

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-SEVENTH YEAR

2407th MEETING: 15 DECEMBER 1982

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2407)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
Complaint by Lesotho against South Africa: Letter dated 9 December 1982 from the Chargé d'Affaires a.i. of the Per- manent Mission of Lesotho to the United Nations addressed to the Presi- dent of the Security Council (S/15515)	1

UN LIBRARY
SEP 18 1991
UN/SA COLLECTION

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/ . . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements of the Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

UN DOCUMENTATION
UNIT
1000

2407th MEETING

Held in New York on Wednesday, 15 December 1982, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. Włodzimierz NATORF (Poland).

Present: The representatives of the following States: China, France, Guyana, Ireland, Japan, Jordan, Panama, Poland, Spain, Togo, Uganda, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zaire.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2407)

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. Complaint by Lesotho against South Africa:
Letter dated 9 December 1982 from the Chargé d'Affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Lesotho to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15515)

The meeting was called to order at 3.45 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Complaint by Lesotho against South Africa:

Letter dated 9 December 1982 from the Chargé d'Affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Lesotho to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15515)

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decision taken at the preceding meeting on this item [2406th meeting], I invite the representative of Lesotho to take a place at the Council table; I invite the representatives of Algeria, Angola, Botswana, India and Zimbabwe to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Molapo (Lesotho) took a place at the Council table; Mr. Sahnoun (Algeria), Mr. de Figueiredo (Angola), Mr. Legwaila (Botswana), Mr. Krishnan (India) and Mr. Mashingaidze (Zimbabwe) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

2. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Egypt, Guinea, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Swaziland, Yugoslavia and Zambia in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion

on 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 provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Abdel Meguid (Egypt), Mr. Kaba (Guinea), Mr. Treiki (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), Ms. Gonthier (Seychelles), Mr. Koroma (Sierra Leone), Mr. Steward (South Africa), Mr. Malinga (Swaziland), Mr. Golob (Yugoslavia) and Mr. Lusaka (Zambia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

3. The PRESIDENT: Members of the Council have before them document S/15524, which contains the text of a draft resolution prepared in the course of the Council's consultations. It is my understanding that the Council is ready to proceed to the vote on the draft resolution before it. Unless I hear any objection I shall put the draft resolution to the vote now.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The draft resolution was adopted unanimously (resolution 527 (1982)).

4. The PRESIDENT: The first speaker is the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, who wishes to make a statement in his capacity as Chairman of the Group of African States at the United Nations for the month of December. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

5. Mr. TREIKI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya): In my capacity as Chairman of the Group of African States, I should like to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for this month and express my delegation's firm belief in your dedication and leadership.

6. Once again the Council is meeting to discuss a serious matter in southern Africa caused by irresponsible action committed by the racist minority régime of South Africa against the Kingdom of Lesotho. On 9 December 1982, South Africa invaded Lesotho, an action which resulted in the loss of many innocent lives and caused the destruction of property.

7. Yesterday the King of Lesotho eloquently elaborated on the events which took place on 9 De-

ember [*ibid.*], so I shall not go into the details of what happened during that unprecedented aggression, but I would like to make some brief remarks on the critical situation in an important part of our world. As Chairman of the Group of African States, I would like first of all to express our full support for and our solidarity with the Government and people of Lesotho during these critical days in their just struggle against the colonial and racist aggression of the *apartheid* régime of the South African white minority.

8. This kind of naked aggression is not the first, nor will it be the last. In past years the South African régime has committed many acts of aggression against front-line States, particularly Lesotho and Mozambique, and has occupied a part of Angolan territory, causing loss of life and damage and destruction of property in these brotherly States. This situation has created an economic and social problem which has resulted in obstacles being placed before development plans. This action not only poses a serious economic problem for the people and Government of Lesotho and the other front-line States but also constitutes a flagrant violation of the Charter of the United Nations and the basic principles of international law. It is a threat to peace and security, not only in that area, but also in the African continent and the whole world. The main purpose of the racist régime of Pretoria in its criminal acts against Lesotho and other front-line States is to sway them away from their solid stand against the *apartheid* policy of the South African régime, its policy of continuing occupation of Namibia and the exploitation of its human and natural resources. Moreover, its aim is to prevent those countries from giving refuge to South African refugees.

9. It is sad to note that the international community is witnessing and accepting these continued acts of aggression without giving the full and essential assistance necessary to prevent such criminal acts. It is our conviction that the main reason for this failure of the international community to put an end to this aggression is the fact that the imperialist Powers extend their full support financially, militarily and politically to the racist régime in Pretoria in order to protect their imperialist and colonialist interests in that part of the world. On such a pretext, we are faced with another situation of similarity of interests, namely the occupation by the Zionist régime of Palestine and other Arab territories. It is in the common interests of those two régimes to deprive the native inhabitants of the exercise of their inalienable rights. Indeed, they are bound by the hideous links of colonialism and racism, and constitute a racist axis whose purpose is to silence any voices opposed to their racist policy.

10. The two racist régimes, in Africa and the Middle East, have resorted to a closer co-operation, the main objective of which is to make southern Africa and the Middle East a common strategic concern of the Western Powers. This growing collaboration has provided

each régime with an additional source of arms supplies and technological know-how. The two régimes have found no alternative, after their isolation by the international community, but to strengthen their co-operation and thus to challenge the will of the international community. The examples are numerous. To mention a few, there are the latest aggression against Mozambique; the continuation of the policy of *apartheid*; the flagrant violation of human rights in occupied Palestine; the continued occupation of Arab territories and the establishment of illegal settlements; the aggression against the Iraqi reactor; the occupation of southern Lebanon, the massacre of Sabra and Shatila; and the continued defiance by the régime of South Africa of the United Nations calls for the early independence of Namibia. The continued support by the imperialist Powers of the racist régime of South Africa contributes to the suffering and deprivation experienced by the indigenous Namibian people.

11. It is high time for the United Nations, especially for the Council, to take concrete measures to guarantee to the Namibian people their legitimate right to self-determination and independence. Moreover, the United Nations, and particularly the Council, should take effective measures to put an end to aggression perpetrated by the racist régime of South Africa against Lesotho and other front-line States.

12. The General Assembly has repeatedly condemned such unprovoked invasions, which have caused damage, loss of innocent lives and destruction of property. Only yesterday, the General Assembly adopted without a vote a resolution [*resolution 37/101*], in which it condemned the South African régime for its unprovoked invasion of Lesotho and commended the Government of Lesotho for its opposition to the *apartheid* policy of the South African racist régime and for the refuge it is giving to South African refugees and freedom fighters. The Assembly has urged the Council to take immediate steps to deter South Africa from repeating its acts of aggression and destabilization against Lesotho and other neighbouring independent African States.

13. It is the conviction of the African States Members that, under the Charter, it is the duty and responsibility of the Council to invoke Chapter VII on such clear violations of the Charter and of international law as in the case we are facing now. In particular, the permanent members of the Council should bear in mind these responsibilities and should not misuse the right of veto in an act directed against the wishes and ambitions of the peoples of southern Africa and the Middle East.

14. The Council should strongly condemn the racist régime of South Africa for its aggression against Lesotho and other African countries.

15. The Council should fully support the rights of the peoples who have suffered and continue to suffer

from injustice and subjugation under the yoke of the Fascist and racist minority régimes in Africa and the Middle East.

16. Any failure on the part of the Council to ensure such support will no doubt reinforce the dangerous pattern, which could prove to have extremely harmful repercussions for world peace and security.

17. Finally, I should like, on behalf of the Group of African States, to reaffirm again our full support and our pledge to the brotherly State of Lesotho in its right to confront aggression and to any effective and relevant action that may be taken by the Council against the racist régime of South Africa. The Council has now adopted resolution 527 (1982), but we should not confine ourselves to a resolution. We feel that this aggression of South Africa will be repeated against Lesotho and the front-line States. This is why I feel that the Council should assume its responsibility to adopt concrete sanctions against South Africa.

18. Mr. KAMANDA wa KAMANDA (Zaire) (*interpretation from French*): First of all, Sir, I should like to congratulate you warmly on your accession to the presidency for the month of December. I should like also to express our great appreciation to your predecessor for the excellent leadership he provided the Council during the month of November.

19. The unprovoked invasion of Lesotho on 9 December by the South African Defence Force (SADF), which caused great damage to property and loss of human life, including the lives of innocent women, children and old people, aroused great indignation among the people of Zaire.

20. King Moshoeshoe II of Lesotho has expressed in the clearest possible way the seriousness of the action to which his peaceful country was subjected on 9 December by coming to New York himself.

21. *Apartheid* has been proclaimed by the United Nations to be a crime against humanity. The legitimacy of the liberation struggle waged by the liberation movement of South Africa has been recognized by the United Nations and by the international community as a whole. The liberation movements of South Africa are, as far as the Organization is concerned, the sole authentic representatives of the black populations of South Africa.

22. There is not the shadow of a doubt that all decisions of the United Nations, through the General Assembly, the Security Council and all other bodies which, in one way or another, deal with the situation in South Africa in particular and in southern Africa in general are binding on all Member States.

23. Under other circumstances, I have had the opportunity of recalling that United Nations decisions

and resolutions which are in keeping with the principles and purposes of the United Nations are binding on all States Members, whatever position they may have taken on a particular resolution. If that were not recognized, then it would mean that any Member State could disown the mission, the goals and the objectives of the universal Organization.

24. This, as I see it, is the conclusion reached by Lesotho, a loyal Member of the United Nations, which has always had the courage to lend its support to the African liberation movements in southern Africa, regardless of its proximity to South Africa. Lesotho only did its duty to the international community, the United Nations and the peoples which are struggling to regain their most elementary rights.

25. This is why we feel that the Council must condemn South Africa for its unprovoked acts of aggression and make it liable for the damages caused and for the loss of human life and destruction to property. At the same time we feel that the Council should congratulate Lesotho for its justified and legitimate opposition to the policy of *apartheid* and reaffirm its right to harbour within its territory refugees and other victims of *apartheid*, in accordance with its humanitarian principles and its international obligations.

26. The Council should also take the necessary measures to deter South Africa from continuing or resuming acts of aggression and destabilization against Lesotho and other independent neighbouring African States. The Republic of Zaire fully endorses the idea that Member States should be invited to give to Lesotho, in so far as they are able, the necessary economic assistance to enable it to strengthen its capacity to receive refugees and rebuild its economy.

27. This aggression by South Africa against Lesotho is not only a violation of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and of international law, but is also a violation of the specific provisions of General Assembly resolution 33/73 of 15 December 1978, entitled Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace. This declaration calls on all States to guide themselves in their activities by the recognition of the necessity of establishing, maintaining and strengthening a just and durable peace, and to observe the following principles, *inter alia*; that: every nation and every human being has the inherent right to life in peace; wars of aggression are crimes against peace and are prohibited by international law; and States have the duty to refrain from propaganda for wars of aggression. States also have the duty to promote co-operation with other States in order to further the ideals of peace, humanism and freedom; to respect the right to self-determination, independence, equality, sovereignty, the territorial integrity of States and the inviolability of their frontiers, including the right to determine the road of their development, without interference; and to discourage all incitement to hatred and prejudice, as well as all

manifestations of colonialism, racism, racial discrimination and *apartheid*.

28. The aggression against Lesotho is also a violation of General Assembly resolution 36/103 of 9 December 1981, entitled Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention and Interference in the Internal Affairs of States, which sets forth, *inter alia*, the rights and duties flowing from the principle of non-intervention and non-interference in the internal and external affairs of States and also recalls that the establishment, maintenance and strengthening of international peace and security are based on freedom, equality, self-determination, independence and respect for the sovereignty of States.

29. Are we to believe, then, that the Pretoria régime has firmly declared itself to be opposed to the principles and purposes of the Charter, to the principles of international law relating to friendly relations and co-operation among States, to preparing societies to live in peace, and to the inadmissibility of intervention and interference in the internal affairs of States?

30. Such a prospect is in itself so serious in its implications for international peace and security, and is in itself such a denial of the vocation of the United Nations and of its work as a whole, that the Council cannot remain unconcerned about it.

31. We therefore believe that it is the Council's duty to take measures to ensure that in future South Africa complies with the provisions of the Charter, the principles of international law and the many resolutions of the United Nations, and undertakes not to repeat its acts of aggression against neighbouring independent African States which are more than sufficiently aware of their international obligations.

32. For all those reasons the Republic of Zaire voted in favour of resolution 527 (1982).

33. Mr. AMEGA (Togo) (*interpretation from French*): Fate has decreed, Mr. President, that you should assume the presidency of the Council when it has to discuss disturbing questions of the violation of the inalienable rights and fundamental freedoms of a people and the sovereignty and territorial integrity of a State. Your country, Poland, has a long history marked by events which give the word "freedom" its full meaning and scope, and this helps you to understand the struggle being waged throughout the world by the national liberation movements—in this case, the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC). You belong, Mr. President, to a heroic people open to various currents of world political and philosophical thought, a people with a great understanding of the major national and international problems. This background means that you assume the presidency with competence, efficiency and sound judgement.

34. I should like to take this opportunity, Sir, to congratulate your predecessor, the representative of

Panama, Mr. Carlos Ozores Typaldos, whose common sense and great open-mindedness are well known in international affairs. He demonstrated those qualities when he presided over the Council last month.

35. Once again, South Africa has committed aggression against a sovereign State, Lesotho. Once again, South Africa is defying the international community. Once again, the international community is witnessing a flagrant violation of the fundamental rights of a people and of a State.

36. During the night of Wednesday, 8 December, to Thursday, 9 December, South Africa, disregarding the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, of international positive law and resolutions of the General Assembly, launched a raid against Lesotho which claimed about 40 innocent victims. The raid was launched on the pretext that the operation was directed against so-called terrorists of the ANC who had intended to intensify their liberation activities in South Africa. This is not the first time that South Africa has committed aggression against States in the region on various pretexts. The cases of Mozambique and Angola—particularly operation Protea of September 1981 in the latter country—are still fresh in our minds. These violations are constant threats to international peace and security. The presence of ANC freedom fighters in Lesotho, if it can in fact be proved, is a matter within the exclusive sovereignty of that country, which has the right to shelter in its territory whomever it wishes. South Africa claims, as usual, that in striking at the ANC fighters in the territory of Lesotho it was exercising a right of hot pursuit. That is a false argument, because the right of hot pursuit exists only on the high seas, and does not apply on land.

37. Moreover, how can one reproach the ANC for existing, and how can one reproach Lesotho for supporting that movement, which is defending the noble cause of the freedom of the overwhelming majority of the South African people who are now subjected to the inhuman yoke of *apartheid*? As long as *apartheid* exists, the ANC or some form of liberation movement will have to exist. It is South Africa itself which, through its policy of *apartheid*, has called into existence the ANC and its armed struggle. By its ignoble policy of *apartheid*, which denies coloured peoples the most elementary rights and tramples them underfoot, South Africa has elicited a natural reaction of revolt on the part of those peoples. No individual, no people, can indefinitely tolerate tyrannical harassment by another people that denies its right to exist. No people can stand by passively and witness its own destruction. We can therefore understand the actions of the ANC, whose sole aim is to free the oppressed peoples and enable them to enjoy the legitimate rights of which they are now deprived.

38. Here I would recall that the ANC has not always had recourse to armed struggle. It was forced to do so

out of despair. When it made legitimate claims in peaceful demonstrations and demanded respect for its people's dignity and value as human beings, South Africa responded—and still responds—with inhuman, barbarous repression. Using its so-called security laws, it has increased the number of those in prison, of those tortured and of those sentenced to death, particularly among the ANC freedom fighters. Therefore, the movement had no option but recourse to arms.

39. The international community has often expressed its outrage over the attitude adopted by South Africa and has adopted resolutions designed to impose on that country penalties meaningful enough to force it to wake up to the inhumanity of its policy of *apartheid* and to give it up. But those resolutions have never achieved their aim, because certain States continue to co-operate with South Africa in the economic and military spheres, thus indirectly supporting the racist régime of Pretoria.

40. The Afrikaaner poet, Breyten Breytenbach, was right when he wrote:

“This régime [*apartheid*] exists only because the world wants it to. It flourishes, is accepted, encouraged, nourished, armed, saved if necessary, because it works to the advantage of South Africa's trading partners and investors.”

41. The most elementary rights of the great majority of the South African people are being trampled under foot. They are denied the right to live, and yet mitigating circumstances are still being found for the ignoble *apartheid* régime. Even worse, it is being provided with the means necessary to carry on that policy. That is most deplorable. No account is taken even of the injunctions of the General Assembly, which, on 21 October last, by a large majority called on the International Monetary Fund (IMF) to refrain from granting any loan to South Africa [*resolution 37/2*]. In an attempt to explain this insult to the international Organization, the Special Representative of IMF to the United Nations said that the actions of the Fund must be in conformity with its Articles of Agreement and could not be based on considerations that did not derive from the Articles. But did the same considerations lead the IMF to refuse loans to other States? This is a sign of the times. As Claude Julien pointed out in the monthly magazine *Le Monde Diplomatique* this month, everything is political, and the agreement between the IMF and South Africa is no exception.

42. How can one support a country which has become notorious for its flagrant and repeated violations of the fundamental freedoms of an entire people? As General Gnassingbe Eyadema, founding President of the Rally of the Togolese People, President of the Togolese Republic, said:

“Togo cannot tolerate the situation of injustice and oppression that currently prevails in this region, where a régime unworthy of our species and our age, contrary to all morality, is maintained at the price of indescribable violence against a population whose crime is the colour of their skin.”

43. I invite the international community to look inwards collectively, and I appeal to all the States concerned, all the agencies and corporations concerned, to think about the imminent danger towards which the human race is rushing if no action is taken to bring the racist régime of Pretoria to take the necessary measures to abolish this criminal, vile policy of *apartheid*.

44. On 15 November last, when I spoke at the 68th meeting of the General Assembly on agenda item 33, I said that paradoxically it was the racist minority of South Africa which denies the equality of races and the intermingling of cultures. The black majority, for its part, is quite willing to accept this, because it believes that the civilization of the future is one in which races and cultures will indeed intermingle.

45. Therefore my delegation congratulates the Council for firmly condemning the South African aggression against Lesotho. My delegation feels moreover that that country, whose sovereign rights have been violated and flouted and which has suffered material damage and the loss of human lives because of South Africa's act of piracy, is entitled to compensation. Thus I welcome the decision that has just been adopted.

46. My delegation remains convinced that, faced with the gravity of this situation and the permanent threat posed by South Africa to its neighbours, the Council will always shoulder its responsibilities.

47. Sir John THOMSON (United Kingdom): It gives my delegation and me personally much pleasure, Sir, to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of this important body.

48. It is in the light of a job well done that I express thanks to the delegation of Panama for what the Permanent Representative of Panama did with so much distinction last month.

49. I think that we should also note the outstanding achievements of our colleague, the former Permanent Representative of Zaire, now the Minister for Foreign Affairs of his country. I am delighted to pay a tribute to him for his achievements here as the Permanent Representative and for what I know he will achieve as Foreign Minister of his great country.

50. The Council has been privileged to hear from King Moshoeshoe II a statement of great dignity and clarity [*2406th meeting*]. His presence here at a

critical time for his country is a measure of the importance which Lesotho attaches to the Council's consideration of the matter before us.

51. On behalf of the United Kingdom, I express once again our deep sympathy to the Government and the people of Lesotho and to the relatives of all those who were callously struck down on 9 December. Lesotho has been the victim of an unwarranted attack. In the face of this grave situation, Lesotho has acted with statesmanship and restraint and deserves the support of every member of the Council. I am glad that it is receiving that.

52. We have only to look at a map to appreciate the difficult, indeed vulnerable situation of Lesotho, as a small, land-locked country surrounded on all sides by a much more powerful neighbour, South Africa. As a result of our long and very friendly association with Lesotho, a fellow member of the Commonwealth, we are closely aware of the problems, both political and economic, which that country faces. We have at all times supported and assisted Lesotho to the best of our ability, and it goes without saying that we wish to help the Government of Lesotho deal with the consequences of this unwarranted attack.

53. The issue we are considering here today is clear-cut. We have no need of further inquiries, for the facts are not in dispute. This flagrant violation of Lesotho's sovereignty not only was attested to by a host of witnesses in Maseru, but was brazenly described in a statement issued on 9 December by the Chief of SADF, General Viljoen.

54. It follows that my Government can see no justification for the action undertaken by SADF. South Africa has wilfully breached the principles of international law, of the Charter of the United Nations and of civilized behaviour between nations. Lesotho poses no threat to South Africa. As the King of Lesotho has reminded the Council, his country has followed a policy of peaceful coexistence and good-neighbourliness, a policy which is far from easy in the circumstances of southern Africa and which is therefore all the more commendable. South Africa's coldly premeditated attack is thereby all the more reprehensible. It justly drew immediate condemnation from my own Government and from other Governments, and from the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the Secretary General of the Commonwealth.

55. Condemnation is not enough. Lesotho must be given all possible support. There are a number of steps which should be taken in response to this tragedy.

56. Lesotho's friends will obviously wish to consider what action they can take individually.

57. There is a clear need to assess the implications for the many refugees in that country. The right way

to do this is through the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (HCR). Accordingly, we welcome the news given by the Secretary-General that the High Commissioner has already initiated action.

58. South Africa should make good the damage caused by its attack by paying full and adequate compensation to Lesotho.

59. With regard to the future and to the grave situation which this attack has demonstrated, we must insist that South Africa should henceforth comply scrupulously with the provisions of the Charter. This indeed would be in South Africa's own best interests. South Africa is taking a foolish risk if it sets an example by breaching the principles of international law and of respect for the Organization to which we all belong.

60. I hope very much that we shall hear during the course of this debate from the representative of South Africa that his Government will in the future abide by the Charter and will desist from further violence of this kind. Such a step would assist greatly in the search for peaceful solutions in the region, solutions which South Africa professes to desire.

61. South Africa should show the respect for its international obligations which the King of Lesotho demonstrated yesterday with regard to his own country. Members of the Council will have noted the considerable emphasis which the King placed on these obligations and will wish to assist Lesotho in fulfilling them. Above all, the inadmissibility of acts of this kind must be brought home to South Africa. This is a point on which I wish to expand briefly.

62. We all have a responsibility to try to reverse the escalation of violence and confrontation in southern Africa. My Government, as the Council knows, is continuing to play a very active part in the search for peaceful solutions to the problems of the region, in close contact with the countries of the region and with other Western countries.

63. I therefore much regret the preposterous and intemperate statements made by one representative, both in the General Assembly yesterday at its 103rd meeting and in the Council today, in marked contrast to the statesmanship shown by Lesotho. I was left in some doubt as I listened whether the representative was, as he said at one time, speaking on his own behalf, or whether he was, as he appeared to be saying at another time, speaking on behalf of a whole continent, of all the African States. I could hardly believe as I listened to him that it could be the latter. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Zaire and the representative of Togo spoke in different accents; they spoke in a measured and far more persuasive way. If we are really concerned with promoting peace, if we are really concerned with the security of Lesotho itself, which is the very reason why we are meeting here today, we should not try to stir up strife, we should not try to provoke violence.

64. We must ask what the motives are of those who make such far-fetched allegations—allegations which I believe every member of the Council knows in his heart to be without foundation. Are they genuinely trying to promote peace and stability among the nations of southern Africa, or are they among those who hope to exploit the region's problems, and this latest tragedy, precisely in order to complicate those problems, even to the extent of frustrating peaceful negotiated solutions to them? We cannot help wondering whether some people do not actually welcome and encourage violence.

65. Those who, from whatever quarter, preach violence and use the jargon of blind extremism can only help to accelerate the cycle of violence and to create divisions within our ranks. Violence begets violence. The most likely consequence of their destructive attitude is further destructive behaviour by South Africa. Is this the way to help land-locked Lesotho?

66. If, on the other hand, we want to make the most positive impact, we can do no better than to follow the example set by Lesotho, to let the facts speak for themselves and to repudiate violence. My Government has always deplored the use of violence from any quarter in the search for solutions to the problems of southern Africa. We have repeatedly appealed for restraint to be shown by all in the region. We have consistently urged that those problems be resolved peacefully and have expressed our deep regret at any acts which contribute to a cycle of violence.

67. These are the views we shall continue to press strongly on the Government of South Africa. We earnestly hope that, before it is too late, the South African Government will see the error of its ways and will desist from adding further twists to the menacing spiral of violence in southern Africa. We are committed to working for peaceful change within South Africa. We do not believe that South Africa can in any sense resolve its own problems by inflicting force upon its neighbours. We believe that it is only through peaceful change, and not through force of repression, that we can hope to see the unhappy situation within that country and between it and its neighbours improve.

68. In conclusion, I should like to express my delegation's pleasure that this resolution has been adopted promptly and unanimously. In the eloquent speech which he made to us yesterday afternoon, the King of Lesotho said this:

"We appeal to the Council, which has set itself the noble task of maintaining world peace, to restrain South Africa from flouting the Charter of the United Nations, from violating the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Member States of the Organization and from pursuing a strategy of naked terrorism against a whole subcontinent." [2406th meeting, para. 37.]

I trust and believe that in adopting this present resolution the Council has signified its support in clear and unmistakable terms.

69. Mr. de La BARRE de NANTEUIL (France) (*interpretation from French*): I should like first of all, Sir, to express to you my warmest congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Council. My delegation is convinced that under your wise guidance our work will be successfully completed. Proof of this is the unanimous adoption of resolution 527 (1982).

70. I should also like to pay a tribute to the representative of Panama, who presided over our work last month with a great deal of competence and skill.

71. Once again, the Council is meeting to consider the complaint of an African State against the Republic of South Africa.

72. My delegation listened with the greatest attention to the particularly eloquent statement made by King Moshoeshoe II [2406th meeting]. When the raid was reported, the French Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Claude Cheysson, said that he was "astounded that South Africa could show such disdain for international law". He then addressed to the Prime Minister of Lesotho, Mr. Jonathan, a message of solidarity and support. I in turn would like to assure the representatives of Lesotho of our deepest sympathy and to ask them to transmit to the families of the victims the condolences of the French Government.

73. In this ordeal, France stands unhesitatingly at the side of Lesotho. We pay a tribute to its courageous and worthy people, which, in a threatening atmosphere, is endeavouring to preserve its independence and chart a course of economic and social progress for the country. As a peace-loving country, Lesotho also prides itself on being a land of asylum. Those whom *apartheid* makes pariahs in their own country can find refuge in Lesotho, where there is respect for national laws and international agreements.

74. It is precisely that policy of welcoming political refugees, which is completely consistent with the generous traditions of African hospitality and with international law, that according to the Pretoria authorities justified the murderous raid of 9 December, which was described as a "preventive" action.

75. My Government rejects that reasoning and strongly condemns the unprovoked attack perpetrated by South Africa against Lesotho. It denounces this flagrant violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Kingdom. It deplores the many victims, including women and children, of that unjustifiable commando action.

76. Not only the events but their causes must be denounced.

77. *Apartheid* inevitably leads to repression, for no one can stand idly by while his dignity is constantly and institutionally insulted. Moreover, internal repression inevitably leads to external aggression, for a State always tends to blame others when the responsibility lies mainly with itself.
78. It is high time for the Government of South Africa to understand that it has embarked on a dead-end course, or rather a course whose outcome can only be bloody confrontation. We would like to think that it is not yet too late. We would have liked to take some encouragement from two recent and undeniably positive events. I refer to the release of the great poet Breyten Breytenbach, who is now living in Paris, and the talks in Praia between two high-level delegations, one South African and the other Angolan.
79. We are convinced that South Africa would have everything to gain if it were resolutely to embark on that course of action. It has a great deal to lose by indulging in actions as inexcusable as the Maseru raid. An end must be put without delay to such armed incursions across borders, which dangerously heighten tension in southern Africa without in any way reducing the tension caused within South Africa by the *apartheid* policy of the South African Government.
80. France, which took the initiative of proposing a protest by the 10 members of the European Community addressed to the Pretoria authorities, is pleased that the Council was able unanimously to condemn the unjustifiable attack committed by South Africa against Lesotho.
81. Mr. DORR (Ireland): Sir, I begin by extending my good wishes to you on your assumption of the office of President, and indeed my congratulations on your conduct of the office so far. I should also like to thank your predecessor, Mr. Carlos Ozores Typaldos, and the delegation of Panama, for the conduct of the presidency during November. I should also like to join in welcoming the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Lesotho to the Council table and to offer good wishes also to our own former colleague, the new Minister for Foreign Affairs of Zaire, who has taken part in our proceedings today.
82. For once the facts of an issue before the Council are not really in dispute. All accounts, including that given by South Africa itself, agree that SADF forces, numbering apparently about 100, struck across the border at Maseru, capital of the independent State of Lesotho, during the night of 8/9 December. A number of houses in the capital were attacked. About forty people were killed. A number of women and children—five women and two children, according to South Africa's own account—died in the attack.
83. What was the reason for this brutal attack on an independent State? South Africa itself has given its own explanation.
84. On 9 December, the South African Mission here circulated a statement on behalf of the Chief of SADF seeking to justify the attack on Maseru. The statement is a masterpiece of unconscious irony. It speaks of information that the ANC was planning "deeds of terror in South Africa, Transkei and Ciskei during the festive season". It refers to the danger that what it calls "the ANC's terror activities from Lesotho" could "increasingly follow the pattern of brutal violence and disregard for human life". It mentions the Palestine Liberation Organization for good measure. And it emphasizes that "SADF's sole aim was to prevent deeds such as bloodshed of the innocent, bombings, sabotage and other acts of terror".
85. The irony is that many of these phrases describing activities vaguely attributed to the ANC as a matter of future intention are an exact description of South Africa's own activities on the night of 9 December. An attack by South Africa's powerful forces on a weak and defenceless neighbouring State in which about 40 people were killed is indeed very well described in the phrase "a pattern of brutal violence and disregard for human life"; and the "deeds such as bloodshed of the innocent, bombings, sabotage and other acts of terror", which the South African statement claims it was the sole aim of SADF to prevent, are precisely those which the South African forces themselves engaged in when they struck at Maseru.
86. The statement acknowledges that five women and two children were killed. As it puts it, they "died in the cross-fire". There is even a kind of apology. The statement says "it is regretted that the innocent also had to suffer because they were housed by terrorists to discourage action against them".
87. Notice the terms of that expression of regret. First, it is impersonal—"it is regretted"—as if to detach the South African attackers from the event. Second, it is made to appear unavoidable—"the innocent also had to suffer"—as if further to remove responsibility from those who attacked Maseru and as if to make the death of the innocent unavoidable or somehow their own fault.
88. But, it may be said, this particular attack should be seen as part of a pattern of growing violence in the region. The ANC, indeed, has struck at times at targets within South Africa, and perhaps South Africa may now claim to be striking at the ANC where it can. Perhaps there are some who deplore the particular attack but still think a kind of rough justice was served by it.
89. To refute this suggestion it is important to record the fact that there is no evidence, I repeat, no evidence, of any attack on South Africa from Lesotho, by the ANC or otherwise, in the past. We were already aware of this—and in his moving and eloquent statement here yesterday, King Moshoe-

shoe II was again quite categorical on this point. He said:

“Not a single obvious across-the-border incident has been alleged, let alone proved, against us, in contrast with numerous occasions when mortars have been launched from South African territory into Lesotho.

“In numerous political trials held in South Africa involving ANC freedom fighters, not once has it been alleged that any were based in or operated from Lesotho.” [*Ibid.*, paras. 25 and 26.]

90. So there is not even the kind of crude balance, the tit-for-tat retaliation that sometimes exists in cases which come before the Council. Even South Africa's own statement, to which I have referred earlier, makes no clear allegation about anything that happened in the past. The focus is on the supposed plans of the ANC, and on “the danger” that its activities, as the statement says, “could increasingly follow the pattern of brutal violence”.

91. So it appears that even by its own admission, South Africa carried out this ruthless attack on a small and defenceless neighbour with an eye to the future. For that reason, I do not think it an exaggeration to say, and I weigh the words, that it was in the strict sense a terrorist attack—if not in the sense of indiscriminate terrorism, then at least terrorism in the sense of an attack designed to spread fear among a particular group—the South African refugees in Lesotho. It was no doubt also intended to frighten the Government of Lesotho, the country where they have found refuge.

92. We learn from the statement yesterday by King Moshoeshoe that 12 of those who were aroused from their beds in Maseru during the night and coldly shot down with machine-guns, hand grenades and bazookas by South African forces were citizens of Lesotho. It appears that many of the others were refugees from South Africa, that is to say, they were black South Africans, excluded by the minority white population from virtually all rights in their own country. Like many others, they have found the situation intolerable and fled across the border into Lesotho.

93. Ireland has argued before that peaceful change in South Africa is preferable to violence which brings bloodshed and suffering in its wake. But it is that much more difficult to sustain this kind of argument when white South African forces carry out a brutal attack which amounts, in the literal sense, to an act of terrorism by a Government and which seems almost deliberately designed to give the spiral of violence in the region a new upward twist.

94. This point has wider application to the problems of the whole region. South Africa claims to be interested in a settlement of the Namibia problem. There

is talk of confidence-building measures and of negotiation behind the scenes with certain other States. How can this kind of attack on a defenceless neighbour, totally surrounded by South Africa, contribute to confidence? How can it be seen as other than part of a pattern of intimidation and violence by South Africa directed at other countries of the region? Surely *The Washington Post* was right to describe it in its editorial of 11 December as “an inexcusable act of bullying”.

95. Ireland has close and friendly relations with Lesotho and we have concentrated a good part of our modest bilateral aid programme in that country. We have, therefore, all the more reason to know the situation there at first hand and to know that the South African attack was simply designed to intimidate a weak and defenceless neighbour.

96. The Government of Ireland unreservedly condemns this attack by South Africa, which violates the sovereignty of a peaceful, independent country and is in direct violation of the Charter of the United Nations. We are deeply disturbed by the implications for the future of southern Africa as a whole of this and other similar attacks on Angola and Mozambique, and we express our deep sympathy to the Government and people of Lesotho and to the relatives of those who died at the hands of the invading South African forces.

97. Ireland therefore considered it necessary for the Council to respond both firmly and urgently to this clear breach of the Charter. We were glad, for this reason, to vote in favour of the draft resolution, and we are very glad indeed that it was adopted unanimously by the Council.

98. Mr. NISIBORI (Japan): Mr. President, first of all, I wish to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the Presidency for the month of December. I am confident that our work will greatly benefit from your rich diplomatic experience and keen insight, and that under your able guidance the Council will successfully discharge its duties. Also, I am pleased to have this opportunity to express my delegation's appreciation to Mr. Ozores Typaldos of Panama, President for the month of November, for the effective and efficient manner in which he handled the matters before the Council last month.

99. My delegation has listened carefully and with deep sympathy as King Moshoeshoe II of Lesotho described to the Council [2406th meeting] the tragedy his Kingdom has recently experienced. We are profoundly moved by the fact that he has left his country at a critical time in order to present to the Council a first-hand account of the situation there. In so doing, he has demonstrated his trust in the Council. It is now up to the members of the Council to prove that his trust is not misplaced.

100. As the King of Lesotho has so forcefully stated, it is clear that South Africa, in its recent raid, violated the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lesotho. Indeed, the attack is a flagrant violation of the Charter of the United Nations, and it contravenes established norms of international law, the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations,¹ and other relevant resolutions of the United Nations.

101. The Commander of SADF reportedly announced that the raid was a pre-emptive measure to prevent terrorists from committing terrorist acts in the Republic of South Africa during the Christmas season. My Government rejects this justification of South Africa's hostile act against its neighbour.

102. As a country which firmly upholds the principle of settling all international disputes by strictly peaceful means and of refraining from the threat or use of force in international relations, Japan strongly condemns South Africa's commando attack on Lesotho. In the view of my delegation, such actions, for whatever reason, cannot be tolerated. Japan deeply deplores the loss of more than 40 lives—including innocent women and children—in the raid. The responsibility for this villainous killing lies solely with South Africa.

103. The Government of Japan is of the view that South Africa's recent violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lesotho cannot be considered apart from the general political situation prevailing throughout southern Africa. Indeed, States Members of the United Nations have long been endeavouring to resolve two major problems in that region, namely, the question of Namibia and that of the *apartheid* policies of South Africa. It is from this latter problem that the incident now under consideration stems. Thus, because the attack against Lesotho is not an isolated incident, my Government is concerned that it could have dangerous consequences for peace and stability throughout southern Africa.

104. In this context, the Government of Japan must also point out that this is not the first instance of South African military operations against its neighbours. Indeed, in just the past two years alone, South African attacks have been reported to the Organization by, for example, Mozambique—in January and March 1981 and August 1982—and Angola—in January and August of 1981 and March and July of 1982. And Lesotho too reported an insurgent attack from South African territory against its paramilitary headquarters in March of this year.

105. This latest hostile act by South Africa is thus one additional incident which runs counter to all the efforts of the world Organization in search of peace in the region.

106. My Government strongly believes, therefore, that it is now incumbent upon the Council to work expeditiously to resolve this situation. The Council must first of all impress upon the leaders of South Africa that its villainous attack on Lesotho has gained universal condemnation. Further, the Council should demand that South Africa redress the terrible wrongs it has perpetrated against its neighbour. And finally, it must insist that South Africa refrain from the use of force and settle this dispute peacefully, in accordance with the Charter.

107. Thus my delegation is pleased that the resolution which set forth these ideas was adopted unanimously by the Council. We earnestly hope that it will be fully implemented so that the stability of the region will be ensured, for regional stability is essential if international efforts to resolve the two fundamental sources of difficulty in the region are to continue in a realistic manner.

108. Mr. OTUNNU (Uganda): My delegation is very pleased, Sir, to see you presiding over the Council for the month of December. Our pleasure is all the greater because you represent the Polish People's Republic, a country with which Uganda enjoys cordial and fruitful relations. We are confident that under your able and wise leadership, the Council will discharge its responsibilities with speed and effectiveness.

109. I also wish to express our deep gratitude to our President for the month of November, the representative of Panama, Mr. Carlos Ozores Typaldos. Through his skilful and patient leadership, the Council was able to accomplish its tasks smoothly and successfully during the month of November.

110. We are honoured to have in the Council today the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Lesotho, Mr. Charles Dube Malapo.

111. The Council is meeting today because early on the morning of 9 December South Africa struck another deadly blow to the heart of independent Africa. The victim of this latest aggression by the *apartheid* régime is Lesotho. I shall not dwell on the details surrounding this grim episode, since yesterday King Moshoeshoe II presented to the Council in moving and eloquent terms [*ibid.*] the complete facts of this case. It is sufficient for me to underline the fact that by the time the invading force departed from Maseru it had massacred 42 people, including women and children, and caused extensive damage to property.

112. Uganda expresses its deep sympathy and solidarity with Lesotho and the people of South Africa during this painful period of mourning.

113. There is also no need for me to go to any great length to prove that South Africa was responsible for

the aggression and the subsequent carnage, because South Africa itself lost no time in boasting of its exploits in Maseru.

114. Following a now familiar pattern, the aggressor has quickly sought to shift responsibility for its actions onto the victims, in this case Lesotho and the South African refugees who have been residing in Lesotho. What possible threat could Lesotho pose to the national security of South Africa? Let us consider the following factors: geographically, Lesotho is located in the very belly of the beast, with barely a breathing space for itself; Lesotho occupies an area of barely 30,000 square kilometres as compared to South Africa's land space of 1.2 million square kilometres, which surrounds the Kingdom; Lesotho has a population of 1.2 million people, which is nearly 22 times less than the South African total of 27.3 million people; the gross national product of Lesotho is \$US 240 million, whereas that of South Africa is a gigantic \$US 45.7 billion; and Lesotho has an army of 2,000 men, while South Africa has some 480,000 men under arms.

115. Where in this scenario can one locate the element of threat to South African national security? Clearly, Lesotho is in no position to play David to the *apartheid* Goliath, and it has never tried to do so. On the contrary, Lesotho has consistently pursued a policy of peaceful coexistence in order to ensure its survival.

116. As for the refugees who fled from the persecution of the *apartheid* system and who have been resident in Lesotho, the facts are as follows: the ANC does not have any bases in Lesotho; the refugees are all unarmed, and therefore are in no position to make any armed incursions into South Africa; the refugees are not located in refugee camps, but are settled generally within the Basotho community; and in any case, there are not that many refugees, since the majority prefer to settle further afield in other parts of Africa. It is obvious, therefore, that there is no basis in fact for the claim of the *apartheid* régime that these refugees constitute a threat to its security.

117. Since the claims of South Africa are false, what then are the real reasons for South Africa's aggression against Lesotho? There is no doubt that the *apartheid* régime, today more than ever before, is feeling the heat of the political and armed resistance being waged within South Africa by the liberation movements. This has led to some desperation, which has led to the search for scapegoats outside South Africa. The *apartheid* régime, like every bully, is upset that Lesotho, in spite of its vulnerable size and location, has consistently denounced *apartheid* and refused to confer any legitimacy on the manifestations of the *apartheid* system, most notably the so-called bantustans. Moreover, Lesotho has continued to receive and host refugees fleeing from the oppression in South Africa.

118. For those reasons, Lesotho has become the target of South African aggression.

119. Yet it is clear that the real threat to the *apartheid* system lies within South Africa itself, and not outside its borders. The Pretoria régime has no choice but to come to terms with the oppressed people of South Africa, who constitute the overwhelming majority of the population.

120. The aggression against Lesotho raises some larger questions that must also be addressed here.

121. First of all, the aggression against Lesotho is only the latest incident in a comprehensive campaign in which South Africa has unleashed and sustained a reign of terror throughout the southern region of Africa. The impact of this undeclared war has been especially damaging for Angola and Mozambique. Even as we deliberate here, South African troops continue to occupy part of the southern province of Angola. Just before the attack on Maseru, a special South African squadron mounted a similar raid on fuel depots at Muhava, near Beira, in Mozambique. Pretoria's programme of aggression and destabilization has now extended well beyond the general area of southern Africa. The best example was the mercenary invasion of Seychelles in November 1981; yet Seychelles is geographically far removed from the borders of South Africa. Whereas South Africa has continued for years to commit aggression and conduct a campaign of terror against independent African States, no one can cite a single instance where an independent African State has launched an attack against South Africa.

122. Secondly, there are those who still cherish the notion of South Africa as some sort of regional policeman for Africa. This is a truly curious notion. A policeman is a keeper of the peace, an agent of law and order. What kind of a policeman is this, who has become the main instrument of terror throughout the southern region of Africa? Does all this mean anything to those who speak so often about regional security for southern Africa?

123. Thirdly, if South Africa is now escalating its war of aggression against independent African States, the Security Council must bear some measure of responsibility for this state of affairs. The Council has consistently failed to take any action against South Africa for its repeated acts of aggression. South Africa has enjoyed an unusual protective shield within the Council, which has blocked all moves against the *apartheid* régime. This failure by the Council has given South Africa the confidence to pursue its adventures with complete impunity. Will the Council continue to fiddle while the whole of southern Africa is burning? I fear that if the present trend is not arrested soon, the whole of Africa could become a free hunting ground for the *apartheid* régime. To halt this dangerous trend, the Council will have to consider more definite measures beyond the tokenism of mere condemnation.

124. Finally, it must be stressed that no amount of aggression, destabilization or intimidation can hold back the historic tide of freedom. This is the lesson which colonial Portugal learned much too late in Mozambique, Angola and Guinea-Bissau.

125. Ian Smith of Rhodesia once declared that never in a thousand years, never in his lifetime, would there be majority rule in that land. Today, this man is the recalcitrant citizen of an independent Zimbabwe. It is tragic that the masters of *apartheid* in Pretoria still suffer from the Ian Smith syndrome. But the tide of freedom has irreversibly crossed the Limpopo. The peoples of Africa will not rest until that tide embraces the Cape of Good Hope.

126. Mr. LING Qing (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): First of all, Sir, I would like to express, in the name of the Chinese delegation, our warm congratulations to you on your assumption of the presidency for the month of December. With your outstanding capability and rich diplomatic experience, you will surely guide the Council in smoothly accomplishing this month's work. I would also like to take this opportunity to express our appreciation to Mr. Carlos Ozores Typaldos of Panama, under whose leadership the Council successfully completed its work during the month of November.

127. The Chinese delegation would also like to extend a warm welcome to the King of Lesotho for attending the Council meeting. We listened attentively to his important statement yesterday [*ibid.*].

128. In the early morning of 9 December, the racist South African authorities wantonly launched an armed attack on Lesotho. Using military aircraft and helicopters, South African troops temporarily occupied Lesotho's capital city, Maseru, and brutally killed more than 40 innocent people, including women and children. The attack, which caused heavy losses of life and property to the people of Lesotho, is a serious violation of the independence and sovereignty of Lesotho, a Member State of the United Nations and a member of the Organization of African Unity. It also constitutes a gross violation of the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the accepted norms of international relations. Such acts of aggression by Pretoria have met with the firm resistance of the people of Lesotho and aroused the anger of the African countries and the entire international community. The Chinese Government and people express strong indignation and condemnation over this fresh crime committed by the South African authorities against the people of Lesotho and Africa. We extend our deep sympathy to the Government and people of Lesotho and our firm support for their just struggle to resist South Africa's acts of aggression.

129. Over a long period of time, the South African authorities have pursued a barbaric policy of *apartheid* at home and brutally suppressed the struggle of

the black people for freedom and liberation. Beyond its borders, Pretoria stubbornly clings to its illegal occupation of and colonial rule over Namibia, and has repeatedly launched armed incursions into Angola and other neighbouring countries as well as posing a military threat and carrying out subversive activities against Zimbabwe and Mozambique.

130. However, despite the repeated denunciation of those outrages by the United Nations and the international community, the South African régime remains defiant and recalcitrant. Instead of showing restraint, it has become even more reckless in its aggressiveness. Hence the 9 December assault on Lesotho. By its reactionary policies and acts of aggression, Pretoria has again proved itself to be the main source of the serious threat to peace and stability in southern Africa.

131. The Chinese Government firmly supports the just position and legitimate demands of Lesotho and other African countries. Our support also extends to the just struggle of the people of South Africa and their national liberation organizations against *apartheid*. We believe that, with its primary responsibility for maintaining international peace and security, the Council should not only severely condemn Pretoria's wanton aggression against an independent sovereign neighbour as well as its menace against and sabotage of the peace and security of the region, but should also adopt forceful and effective measures, such as calling for the strict implementation of the arms embargo against South Africa and seriously considering the adoption against it of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter, so as to prevent the recurrence of South Africa's aggressions against neighbouring States.

132. We are of the view that the Power which has all along shielded, and connived with, South Africa is duty bound to exert the necessary pressure on the South African authorities so as to stop it from continuing its atrocities.

133. Mr. NUSEIBEH (Jordan): I wish to express on behalf of the Jordanian delegation the sincerest congratulations of my delegation to the President of the Council for the month of December, Mr. Włodzimierz Natorf of friendly Poland, on his assumption of the presidency. His wisdom, statesmanship and grasp of international issues will no doubt facilitate the successful outcome of the Council's deliberations.

134. I wish to take this opportunity to express appreciation of the outstanding manner in which the President for last month, Mr. Carlos Typaldos of friendly Panama, presided over the work of the Council during that period.

135. The dastardly act of unprovoked aggression perpetrated last Thursday by the *apartheid* régime of South Africa against Maseru, the capital of the peace-

ful Kingdom of Lesotho, which resulted in grievous loss of innocent refugee lives and extensive damage to both private and government premises, can be described only as an act of State terrorism against a contiguous independent, sovereign State.

136. That warlike act is the more reprehensible when we take into consideration that Lesotho is landlocked, small and to all intents and purposes unarmed when compared to armed-to-the-teeth South Africa. The victims of that ruthless attack were for the greater part evidently chosen at random, ranging from children to—as the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Lesotho informed us two days ago—a newly-wed couple, who by no stretch of the imagination could possibly, in any rational analysis whatsoever, be accused of posing a threat to the might of a racist and Fascist South Africa, which has evidently gone literally berserk. Even South African newspapers, usually supportive of South Africa's inimical policies and practices, have expressly and sternly criticized their Government's act of aggression and terrorism, describing it as not only sterile but also counter-productive, inasmuch as it has intensified the sense of revulsion and insecurity which the peoples of southern Africa as a whole already deeply feel in consequence of South Africa's repeated acts of aggression committed against neighbouring States, such as Angola and Mozambique, as well as a deepening justifiable alienation on the part of the vast majority of the population of South Africa against the ruling heartless and mindless circles in South Africa itself.

137. The abominable act of aggression committed against Lesotho, as King Moshoeshoe II explained before the Council yesterday [*ibid.*], was an act committed against a fundamental precept and norm of universally accepted civilized behaviour, namely, the right and duty of every State to accord asylum to immigrants of conscience who might find themselves unable to accept the intolerable indignity of *apartheid*. Which self-respecting State in the world is willing to give up this right and duty?

138. Lesotho is a nation of refugees, as King Moshoeshoe mentioned yesterday, and no one can be more conscious of the duties which devolve upon States towards the oppressed than those who themselves have experienced its inhuman wickedness.

139. The delegation of Jordan, mindful of similar—though far more extensive—acts of State terrorism perpetrated by Israel in our region—and I am not trying to score any political point here—strongly condemns *apartheid* and South Africa's savage and indiscriminate attack against Lesotho and supports the demand in paragraph 2 of the resolution adopted at the beginning of this meeting that South Africa pay full and adequate compensation to the Kingdom of Lesotho for all the damage to life and property wrought by its act of aggression.

140. What is no less important is to ensure that this act of aggression does not serve as a pattern and precedent, in violation of the cornerstone of the Charter of the United Nations and international law. In our Middle East region, such wanton acts started more than a decade ago, in 1969 or even earlier, as relatively limited acts of aggression and ended, as we have all seen, in last summer's all-out genocidal war against Lebanon and the Palestinian refugees.

141. It started—and I recall all too well how it started, because I was there—in an Israeli air strike, including helicopters, against Beirut's famous international airport. More than 14 Boeing aircraft and other installations were totally destroyed.

142. The reason then given by Israel was that a young man, or two young men, had embarked at that airport, at which thousands of people embark every day. We all know that Lebanon is a *laissez-faire* country. Tens of thousands of people go to all the continents of the world from that airport—or used to.

143. That was followed by commando strikes at regular intervals against unarmed refugee camps. In due course, those refugees were impelled to carry small arms for self-defence or be massacred. The Israelis took this instinctive step as a mortal danger to Israel. That is how the whole matter started. The spiral began, and culminated in an indescribable catastrophe.

144. Is South Africa embarking on a similar course of action? Is it striving to derail the hoped-for settlement of Namibian independence? Is it a continuum of the kind of ubiquitous attacks on Angola and Mozambique to which we have all become accustomed? Only the future will tell, and the Council's response is crucial indeed, for, with the whole of southern Africa being enveloped and encompassed by this reign of terror, international peace and security will inevitably be at stake.

145. My delegation would have supported a stronger resolution, not so much in a spirit of taking punitive action but in order to deter the kind of development that has taken place in my part of the world and that is at present taking place in southern Africa. It would have liked a stronger resolution on such a clear-cut issue, but it went along with the existing resolution for the sake of unanimity.

146. May I express the deep condolences of the Government and people of Jordan to the families of the bereaved and to the proud people of Lesotho.

147. Mr. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): I should like first, Mr. President, to welcome you to the presidency of the Council. Your extensive diplomatic experience and your ability, demonstrated in the negotiations in the Committee on Disarmament

in Geneva and in other international forums, are well known to us all. We are happy to see in the President's seat the representative of socialist Poland, a country with which my country has brotherly relations of friendship and co-operation, and we wish you every success in that important position.

148. I should also like to express our appreciation to the representative of Panama, Mr. Carlos Ozores Typaldos, who so ably presided over the Council's work in November.

149. The Soviet delegation listened with close attention to the statement made at yesterday's meeting of the Council by King Moshoeshoe II of Lesotho [*ibid.*]. We were impressed by the convincing arguments in his statement and by the sincerity with which he spoke. We should like to express to him and to the people of Lesotho our deepest condolences at the deaths of many innocent citizens of their country.

150. The picture of what happened is quite clear. The racist régime of South Africa committed yet another crime, blatant armed aggression against the African State of Lesotho. On 9 December, the armed forces of the racists invaded the territory of Lesotho, raided the capital of the country and wreaked havoc there, killing completely innocent people. The South African air force participated in the attack, using aircraft and military helicopters.

151. This is another attempt to intimidate the young, newly independent States of southern Africa and to compel them to submit to the will of the racists.

152. This standard aggression by Pretoria is far from being an isolated case. It is just one more link in the long chain of unending military actions, basically a permanent war, which South Africa wages against the African States.

153. In recent years, the Council has frequently condemned the aggressive attacks by South Africa on Angola, Zambia, Mozambique and Seychelles. South African troops, having invaded the territory of Angola, are still occupying towns and villages in that country and killing people and destroying houses, bridges and means of transport and communications.

154. New reports are being received about a further dangerous concentration and buildup of armed forces by the racists on the border with Mozambique. All of this demonstrates once again that South Africa's policy is a growing threat to the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the African States and to international peace and security in southern Africa.

155. It is quite clear to all sensible people that, as was stated very convincingly yesterday by the King of Lesotho, the Pretoria régime would never have dared to act so boldly and brazenly if it had not been able to rely on the direct and indirect, open and covert,

military, economic and diplomatic support of a number of Western countries—to be specific, primarily the United States. It is those very States that are advocating patience in dealing with the South African racists, and are thereby in fact encouraging them further to expand their aggression in southern Africa.

156. The latest commando-type attack on Lesotho was a direct consequence of the fact that Pretoria went unpunished for its earlier misdeeds against the African States.

157. The Soviet Union firmly condemns South Africa's armed invasion of the territory of Lesotho. We share the view of the representatives of the African States that the continuing acts of aggression by the South African racists against neighbouring countries constitute a serious threat to international peace and security.

158. The Soviet delegation supported the draft resolution submitted to us for our consideration, but the following question arises: What next? It would probably be simply wishful thinking to believe that the resolution would compel South Africa to abandon its policy of aggression and terrorism against the neighbouring African States.

159. We can expect something quite different to happen, namely, that South Africa once again, as so often in the past, will simply ignore the resolution of the Council and continue its policy of aggression. In this connection, the question arises—and it was quite rightly raised by the Secretary-General in his annual report on the work of the Organization²—how we are to ensure implementation of resolutions adopted by the Security Council, which should be binding. We feel that, in the event of the failure of one or another country to implement a resolution of the Council, the Council should take the next step and adopt such coercive measures as would compel that State to take account of and comply with its will.

160. The Soviet delegation has stated on many occasions, and we repeat once again, that the Council should be ready to adopt measures under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations against South Africa; otherwise, all this talk about a desire to enhance the effectiveness of the United Nations as a whole and the Council in particular will remain just that, talk.

161. Meanwhile, there are some States, permanent members of the Security Council—we do not have to name them, they are already quite well known—that quite blithely threaten and talk a lot about sanctions. Things have even come to such a pass that, as was reported in the press yesterday, the Under Secretary of Defence of the United States even threatened to apply sanctions against neutral Austria. But whenever it is a question of South Africa, whether in connection with the question of Namibia or aggression against Angola, Zambia or Mozambique, a thousand different pretexts are put forward to explain why it is simply

not possible to adopt a resolution on sanctions. Apparently sanctions either are not effective, or cannot be applied—or even are unconstitutional. And if, as has happened, we actually get as far as a vote on a draft resolution calling for the application of sanctions in accordance with the Charter, the adoption of such a decision is simply blocked. We believe that the Council must constantly keep in view the aggressive foreign policy of Pretoria and its specific actions so as finally to take decisive measures, in accordance with the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter, to compel South Africa to cease immediately its aggression against States in the region.

162. Mr. de PINIES (Spain) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should first like to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council. Of course, we assure you of all the help and co-operation that we can provide during your term of office.

163. We should also like to congratulate the outgoing President, the representative of Panama, for the outstanding way in which he discharged his responsibilities at the head of the Council.

164. I should also like to convey a special greeting to my friend from Zaire, who has been promoted to the very important post of Minister for Foreign Affairs. I extend my most cordial congratulations to him.

165. This is not the first time that the authorities of Lesotho have addressed the Council because of acts of violence committed against their country from South African territory. On this occasion, however, the acts denounced are of particular seriousness, both because of the brazen manner in which the offenders invaded the territory and attacked the very capital of a neighbouring State and because of the damage and above all the tragic loss of the dozens of human lives—South African refugees and citizens of Lesotho—that those attacks caused. The seriousness of what occurred in Maseru on 9 December fully warranted, in the view of my delegation, approval of the resolution that we have just adopted unanimously.

166. As soon as news was received of the South African attack, the Spanish Minister for Foreign Affairs sent to his counterpart of Lesotho, who is honouring us with his presence here today, a telegram, the text of which read as follows:

"I have the honour to send to your Excellency the expression of my most sincere condolences and regrets for the loss of human lives due to the attack against your country by South African troops, which the Spanish Government and people strongly condemn as a flagrant violation of international law and a new blow against peace and stability in southern Africa."*

167. My delegation most strongly condemns this act of aggression committed by South Africa in violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lesotho and once again expresses its concern at the situation of tension prevailing in southern Africa, the root cause of which is, in our opinion, the persistence of the abominable régime of *apartheid*. The Security Council and the General Assembly have repeatedly condemned that régime, which not only constitutes a flagrant violation of the human rights of the overwhelming majority of the South African population but also bears the seeds of confrontation with neighbouring countries. The system of *apartheid* is a foreign body which is rejected by the entire international community. In order to survive, it reacts against the neighbouring countries with such reprehensible actions as that being considered by the Council today.

168. The authorities in South Africa must realize that the patience of the international community is not boundless and that they must refrain from harassing and committing further attacks against Lesotho or any other State of the region.

169. My delegation, which listened with great attention and sympathy to the statement made yesterday by King Moshoeshoe II [*ibid.*], wishes to express its solidarity to the delegation of Lesotho and to ask that it convey our condolences to the victims' families.

The meeting rose at 5.50 p.m.

NOTES

¹ General Assembly resolution 2625 (XXV), annex.

² *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-seventh Session, Special Supplement No. 1 (A/37/1)*, p. 1.

* Quoted in English by the speaker.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم - استلم منها من المكتبة التي تعامل معها أو اكتب إلى : الأمم المتحدة ، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف .

如何获取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经销处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишете по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.
