheid and the attainment by the Namibian people of its rights to self-determination and freedom in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978). In his statement, Mr. Botha once again rejected the terms of the agreement embodied in this resolution and called instead for the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola.

Everyone is aware that UNITA insurgents have enjoyed support from the South African régime in pursuance of the latter's aim to destabilize the lawful Government of Angola. The Special Committee against Apartheid and the international community are deeply concerned over the support given by the United States Government to the head of UNITA, the repeal of the Clark Amendment and the

(Mr. Charles, Acting Chairman, Special
Committee against Apartheid)

official reception given to Mr. Savimbi in Washington, where he was received by the highest-ranking members of the United States Administration. The United States Administration should cease giving any assistance to movements whose collaboration with Pretoria clearly leads to consolidation of white domination in southern Africa.

At a time when the Security Council is deciding upon measures to be taken to deal with this situation, there is no need to recall that the stakes are indeed high. What is involved are the illegal acts of aggression against independent States, Members of the United Nations, the illegal occupation of territories in respect of which the United Nations has assumed full responsibility and the continued inhuman system of apartheid. At stake are the principles of international law, in particular the sanctity of international conventions, the respect due codes of behaviour among nations and the role and credibility of the Council as a protector of international peace and security.

The Security Council is faced with an unprecedented challenge. Now is the time for it to respond promptly and in an appropriate manner, consistent with its primary responsibilities, to restore peace and security in southern Africa and to pave the way for the emancipation of the oppressed peoples of South Africa and Namibia.

The Security Council, in the discharge of its obligations, must take immediate action in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter to maintain regional and international peace and security. Resort to the appropriate provisions of the Charter is necessary to underscore the determination of the international community to put a stop to Pretoria's acts of aggression and intervention against neighbouring States.

Despite past disappointments, the Special Committee against Apartheid cannot but continue to hope that this time all members of the Security Council will arrive at the same conclusions in the interest of peace and justice for all.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I thank the Acting Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid for the kind words he addressed to me.

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

Mr. MUDENGE (Zimbabwe): I wish to join the many others who have already spoken in congratulating you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of February. Your country is well known as a firm and resolute champion of African freedom. From my delegation's point of view, the Council's affairs could hardly be in better hands than those of the representative of the People's Republic of the Congo.

It is equally my pleasure to congratulate your predecessor, the Permanent Representative of the People's Republic of China, for the charm and grace with which he conducted the Council's business during the month of January.

The advent of a new year is normally associated with happy feelings in different parts of the world, among them the feeling of hope - hope for a bright new year and, for most of us, hope for a better world in which peace and tranquillity will reign.

Sadly, in southern Africa the new year could hardly have opened more inauspiciously. The region has been subjected to the apartheid régime's acts of State terrorism and banditry, in violation of the basic norms of established and civilized conduct of relations between sovereign States. Such a beginning does not augur well for southern Africa and indeed for world peace and security as a whole in 1986. South Africa's recent threats against its neighbours, economic blockades and other acts of aggression constitute a clear negation of the basic provisions of the United Nations Charter and the United Nations Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in Accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, in which the following is stated:

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

"Every State has the duty to refrain in its 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. Such a threat or use of force constitutes a violation of international law and the Charter of the United Nations and shall never be employed as a means of settling international issues." (General Assembly resolution 2625 (XXV), annex)

But in southern Africa Pretoria has made aggression, economic strangulation and State terrorism the leitmotiv of its existence as it seeks to achieve its long-cherished goal of establishing hegemony over the whole region. Not only has Pretoria turned loose its military machinery on its innocent neighbours but it has to date also fomented, fanned and master-minded acts of civil strife and terrorism in almost every independent State in southern Africa, in flagrant violation of the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention and Interference in the Internal Affairs of States, which unambiguously demands that every State should:

"... refrain from armed intervention, subversion, military occupation or any other form of intervention and interference, overt or covert, directed at another State or group of States, or any act of military, political or economic interference in the internal affairs of another State, including acts of reprisal involving the use of force." (General Assembly resolution 36/103, annex)

Why, then, one may wonder aloud, has the apartheid régime chosen to act in such a delinquent manner towards its neighbours? The declared reason is that Pretoria does not want its neighbours to give refuge to its citizens, because it regards them as "terrorists". But, as we all know, those refugees are the brutalized victims of the apartheid system who flee to neighbouring countries in

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

search of protection and refuge. South Africa's neighbours do not advertise in the South African press for refugees; neither do they run recruitment agencies, as the South African gold mines do in some of the neighbouring States, aimed at attracting its nationals to come to their countries. The South African nationals who cross the borders into Lesotho, Swaziland and the front-line States are victims of apartheid, and their refugee status is clearly defined by international law, in particular the 1951 Convention and Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees, which clearly states the following in its article 1:

"A refugee is any person who, owing to well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion, is outside the country of his nationality and is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail himself of the protection of that country; or who, not having a nationality and being outside the country of his former habitual residence as a result of such events, is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to return to it."

It is those victims of apartheid who today are being labelled "terrorists" by Pretoria instead of being seen for what they are - persecuted and frightened fellow human beings forced to flee the land of their birth, leaving behind their loved ones and belongings for an uncertain prospect of freedom. South Africa's neighbours are bound by international conventions and by bonds of a common humanity to uphold the provisions of the 1951 Convention on the Status of Refugees, in particular as set out in its article 33.

The truth of the matter is that it is not South Africa's neighbours which recruit and harbour dissidents against their powerful neighbour. It is Pretoria itself which incites, recruits and finances malcontents for destabilization activities in neighbouring countries. Take my own country, Zimbabwe, as an example. South Africa recruited and retrained over 5,000 former Muzorewa personal

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

auxiliary forces - Pfumo Revanhu - in dissident activities aimed at disrupting the infrastructure of our economy. Pretoria has also set up a radio station, misnamed "Radio Truth", in the Transvaal Province solely - yes, I mean specifically - to broadcast hostile propaganda aimed at inciting insurrection in Zimbabwe. Today, this very evening, and every other evening at 7 p.m. Zimbabwe time, or 1700 hours GMT, Zimbabwe's version of "Lord Haw-Haw" will be on "Radio Truth" spewing Pretoria's venom against Zimbabwe. Zimbabwe does not have a similar station aimed solely against South Africa.

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

The South African régime is responsible for the creation of political instability and the economic strangulation of Zimbabwe and other neighbouring States in order to make South Africa safe for apartheid. That is done by blowing up our rail links with Mozambique and by sabotaging our oil pipeline in that country in order to force us to use South African routes, thereby increasing our dependency on the whims and dictates of the apartheid State. In addition, Pretoria has instructed its agents to kill Zimbabwe's white commercial farmers and the leaders of Zimbabwe's ruling Party - ZANU PF - in an effort to create chaos and uncertainty and thus scare away potential investors from my country. During the past year alone, Pretoria's bandits have been responsible for 103 murders, 263 armed robberies and 57 rapes and for the destruction of \$41 million worth of property. We have previously pointed out that in the last five years the countries of the Southern African Development Co-ordination Conference (SADCC) have suffered \$10 billion worth of damage as a result of South Africa's destabilization activities.

We have often said that while at independence we could choose our friends, unfortunately we were unable to choose our neighbours - and South Africa happens to be a hostile and difficult neighbour to the south of us. Nevertheless, we made it our policy at independence to seek correct relations with all our neighbours, including South Africa, in accordance with established and accepted norms of international law. We did not permit the establishment of military bases for South African liberation movements in our country. That is a position we have declared openly, and no one has ever proved the existence of such bases. Our support for the liberation movements has been moral, diplomatic and in the context of the Organization of African Unity (OAU). And we have stated that openly too. As members of the OAU we have certain obligations, like all the other members, but

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

these do not include provision of bases. It was therefore most disingenuous of South Africa to suggest that the ANC was using Zimbabwe as a base to attack South Africa.

Pretoria's nefarious fabrications against my country on this occasion remind me of the children's story about Mr. Big Bad Wolf and Little Baby Rabbit. In that story, representatives will recall, Big Bad Wolf was drinking water upstream while Little Baby Rabbit was drinking downstream. As usual, Big Bad Wolf messed the pool where he was drinking, and afterwards the water did not look pretty at all. So when Big Bad Wolf came to where Little Baby Rabbit was drinking downstream, seeing how clean the water looked he accused the little one of having messed the water he was drinking upstream. But Little Baby Rabbit explained that since water flows downstream it was not possible that he could have messed the water for Big Bad Wolf. But of course Mr. Big Bad Wolf had other intentions, and so he proceeded to accuse Little Baby Rabbit of having messed the waters the previous year - to which Baby Rabbit explained that he was not yet born then. But Mr. Bad, by now getting rather exasperated, went on to claim that it must have been Little Baby Rabbit's daddy who did it and for that reason he said he was going to eat Baby Rabbit. However, Little Baby Rabbit pointed out to Mr. Big Bad Wolf that the previous year its daddy had lived in another part of the forest and so could not have messed the waters of the stream in question. "Then," Mr. Bad retorted angrily, "it must have been your granddaddy." And so the story goes on, with Mr. Big Bad Wolf trying desperately to find excuses to eat Little Baby Rabbit.

The real reason why Pretoria is destabilizing its neighbours is that it cannot stand non-racial democratic societies on its frontiers, for such societies are the antithesis of the policy of apartheid, which espouses the doctrine of the supremacy of one race over another. So the fact that we neighbours of the Pretoria régime

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

have made successes of our independence, while Pretoria is in such a mess, is a crime for which we must be punished. And for that reason in Zimbabwe our Party leadership is being assassinated and our white commercial farmers live in constant fear of being murdered for being accomplices in the successful formation of a non-racial society; and our railways and roads are mined and our economy has become the target of Pretoria's bandits, while our people have become the victims of racist aggression and southern Africa a hotbed of conflict and tension. Mr. Big Bad Wolf does not like the fact that his pool looks so messy, while Little Baby Rabbit's pool is clean.

Perhaps one of the most perceptive comments on South Africa's policy towards its neighbours in general, and my country Zimbabwe in particular, to appear in print in recent months is contained in a letter to the editor published in the South African Sunday paper The Sunday Star on 8 December 1985. With the Council's indulgence, I shall read out that letter to the editor, which was written by a white South African, a Mr. I. Shaskolsky, under the heading "South African Government is the Pot that Calls the Kettle Black":

"The eagerness with which the South African Government has accused Zimbabwe of involvement in the landmine incident in the Northern Transvaal is an indication of: (a) an instinctive aggressiveness on the part of Mr. Botha's Government which derives not from any threat posed by its neighbours, but from the fundamental weakness of its political position in its own country, where it is an unpopular ruler; (b) embarrassment at having to watch Zimbabwe prosper under a black Government while South Africa declines under a white one; (c) the incapacity of Mr. Botha and his generals to understand the extent to which Government policy is the cause of conflict in South Africa.

"General Magnus Malan's" - the South African Defence Minister's -

"argument that 'the Zimbabwe Government is unable to control its own rebels

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

while its economy is in shambles' is a better description of South Africa. His cynical claim that the ANC is using Zimbabwe territory in the hope of causing conflict between South Africa and Zimbabwe is more arguably the intentions of his own Government.

"A question: Is there any other government in the world whose policies are so unpopular both within and without its borders?".

And that is a white South African writing in a white South African Sunday newspaper. The simple answer to Mr. I. Shaskolsky's question is of course that there is no other government in the world whose policies are so unpopular both within and outside its borders as those of the South African Government.

The Afrikaner leadership is bankrupt of ideas on how to stop their country from going up in smoke. And so by some convoluted logic they believe that by putting their neighbours' houses on fire as well they may somehow reduce the intensity of the fire in their own house. Certainly the destabilization of Angola, Botswana, Lesotho, Mozambique, Zambia and Zimbabwe will not save the apartheid edifice from its inevitable destruction. It is doomed. Mr. Botha's recent statement to the South African Parliament and subsequent newspaper advertisements prove beyond doubt that Mr. Botha is out of touch with reality. He seems seriously to believe that he can still get away with his now notorious Bothaspeak obfuscation and other manner of verbal imprecision and camouflage. On the one hand he says he will abolish the pass laws by July this year, but on the other he says he will replace them by "measures which will facilitate orderly urbanization". What measures for "orderly urbanization" does he have in mind? He leaves us to guess.

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

And if we have to use Mr. Botha's past record as anything to go by, not much will change. It will be influx control under another name. He refers to the "outdated concept of apartheid", yet he says nothing about repealing some of its cornerstones, such as the Group Areas Act, which designates where each racial group may live. He refuses to negotiate with the true leaders of the black people of South Africa, dismissing them as "revolutionaries". He has not released the genuine leaders of the people, but is pining for the emergence of a pliable black leadership willing to make a contribution to the running of the country by serving in a council "under my [Botha's] chairmanship". The proposed statutory council will be only advisory, and Mr. Botha calls this "power sharing".

Members will have read that on 4 February - two days ago, to be precise - the Rev. Peter Hendrickse, one of the so-called coloured Ministers in the President's Council, under the present tricameral arrangement, and the other 25 Coloured Members of Parliament and one other Minister were humiliated when white MPs refused them entry into a whites-only restaurant in Parliament Building, right under Mr. Botha's nose. And Mr. Botha has the temerity to tell black leaders that this is his example of power sharing, where his own Ministers and MPs cannot eat together in Parliament, and he says that South Africa is ready for change. Some power sharing, indeed!

Mr. Botha still refers to his country of over 28 million blacks and four and a half million whites as "a nation of minorities" - minorities of 28 million! This, of course, is the fiction that has led to the establishment of the policy of Bantustans. Here we see the validity of that old adage that a leopard cannot change its spots being proved again. It is plain that Mr. Botha's statement and the sleazy newspaper advertisements had little to do with finding a just solution to his country's problems and more to do with attempting to hoodwink his international bankers. They can be taken in if they wish, but Mr. Botha will not

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

fool the average Sowetan. Why, he has even failed to keep his own Minister responsible for the education of whites, and possible successor, Mr. F. W. De Klerk from making a clown out of him internationally. Only four days after Mr. Botha's famous statement that South Africa had "outgrown the ... outdated concept of apartheid", Mr. De Klerk, asked whether school integration would now be considered, emphatically replied:

"Not in government schools ... as long as our Party stands where it stands.

In the particular situation in South Africa, as far as government schools are concerned, own schools is an important factor in ensuring stability, ensuring group security".

That is what Bothaspeak amounts to when spelt out in detail. It means apartheid, for ever and ever.

The independent countries in southern Africa have been stunned, not only by the recent events in the region, which I have already dealt with, but even more by some of those taking place on this side of the Atlantic at this very moment. I am referring, of course, to the visit of the renegade Savimbi and recent revelations in the American media that the United States Government is considering renewing aid to the UNITA bandits. I hope that in the end better counsels will prevail in Washington, because to begin aiding Savimbi is to embark on a journey to nowhere through emotionally costly and uncharted terrain.

The African continent, through its leaders at a Summit Meeting in Addis Ababa in 1985, has made known in advance its view about any renewal of aid to the UNITA bandits by the United States, with the following declaration:

"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. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

That stand was also supported by the Foreign Ministers of the Non-Aligned Movement, meeting in Luanda, capital of Angola, in September 1985.

When the present American Administration first put forward its policy of constructive engagement to the front-line States we had misgivings about its efficacy, and we said so to the American leaders in our encounters with them. On their part, the Americans asked us to judge their policy by its results and not by some philosophical shortcomings we might find in its formulation. For a year or two the front-line States muted their criticism of constructive engagement. But, as it became obvious that constructive engagement had yielded few, if any, results, at first we started to question it openly, but later, as its negative aspects unfolded, we began actively to oppose it.

I recall this brief history to underline the fact that the front-line States want so much to have the United States as a partner in solving the problems of our region that they were prepared for nearly two years to hold their peace - restlessly, admittedly - while the United States tried to apply its policy of constructive engagement on southern Africa until it had been shown to be ill-conceived and ineffectual.

The United States seems now to be in the process of formulating a new policy for southern Africa, which can only be termed destructive engagement. This policy calls for American corporate disinvestment from Angola. As reported in The New York Times and The Washington Post of 29 January 1986, Dr. Crocker, Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, speaking for the American Government, wants American companies to consider moving out of Angola. We hardly need mention that the same Administration has fought a vigorous rearguard action to keep American companies operating in South Africa.

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

In addition to that move, the Administration is said to be considering giving lethal weapons and/or millions of dollars to South Africa's quisling, Jonas Savimbi, in order to influence events in Angola through what is called a low-intensity war in which no Americans would be killed. Jonas Savimbi has been wined, dined and feted like a visiting Head of State. He has even been received by President Reagan. Needless to say, the actual President of Angola, President Dos Santos, is yet to be recognized, let alone to be received by the United States President. The only other time Savimbi was received with such pomp and protocol was when he attended the inauguration of President Botha of South Africa in Cape Town. President Reagan is the only other President he has met openly, with due ceremony, since he became a South African surrogate. It is not necessary for me to comment on the significance of this. We can all draw our own conclusions.

I recount these well-known recent events to show why we think that we have the makings of a new American policy on southern Africa. Whatever title it ends up with, its outlines are clear. And we can already state that we are moving from the disastrous policy of constructive engagement to a catastrophic one of unconstructive engagement. It is the policy of 1975, when the United States and South Africa joined hands to try to impose their puppets, Jonas Savimbi and Holden Roberto, as the leaders of Angola.

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

But of course the Americans argue that they are going to collaborate with the apartheid régime regarding Angola only because they are opposed to the presence of Cuban troops and Russian influence in Angola. The reason they do not like the Russians is that they are their world-wide rivals who follow a centrally planned economic system which the Americans see as being less efficient than their own system of free enterprise. That is a straight-forward matter of East-West ideological rivalry.

To the millions of black Africans whose very humanity is denied under the apartheid system, the "great debate" on the respective virtues of free enterprise and centrally planned economies is one which is hardly a preoccupation at this moment in history. That is a debate among human beings who recognize themselves as equal human beings but who differ in their approach towards how to make this world more wonderful for man to live in. Apartheid, on the other hand, denies the very humanity of the black man. The burning issue for the African in southern Africa is, therefore, very clear: his first struggle is to have his humanity accepted; only then, as an equal to other human beings, can he engage in the "great debate" of the age concerning the system which is going to make this world more livable for man.

We therefore appeal to our American friends not to be misled by simplistic and faulty geo-political theories. The fundamental issue of southern Africa boils down to apartheid in South Africa and racist South Africa's colonization of Namibia. It is the unfinished story of Europe's humiliation and domination of Africa; it is the story of the Atlantic slave trade, the middle passage and many other sad and painful memories of the humiliation of the African as a race. No African can be free and no black man can walk tall until that last vestige of our humiliation as a race is undone. And in that struggle to establish our humanity, how can our enemy's ally also be our friend?

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

We have argued in the past and still maintain today that the only effective, non-violent way for the international community to show its strong disapproval of apartheid is the imposition of effective, mandatory sanctions. However, in this debate, the Council is called upon to send a powerful, united message to apartheid South Africa, warning it to desist from bullying its neighbours because they carry out their bounden duty and obligation to give asylum to refugees, and demanding that South Africa dismantle its iniquitous apartheid system forthwith.

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

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

Mr. de FIGUEIREDO (Angola): Please accept, Sir, the best wishes of my Government and delegation on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of February. We are all the more pleased, in the light of the fraternal relations between our two parties, peoples and Governments, to see you in presiding over the consideration of an issue - or rather an amalgam of issues - of such concern to southern Africa in particular and to Africa as a whole.

We talk nowadays of a "global village", a world made smaller and more accessible by communications, transport, inter-relationships and interdependence. But I would venture to say that it is since the dawn of colonialism and imperialism that the world has been made smaller. From the time the first colonialist set foot in Africa, the entire continent was doomed, because the appetite of the colonialist and imperialist for human and natural resources is insatiable. And that has proved to be the case.

(Mr. de Figueiredo, Angola)

The present issue - the exploitative and dangerous policies and practices of the racist apartheid régime in South Africa against all the neighbouring sovereign independent States of southern Africa - is but the 1980s form of the colonial imperialist thirst that drove the colonialists across our vast continent, a thirst that survives to this day and that manifests itself in forms ranging from the overt and blatant to the covert and subtle.

The case of South African aggression against the People's Republic of Angola has been before this Council since 1976. Since that time, neither our appeals, nor world public opinion, nor the mandatory resolutions adopted by this Council, nor the good offices of those who genuinely seek a genuine peace in southern Africa have led to lasting success: parts of southern Angola are still under the illegal military occupation of the racist South African armed forces; Angolan civilians continue to be brutally murdered by the racist troops; Angolan air-space continues to be violated; Angolan property continues to be destroyed; and the Angolan economic and social infrastructure continues to be sabotaged by the racists. Meanwhile, the Pretoria régime continues to finance, train, arm, supply, protect and rescue a handful of Angolan traitors - Savimbi's - whose links with the former colonial Power's intelligence service, army intelligence and armed forces are a matter of official record, backed by incontrovertible documentary evidence.

And that gang of traitors have been welcomed and fêted by a super-Power whose policy of "constructive engagement" has been an abject failure, whose brokered agreements in southern Africa were being violated by Pretoria even as they were being signed, whose policies have been unfriendly towards much of Africa, whose Administration is seeking to provide assistance to those traitors in contravention of international law and against all the norms of behaviour that govern - or should govern - relations between sovereign States. That aid will only intensify the war

(Mr. de Figueiredo, Angola)

in southern Africa and create destabilization inside Angola. More people will get killed in my country, and the suffering will continue. Is that what the United States Administration wants?

Yet the irony of ironies is that the United States is Angola's largest trading partner, and Angola is the third largest trading partner of the United States in sub-Saharan Africa. Does it make any sense, viewed from the standpoint of the self-interest of the United States, for the United States to support a known traitor and to refuse to establish diplomatic relations with Angola on grounds that are spurious and that cannot stand up to any examination?

(Mr. de Figueiredo, Angola)

Instead, certain Powers continue to support the racist apartheid régime in Pretoria, which continues to dupe them with meaningless talk of reform and token gestures that have done nothing to address the basic issue of equal rights for South Africa's 23 million majority inhabitants. And certainly this support from Pretoria's friends does nothing to check Pretoria's military and political ambitions in southern Africa, ambitions that include military defence plans that call for military action on the part of South Africa up to the Equator; ambitions that have led South Africa to develop its nuclear capability - not against the world's nuclear Powers, which might be understandable, but against its neighbours, who cannot by any stretch of the imagination be included in such a grouping; ambitions that have led Pretoria to break every agreement it has ever had with any of its sovereign neighbours; ambitions that it has turned against its own people; ambitions that could be seen on every television screen in this country and all over the world until South Africa muzzled and censored the media; ambitions that are engraved on countless graveyards, not only inside South Africa but all over southern Africa.

It is time that the international community took seriously the grave danger posed by the unchecked policies of Pretoria. Constructive engagement and half-hearted so-called sanctions will not save the situation. The international community has to set out concrete steps which will lead to independence for Namibia, which will lead to the withdrawal of all racist troops from Angola, which will lead to Pretoria respecting the Nkomati accords, which will lead to the safety of the people of Lesotho, Botswana, Zambia, Zimbabwe, Tanzania, Mozambique, Swaziland and Angola from vicious commando attacks by the racist troops.

We cannot believe it cannot be done. Yes, we know that certain Powers, out of self-interest, have so far supported Pretoria, with the racists' most vile acts earning them simply a mild rebuke or two. But we now request Pretoria's friends to

(Mr. de Figueiredo, Angola)

re-examine their self-interest and honestly recognize that their self-interest coincides with the self-interest of the peoples and Governments of southern Africa, that their support for an increasingly isolated and outcast Pretoria régime can only harm their long-term interests, that a régime that has no legitimacy inside its borders can have no legitimacy outside its borders, that a régime under siege within its borders will know no security outside its borders, that a régime that has earned as much odium as has the Pretoria régime will never be re-admitted into the world community of nations unless it accepts the path to survival that leads through neighbourly relations with States, that a régime that has as many resolutions against it as has the Pretoria régime will never go about its work of statehood in peace and stability until it learns the laws of men and abides by them.

We are not talking about a normal Government, we are talking about a monster, and out-of-control military machine that is devouring its own country, its own people - both black and white - in the name of attitudes and principles which are no longer valid either historically or for its survival and development.

We are talking about a military machine that guns down school-children in the street; we are talking of a military machine that has time and time again displayed its brutality against unarmed civilians deep in sleep hundreds of miles across South African borders.

Finally, we are talking of a political machine that has duped the international community for so long. How else can Pretoria's intransigence on Namibian independence be explained? How else can we account for its adamant refusal to implement Security Council resolutions on the issue of attacks on Angola? - and I do not even mention the hundreds of General Assembly resolutions. How else can we explain the complete lack of movement on the various issues confronting all of us in southern Africa?

(Mr. de Figueiredo, Angola)

Let me state once more, for the record, that the spurious and false positions put forward as obstacles by Pretoria have no basis in reality - namely, the particular issue of internationalist Cuban friends in Angola has no relation whatsoever with the independence of Namibia, with the withdrawal of South African troops from southern Angola, with the granting of basic rights to the majority inhabitants in South Africa, with the security of borders and territorial integrity and sovereignty of the independent States of southern Africa - all the issues that today hound the peoples of that region and lead to so much death and destruction.

Peace in southern Africa can come about only through a just negotiation with the peoples of southern Africa, not through threatening them with war and exposing their legitimate Governments to clumsy destabilization attempts.

Peace will come to southern Africa when the issues that are of burning concern to the peoples of southern Africa are dealt with in southern Africa.

Peace will not and cannot come if southern Africa is made a part of East-West talks with which it has no connection, either geographically, politically or historically.

It is in Luanda, in Maputo, in Harare, in Lusaka, in Mbabane, in Gabarone and in Dar es Salaam that peace can be worked out, and peace is surely our common goal. If such is not the case, why then do the self-appointed guardians of democracy do everything possible to send us opposite signals? And if peace is our common goal, now is the time to step forward and to say so, not in platitudes, but in a concrete resolution that will go a long way towards addressing the issues to which we are urgently seeking a solution.

A luta continua. A vitoria e certa.

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

(The President)

In view of the lateness of the hour, I intend now to adjourn the meeting. The next meeting of the Security Council to continue consideration of this agenda item will be held tomorrow, Friday, 7 February 1986, at 10.30 a.m.

Before adjourning, I should like to remind members of the Council that the Security Council will resume its consideration of the item entitled "Letter dated 4 February 1986 from the Permanent Representative of the Syrian Arab Republic to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council" this afternoon at 3.30 p.m.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.