



Security Council

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.2657
10 February 1986

ENGLISH

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

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Monday, 10 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. TSVETKOV
Mr. FAN Guoxiang
Mr. BIERRING
Mr. BROCHAND
Mr. GBEHO
Mr. RAKOTONDRAMBOA
Mr. KASEMSRI
Mr. MOHAMMED
Mr. OLEANDROV
Mr. AL-SHAALI

Mr. GORE-BOOTH
Mr. OKUN
Mr. PABON

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

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

The meeting was called to order at 11.35 a.m.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

THE SITUATION IN SOUTHERN AFRICA

LETTER DATED 29 JANUARY 1986 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF THE SUDAN TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/17770)

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): In accordance with the decision taken at the 2652nd meeting, I invite the representative of Togo to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Kouassi (Togo) took a place at the Council table.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): In accordance with the decision taken at the 2652nd meeting, I invite the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia and the other members of the delegation of that Council to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Lusaka (Zambia) and the other members of the delegation of the United Nations Council for Namibia took a place at the Council table.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): In accordance with decisions taken at previous meetings, I invite the representatives of Algeria, Angola, Botswana, Egypt, Ethiopia, the German Democratic Republic, India, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Senegal, South Africa, Sudan, the United Republic of Tanzania, Yugoslavia, Zambia and Zimbabwe to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Djoudi (Algeria), Mr. de Figueiredo (Angola), Mr. Yane, (Botswana), Mr. Badawi (Egypt), Mr. Dinka (Ethiopia), Mr. Hucke (German Democratic Republic), Mr. Verma (India), Mr. Azzarouk (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), Mr. Dos Santos (Mozambique), Mr. Icaza Gallard (Nicaragua), Mr. Sarré (Senegal), Mr. von Schirnding (South Africa), Mr. Birido (Sudan), Mr. Foum (United Republic of Tanzania), Mr. Golob (Yugoslavia), Mr. Ngo (Zambia) and Mr. Mudenge (Zimbabwe) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Guyana and the Islamic Republic of Iran 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. Karran (Guyana) and Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani (Islamic Republic of Iran) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

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

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

Mr. FOUM (United Republic of Tanzania): Permit me first of all to extend to you, Sir, our warm congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of February. We are confident that, with your rich

(Mr. Fom, United Republic of Tanzania)

experience and skills, you will successfully guide the work of the Council and these deliberations.

Allow me also to extend our felicitations to your predecessor, His Excellency Mr. Li Luye, Permanent Representative of the People's Republic of China, for the able manner in which he conducted the proceedings on the important issues that were before the Council during the month of January.

Like many others, my delegation has had occasion to appear before the Council many times seeking to contribute to the quest for a solution of the problems engulfing southern Africa as a result of the policies of apartheid of the Pretoria régime. The records of every constituent organ of our Organization bear witness to the efforts of the international community to seek a peaceful resolution of the problem.

As long ago as the early years of this Organization efforts were made, and they have continued to be made, to eradicate that system, which has emerged as the most dangerous and violent against human dignity and freedom in the contemporary history of our continent.

Like most of those who have appeared before the Council or those who have contributed to the collective effort, my delegation has been encouraged by the growing universal awareness of the dangers that apartheid, as a concept and in practice, poses to the masses of the people of South Africa and to stability, peace and security in southern Africa as a whole. We have at the same time noted with concern, and we have been dismayed by, the persistent refusal of some countries, some of them permanent members of the Council, to join the mainstream of international public opinion and to act resolutely and effectively against apartheid.

(Mr. Foun, United Republic
of Tanzania)

There is terror in the air in southern Africa. There is danger, mounting and urgent, engulfing the region. The masses of the black people of South Africa have endured too much oppression, too much suffering and too much tyranny. They are resolved to suffer the indignity of suppression no more, but rather to endure in a struggle that will eradicate apartheid and set the foundations for freedom in South Africa and for peace and security in the region as a whole.

For several months now, the world has been absorbing shock after sordid shock as the machinery of apartheid churns on in a killing spree of the black people of South Africa, and all this during a period when so-called reforms were being instituted. In the past year alone, this Council was convened several times to deliberate on the acts of aggression committed by South Africa against independent African States. Going by the kind of news and reports coming from the area, one can only surmise, indeed conclude, that the immediate future holds nothing in store but more bloodshed from the suppression by the Pretoria régime of the black people and from aggression abroad. Consequently we consider that these meetings of the Council will afford us the opportunity to analyse clinically the critical condition obtaining within South Africa and building up in the region as a whole. The Council, which only recently proclaimed its unanimous readiness to condemn and deal with terrorism, must therefore squarely face the tragedy of State terrorism practised by the Pretoria régime.

Confronted by the unwavering determination of the people, the Pretoria régime has recently adopted new tactics. There has been talk of change. There have been statements of supposed intended release of the South African people's leaders and other prisoners - on condition, of course, that certain so-called reciprocal moves are made. All these are nothing but acts of desperation on the part of the régime. The régime had always hoped, through gaol sentences and other forms of

(Mr. Fom, United Republic
of Tanzania)

violence, to intimidate the people of South Africa from rallying behind their national liberation movement. Having failed in that form, it has had to resort to all the present forms of coercion, but no amount of subterfuge can hide the notorious reality of misery in the land of apartheid. The overwhelming majority of the people are officially considered aliens in their own country. Torture continues to be the order of the day. Hundreds upon hundreds have been condemned to gaol for expressing opposition to apartheid. In the last year alone, more than 1,000 people lost their lives as a result of the carnage brought about by the existence of the apartheid system.

Despite this painful reality, Pretoria continues to trumpet the line that there is nothing wrong domestically, that the situation is under control and improving, and that it is only external factors that are creating a problem in the region. The régime tries, albeit futilely, to camouflage its terrorist nature and aggressive intensions by claiming that it is the subject of externally motivated attacks. This is an element of extreme cunning and particular danger. The aggressor is raising the bogey of external threat with the intention of winning support for its domestic oppression and aggression against its neighbours.

No country has threatened South Africa. The records of this Organization and reality on the ground show unambiguously what the cause of the developing critical situation in southern Africa is: it is the existence of the system of apartheid; it is the continued illegal occupation of Namibia and the non-implementation of resolution 435 (1978) on Namibia; and it is the perpetual threats and military aggression by the Pretoria régime against its neighbours.

Since the Sharpeville massacre, South Africa has intensified its reign of terror against the majority of the population, and the régime has pursued the oppressed and threatens those who have given them refuge. The recent events in

(Mr. Fom, United Republic
of Tanzania)

southern Africa could not have escaped the attention of any freedom- and peace-loving individual. The Pretoria régime, on the excuse of pursuing South African militants, has committed aggression against Lesotho and murdered innocent civilians, as it did in Botswana. The régime has threatened Zimbabwe as it has brutally acted against Zambia and as far afield as the Seychelles. South Africa has been hard put to mask its aggressive intentions against its neighbours. While talking of peace, it has sponsored numerous groupings and launched them for the express purpose of destabilizing its neighbours. Covertly and overtly it has trained and launched armed bandits against the People's Republic of Mozambique, and used its own military machine against Mozambique.

Angola has been the object of particular and sustained military aggression. This aspect of southern Africa's critical condition deserves special attention. The Pretoria régime, banking on its allies, has utilized every means to destabilize the Government of the People's Republic of Angola. It has launched direct military incursions and is at present even continuing aggression against Angola, and it has sponsored, trained, financed and directed the armed bandits of UNITA against Angola. It has done all this by continuing its illegal colonial occupation of Namibia and by frustrating the efforts of the international community to institute a peaceful resolution of the question of Namibia. The South African régime is the Evil Empire incarnate.

Against such a background of the Evil Empire's building up minions and bandits to spread its cancer, against such a background of institutionalized State terrorism and threats and acts of aggression against its neighbours, one would have hoped that the universal condemnation of apartheid would be followed by universal resolute action against that system and against all institutions propped up by that system. One would have hoped that all Governments would take every action to

(Mr. Foum, United Republic
of Tanzania)

frustrate the designs of the régime and contribute to the urgent elimination of apartheid. We who have suffered the indignity and humiliation of colonial subjugation had hoped that all countries, all Governments, would act against the institutions and groupings of racism, apartheid and aggression. Time and again we have been reminded of the particular responsibility of the permanent members of the Security Council for the maintenance of peace and security. With this in perspective we find the actions of certain countries to be particularly distressing. They proclaim their abhorrence of the practices of the Pretoria régime. We do not question or doubt their proclamations of friendship for Africa. It is their actions that we seriously question. Time and again Africa has called upon these countries, in particular those with major holdings and influence in South Africa - like the United States, the United Kingdom, France and West Germany - to refrain from any action that would encourage or give comfort to the racists.

(Mr. Fom, United Republic of Tanzania)

What we have witnessed has been epitomized by the so-called constructive engagement policy pursued by the United States.

As if this were not harmful enough, we now note the open support given to the South-African-sponsored armed bandits of UNITA. The recent decision of the United States to welcome Mr. Savimbi, the self-styled leader of the armed bandits operating in Angola, and the efforts to give him increased financial and political support is a dangerous intrusion in the affairs of the region and an unfortunate contribution to lawlessness and terrorism and to the threat of the peace, stability and security of the region. At the conclusion of the Twenty-First Ordinary Summit Session, the Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity adopted a declaration which stated:

"1. Any financial, military and logistical support to the enemies of the Angolan people by any Government or private group or Government agency, directly or indirectly, would be considered a serious violation of the 1970 Declaration on Friendly Relations among States, and of the provisions of the charters of the Organization of African Unity and the United Nations;

"2. 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; and

"3. Any renewal of clandestine operations against the territorial integrity of the People's Republic of Angola would constitute gross interference in the internal affairs of the Republic of Angola, and the latter reserves the right to take any action it may deem necessary." (A/40/666,

AHG/DECL.3 (XXI))

It is our hope that this Declaration of the African Heads of State and Government will be heeded by all States.

(Mr. Foum, United Republic of Tanzania)

We recognize that we may not all act at the same levels or with the same commitment and feeling. While we have expressed our dismay at the actions of some of these States, we still recognize that they have taken tentative steps, albeit small. We require and demand more.

Earlier I stated that the oppressed people of South Africa are prepared to endure the trials of struggle against institutionalized racism and tyranny. They cannot and will not be duped by the machinations of the apartheid régime. The representative of the African National Congress whom the Council invited to address it made that point quite clear. What we must make clear also is that southern Africa as a whole, given the current trend, is inevitably approaching the threshold of wider and generalized violence. That will be brought about only by the continued existence of apartheid and the frantic efforts of the Pretoria régime to sustain itself.

A generation ago the international community hesitated at a critical moment in history. That factor and appeasement encouraged the perpetrators of institutionalized racism. Nazism shattered peace and security in Europe, and the world went to war.

In the name of freedom we call for common action against apartheid and for the independence of Namibia. In the name of human dignity, we demand action against apartheid. In the name of peace and stability in southern Africa, we appeal for action to safeguard those ideals. We appeal to reason and reject the arrogance of power.

Has the terrible result of appeasing the Nazi supremacists been erased from our collective memory? Or are we suffering from selective amnesia? Are the South African oppressed people expendable? Are the security and territorial integrity of the independent States of the region to be sacrificed?

(Mr. Fom, United Republic of Tanzania)

The Security Council has in the past had to deal with South African aggression and the consequences of such aggression. Under the Charter the Council is enjoined to act to safeguard peace and security. The Pretoria régime, by threats and through action, has persistently been against freedom and against peace and stability in the region. It is our hope that the Council will take the appropriate measures to ensure the implementation of this Organization's decisions for the elimination of apartheid and for the independence of Namibia, and thus eradicate the threat to freedom and to peace and security in southern Africa.

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

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

Mr. AZZAROUK (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (interpretation from Arabic): During the present series of meetings the Security Council is considering the volatile situation in southern Africa resulting from the continued presence of the racist entity implanted in the heart of that region like a cancer. Not satisfied with its illegal presence and its hateful racist practices against the people of South Africa or its continued occupation of the Territory of Namibia, that régime persists in daily acts of military aggression against neighbouring African States, thereby practising official terrorism and spreading instability throughout the region. In so doing, it uses the pretext of protecting its security; it pursues persons engaged in a liberation struggle, a struggle to free the peoples of Namibia and South Africa. It has organized, trained and armed mercenary bandits and terrorist squads to destabilize and damage the economies of neighbouring African countries, first and foremost Angola, which have extended and still extend assistance to national liberation movements.

(Mr. Azzarouk, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

No one can have any doubt but that the military, political and economic support and assistance received by the racist South African régime from the colonialist régimes, especially the United States Administration and the racist Zionist entity in occupied Palestine, are responsible for the continued existence of that hateful racist entity, its continued defiance of the international community's will and its refusal to comply with decisions and resolutions in this connection adopted by the United Nations. There are many such decisions and resolutions; we do not need to list them.

(Mr. Azzarouk, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

Only a few days ago, the Council met to consider a similar case: the practices of the Zionist settler racist entity implanted in the heart of the Arab nation, including State terrorism against the Arab peoples. Not satisfied with occupying Palestine and displacing its people, the Zionist entity pursues a policy of harassing them wherever they are - in the occupied Arab territories, Lebanon, Jordan, Tunisia or even in international airspace. The act of aerial piracy against the Libyan aircraft, to which the representative of the Zionist entity has shamelessly admitted before the Council, stating that two of its military aircraft forced the Libyan plane to land at an airfield in occupied Palestine on the suspicion that it was carrying Palestinian passengers, provides ample proof that the racist Zionist entity practises State terrorism in the Arab region and the Middle East.

The United States Administration, which has always claimed that it is against and resists terrorism, has been silent and adopted an ostrich-like attitude. It has refused to condemn the almost unprecedented terrorist act of air piracy committed by the Israeli entity. The United States is the only other State to have been guilty of such an act - when it forced an Egyptian aircraft to land at an airport in southern Italy.

When the United States representative cast a veto against the draft resolution submitted to condemn the act of aggression against the Libyan aircraft, the United States took the side of the State terrorism practised by the Israeli entity, showing the usual blatant contradiction between its words and deeds. While it claims to be against terrorism, it stands by terrorists, supports them and prevents their condemnation.

The United States Administration is playing the major role in providing protection and support to the two racist régimes in occupied Palestine and South

(Mr. Azzarouk, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

Africa. But for the protection and support provided by the United States Administration to those two régimes, whether within or outside the framework of this Council, they would not have been able to continue their policy of arrogance and terrorism against Arab and African countries and peoples. The United States Administration thus proves to the whole world that it is an active partner in the terrorism practised by States - nay, the leader of international terrorism.

Within the framework of an aggressive escalation pioneered by the United States Administration against national régimes in the third world, Angola has become one of the victims of the racist colonialist war delegated to the troops of racist South Africa, which has launched military attacks against Angola's territory and sovereignty in past years. UNITA agent bandits have been used as an auxiliary tool to execute a plan aimed at destabilizing Angola and eliminating its progressive régime. UNITA forces receive direct and indirect support and assistance from the racist régime in South Africa, whose forces have carried out joint military operations with UNITA bandits against Angolan territory.

According to the report of the Commission of Investigation established by Security Council resolution 571 (1985), the military operations carried out by the racist forces during the period 1981-1985 resulted in huge material and human losses, in addition to aggravating the problem of the refugees and displaced persons and increasing the racist régime's military presence in parts of Angolan territory. The total damage to the Angolan economy as a result of acts of aggression in that period is estimated at \$10 billion.

While the Angolan people is subjected to the racist aggressive war and economic and political pressures by the United States Administration, we see the leader of the UNITA bandits paying a visit to the United States of America - a visit surrounded by a show of official support by the leaders of the United States

(Mr. Azzarouk, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

Administration - amidst reports of that Administration's intention to continue supporting UNITA through covert military means from the Reserve Fund of the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA). The American President's reception of Savimbi crowns attempts aimed at increased military and political support for UNITA.

The Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, Mr. Crocker, is at present calling on American oil companies to consider American national interests when they deal with the Government of Angola. At the same time there is an intensive campaign to force the Chevron Oil Company to leave Angola. As a matter of fact, the President of the United States himself, Mr. Reagan, has announced his intention to increase the support and assistance being given to forces working against the People's Republic of Angola.

In conclusion, I should like to affirm that the policy of State terrorism and arrogance adopted by the two racist régimes in South Africa and occupied Palestine against the peoples of South Africa, Namibia and neighbouring African countries and against the peoples of Palestine and the Arab countries will not end so long as unlimited United States support for those régimes continues and so long as the United States Administration protects them within the Council and outside it. The peoples of the Arab region and southern Africa will assume responsibility for putting an end to the practices of those two hateful and arrogant régimes, since the Council is paralysed and unable to adopt deterrent measures in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter to expel those two entities from the United Nations owing to the United States veto and its strategic alliance with them.

Mr. HOGUE (Australia): The topic before the Council is one of the constant preoccupations of members of this body. The situation in southern Africa is a cause of world tension and of deep concern to my Government. Although there are a number of aspects to the situation under discussion, it is clear to my

(Mr. Hogue, Australia)

delegation that the heart of the problem is the policy of apartheid pursued by the Government of South Africa. This policy and its unjust and tragic consequences for the people of South Africa remain at the core of southern Africa's problems. In my delegation's view, it is the greatest cause of instability and unrest in the region.

My Government's attitude to South Africa's racist policies is well known and requires no elaboration. It has taken numerous measures to express its abhorrence of apartheid and to take concrete steps to encourage its early and fundamental dismantling. Australia is also working for progress towards the elimination of apartheid and trying through its participation in the Commonwealth Eminent Persons Group to encourage dialogue and peaceful change in South Africa. This is an important initiative and my Government hopes that all those concerned - Governments, organizations and individuals - will give the Eminent Persons Group the co-operation it deserves and requires to carry out its work, which could have so much potential impact on South Africa.

We have listened carefully to the statements made thus far in this debate, including that by the Permanent Representative of South Africa. We have noted the expressed reaffirmation of the South African Government to negotiate with the black community on constitutional reform. We have noted also the statement by South Africa that apartheid is an outdated concept and the promise made that certain social and economic reforms in the area of citizenship, influx control and property rights will be introduced into the Parliament of South Africa.

(Mr. Hogue, Australia)

Those are, of course, statements of intent. We hope that they will be translated into action, and that dialogue for change will be opened with genuine representatives of the black community, leading to a multiracial and democratic South Africa. Without such action, the South African Government's professions of reform will not be acceptable either to black South Africans or to the international community. Without such action, the worrying situation of regional instability and unrest will continue, and South Africa will remain a difficult and threatening neighbour for those countries that surround it. In short, I can only remind the South African Government of the old adage that actions speak louder than words.

While the policy of apartheid remains the core of the problems of the southern African region, the persistence of South Africa's refusal to implement resolution 435 (1978) is another source of instability and regional uncertainty. South Africa's refusal is a direct affront to the authority of the United Nations. In the 20 years that have passed since the termination of the mandate and the extension of the United Nations direct authority to Namibia, South Africa has used a series of excuses to delay Namibia's accession to independence. In Australia's view, extraneous factors must not be allowed to delay the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). Australia rejects any moves to pre-empt or bypass the United Nations plan, which enjoys our support and that of the international community.

A third element in the web of issues which has prompted this debate has been South Africa's relations with its neighbours. The series of complaints from countries bordering South Africa addressed to the Council are all-too-familiar to members. My delegation's participation in the Council's Commission of Inquiry into Angola gave it first-hand experience of South Africa's actions towards its

(Mr. Hogue, Australia)

neighbours. It is quite clear that South Africa has acted with complete disregard for its neighbours' sovereignty and territorial integrity, in a series of actions contrary to their independence and territorial integrity. The present debate gives the Council the opportunity to reaffirm the requirement under international law that South Africa cease any act of destabilization against neighbouring States.

Ultimately, of course, the soundest basis for a new beginning between South Africa and its neighbours will be found only with a genuine move by South Africa to abolish apartheid and to establish, in its place, a democratic and multiracial structure, which will ensure justice for all of South Africa's citizens.

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

Mr. YANE (Botswana): On behalf of the delegation of Botswana I wish to convey to you, Sir, our congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of February, and to express our gratitude to your predecessor, the Permanent Representative of the People's Republic of China, for the able manner in which he guided the Council's affairs during the past month.

The troubled situation in southern Africa, which is the subject of this debate, is one that the Council has been seized of for a number of years, in one form or another, and it is distressing that, instead of our moving towards the solution of the main elements that have given rise to the problems of southern Africa, all the indications are that the situation is approaching an even more dangerous level.

During the past few months a number of majority-ruled countries in southern Africa have come before the Council to present individual cases relating to the question before it today. Those were genuine cases of grievance, and all found

(Mr. Yane, Botswana)

their origin in one common denominator: the apartheid policies of South Africa, or, more precisely, the actions that the apartheid régime has embarked upon to perpetuate those policies.

In addressing this issue it is perhaps pertinent to examine the make-up of the problem. The situation inside South Africa has not arisen because of any outside influences. It is a direct result of the abominable policies of apartheid, through which the black majority have been kept in bondage for centuries. Over a number of years the black majority in that country have been the victims of the most savage laws known to exist anywhere in present times. They have been victims of institutionalized racial discrimination, arbitrary arrest, detention without trial, long-term prison sentences for so-called treason, death in detention and so on.

How, then, in the face of all that can South Africa expect the black majority to remain docile? In the history of man there comes a time when even the meekest have to stand up and defend their own survival.

The uprising that the world is witnessing in South Africa today should constitute a clear message to the Government of South Africa that the oppressed majority are not prepared to tolerate the injustices of apartheid any longer. The fact that protest demonstrations have been sustained for over a year should attest to that.

Instead of embarking on a campaign of terror and murder, the Government of South Africa should be seriously engaged in dismantling apartheid. Resistance against apartheid cannot be expected simply to dissipate when fundamental issues, such as the right to vote, the right to own land, the right to live where one chooses, continue to be ignored.

If the Government of South Africa is indeed committed to change, as it has pronounced itself to be, it is incumbent upon it to demonstrate in concrete terms that it means what it says. Cosmetic changes will not help the situation.

(Mr. Yane, Botswana)

Violence will not solve the problems of South Africa, and if pursued will result only in more violence, and eventually could erupt into a human tragedy of unpredictable magnitude.

The other side of the problem of southern Africa is the question of Namibia. The continued illegal occupation of this United Nations Trust Territory by South Africa is an affront to the Council, the General Assembly and the international community at large.

If South Africa had heeded the Council and co-operated in the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), the unrest that has engulfed Angola and other countries in the sub-region could have been avoided.

We believe that the Council has the capacity to enforce its decisions, and we appeal to it to address the stalemate on this question.

Over the years, victims of apartheid have had to flee their home country to seek asylum elsewhere. By reason of proximity, the front-line States and other neighbours of South Africa have become, in these trying times, the logical places of first call for those unfortunate people.

(Mr. Yane, Botswana)

In an effort to fulfil our international obligations under the relevant conventions of the United Nations - and indeed out of sheer good-neighbourliness towards people with whom we share culture and traditions - we have given sanctuary to these refugees, and we continue to do so. What should have been an honourable duty has now been turned into a living nightmare for our countries. The locations occupied by genuine refugees in our countries have been turned into imaginary training camps for "terrorists".

We have bent over backwards in an effort to assure South Africa that we have no terrorist training camps on our soil. We have at times even gone out of our way to invite South Africa to come and show us where those so-called training camps that they so frequently refer to are located. Such invitations have always been ignored; instead, genuine refugees living in our cities have been murdered in cold blood, and our countries are under constant threat of attack simply because we give refuge to victims of apartheid.

We know that we are weak, but our weakness will not deter us from doing what is moral and what is our duty. What we ask of this Council is that it should act to deter South Africa from violating the sovereignty and territorial integrity of our countries and to ensure the safety of refugees to whom we give sanctuary. We believe it is within the competence of this Council to take such action.

South Africa has talked so much about extending a hand of friendship to its neighbours. How can that be taken seriously when we continue to be attacked and threatened? We have always been ready to talk to South Africa on matters relating to security. As recently as last week, my Government was engaged in such talks, and further contacts are being arranged. Given this willingness to talk, how can South Africa continue to portray us as hostile and unco-operative? We have never been a threat to South Africa. It is South Africa that has always been a threat to us.

(Mr. Yane, Botswana)

The countries that make up southern Africa are bound together by geography and history. Whether we like it or not we have to lead an interdependent existence. South Africa needs us as much as we need South Africa. It may be strong militarily and economically, but it cannot exist in isolation. It is, therefore, also in the interests of the South Africans that they create an atmosphere of peace and security in the sub-region. That cannot be achieved unless they abandon the path they have chosen.

The sum total of what we have said is that there will be no peace and there will be no meaningful economic development in southern Africa until South Africa abandons apartheid, which is the root cause of all our problems.

This Council will be aware that a high-level meeting between front-line States and member States of the European Community has just concluded in Lusaka, Zambia. We are encouraged by the seriousness with which the deteriorating situation in southern Africa was addressed by both sides at that meeting, and we hope that it is the beginning of a genuine effort to work towards the resolution of the problems of the sub-region.

It is our hope that this Council and the international community can prevail upon South Africa to turn around and make peace with its neighbours, seriously to address the question of Namibia and, above all, to move towards the total dismantlement of apartheid.

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

Mr. BIERRING (Denmark): There is universal agreement that the situation in southern Africa is rapidly deteriorating. That development not only endangers regional stability, but has wider implications for international peace and security. It is also, I believe, universally acknowledged that the policy of apartheid is the root cause of the conflicts and tensions in southern Africa.

(Mr. Bierring, Denmark)

A few days ago, the President of South Africa had to admit that the concept of apartheid is outdated. Unfortunately, he did not draw the logical conclusion from that belated revelation. President Botha's speech to the South African Parliament was far from an adequate response to the legitimate demands and aspirations of the black majority. Once more we had to note: too little, too late.

The South African Government has yet to demonstrate through actual deeds that its alleged desire for fundamental change in South African society is sincere. Meanwhile, the state of emergency continues, genuine leaders of the majority population remain imprisoned or exiled, and the circle of violence and repression assumes devastating proportions.

In Namibia, South Africa has demonstrated no real willingness to comply with Security Council resolution 435 (1978). On the contrary, the South African Government continues to support an internal settlement in the Territory, while insisting on the complete withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola as a precondition for the implementation of the United Nations plan.

One of the most discouraging aspects of recent developments is that South Africa continues to use force to subdue neighbouring States, politically, economically and militarily. None of the so-called peace agreements have been honoured by South Africa. While professing adherence to those agreements, South Africa has continued its active support for groups trying by armed action to subvert Governments of independent neighbouring States. The most blatant example is, of course, South Africa's now overt assistance to UNITA. Any perpetrators of such actions should be denied any assistance or support.

President Botha's speech to the South African Parliament once again made it clear that South Africa does not intend to change its aggressive policy in the

(Mr. Bierring, Denmark)

region. The South African Government does not hesitate, even in Parliament, to advocate violence should the neighbouring States fail to submit to South Africa's wish for final control and dominance of the region.

Thus, by a combination of pressure and direct intervention in the internal affairs of neighbouring States in contravention of international law, South Africa tries to keep those States off balance and to force them to adopt policies which run counter to their national interests and thus constitute an intolerable infringement upon their freedom of action.

The States Members of the United Nations are in agreement that the international community has a responsibility for contributing to the total abolition of apartheid, for securing Namibia's earliest independence in accordance with resolution 435 (1978), and for taking steps to maintain peace and stability in southern Africa. There is also general recognition that the Security Council has a special responsibility in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.

(Mr. Bierring, Denmark)

Since becoming a member of the Security Council Denmark has continuously urged the Council to fulfil its responsibility by concrete actions, and it is gratifying to note that some progress has been made. Several of the speakers in the present debate have argued that the Security Council in the present situation should play a preventive role. We fully agree with that. Nor is there any doubt in our minds that this preventive role can only be effectively conducted if the Council acts with unanimity. This is the reason we have repeatedly argued that division in the Council will only help South Africa to sustain its repressive policy within its borders, its illegal occupation of Namibia and its destabilization of the front-line States.

The Charter leaves the United Nations with only one means of peaceful persuasion of recalcitrant Member States, namely, the imposition of various forms of sanctions. Denmark strongly feels that the developments in southern Africa in recent years have increased the need for the international community to resort to that instrument. Our consistent support for international sanctions against South Africa, including mandatory sanctions by the Council, and our own national measures, do not reflect political opportunism or a wish for mindless punitive action.

We warn the South African Government against believing that our policy is transient or formulated by a vocal minority. It is based on a deeply and widely felt popular solidarity with the oppressed peoples of southern Africa and an honest wish - also in our own self-interest - to try to prevent the situation in southern Africa from developing into an all-embracing conflict with worldwide repercussions.

Fortunately, we have witnessed - especially during 1985 - a growing international consensus on the policies to be pursued towards South Africa. This consensus has crossed boundaries and brought many countries together in a common endeavour. The most recent example is the very successful meeting in Lusaka on

(Mr. Bierring, Denmark)

3 and 4 February between Foreign Ministers of front-line States and the 12 member countries of the European Community. Another instance was the meeting of the Southern African Development Co-ordination Conference (SADCC) in Harare a week earlier. The latter meeting afforded my Government the opportunity to pledge renewed and increased support for the co-operation among South Africa's neighbours, the need for which was so eloquently described by the Ambassador of Zimbabwe in his statement in the Council last week. The international community has an obligation to alleviate the economic and other problems facing the countries that bear the brunt of South Africa's aggressive policies.

The number and scope of international, regional and national measures have increased dramatically during the recent year. Denmark participates in the international endeavours in this Council, in the General Assembly, in the Nordic Group and with our partners within the European Community. Furthermore, we have decided on far-reaching national measures which, in the course of 1986, will result in a general cessation of economic relations between Denmark and South Africa.

These measures are well known to the members of the Council. The latest is a prohibition of all new investments in and leasing contracts to South Africa and Namibia. In accordance with decisions taken by the Danish Parliament, the Danish Government has also introduced a bill prohibiting the import of coal from South Africa. The Government is also preparing legislation that will lead to a general cessation of Danish imports from and exports to South Africa.

It is important to note that these national measures have been implemented pending mandatory sanctions by the Security Council. We continue to believe that action by this body will also be needed effectively to convince the Government of South Africa that radical changes in its policies are indispensable.

It is, in our view, of paramount importance that the Security Council impress upon South Africa the urgency of fundamental changes in its policy, internally as

(Mr. Bierring, Denmark)

well as externally. We must spare no effort in trying to convince the Government of South Africa that it is in its own best, long-term interest to stop the aggression against neighbouring States, to accept the early implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and, not least, to initiate, without delay and pre-condition, the necessary dialogue with genuine leaders of the majority population.

Some whites in South Africa still seem to be among the few people in the world who have not yet realized that a continuation of the present policy will lead to disaster in a foreseeable future. It is the responsibility of the Council to prevent such a disaster and to bring peace, stability and human dignity to the whole of southern Africa.

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

Mr. HUCKE (German Democratic Republic): Permit me first of all to thank you, Mr. President, and the other members of the Council for giving me the opportunity to explain the position of my Government on the item under consideration. I have already had the opportunity to congratulate you on your assumption of your high office and to wish you much success. We regard it as symbolic that a representative of free Africa should be presiding over this important debate on the situation in the south of that continent, a debate that is focused on effective measures to be taken against the apartheid régime.

At the beginning of the year 1986 all the signs already indicate that the debate on the aggressive, peace-threatening and inhuman policy of the South African apartheid régime will continue to be a main topic on the agenda of the Security Council. It is obvious that Pretoria is cynically aiming at further challenging the international public. How else can one assess the latest acts of the racist

(Mr. Hucke, German Democratic Republic)

régime and Mr. Botha's speech in Cape Town? It becomes ever more clear that the criminal policy pursued by the racist régime inside and outside the country is diametrically opposed to the striving of the African peoples for peace and security, national sovereignty and economic stability.

(Mr. Hucke, German Democratic Republic)

That policy puts an additional heavy burden on the African States and their peoples. It is a well-known fact that the existence of the apartheid system is the cause for the constant exacerbation of the situation in southern Africa. Now as before, Namibia is denied its independence and the Territory is misused as a starting-point for acts of aggression against Angola. The front-line States are permanently exposed to direct or indirect attacks by the apartheid régime. The Security Council had repeatedly to deal with this question last year. The German Democratic Republic supports the implementation of resolution 568 (1985) of 21 June 1985 condemning South Africa's aggression against Botswana as well as resolution 571 (1985) of 20 September 1985 on the aggression against Angola.

The constant threats by South Africa are dangerous declarations of intent to continue its policy of destabilization by military means in the entire region. It is the declared aim of Pretoria to subject the independent States of the region to its diktat.

Aggresssion, occupation and reprisals remain decisive features of apartheid. That policy has caused a tense situation, especially for Angola, Mozambique and other front-line States. Like in Nicaragua, counter-revolutionary gangs in Angola, Mozambique and other front-line States get overt and covert support to overthrow the legitimate Governments of these countries.

That policy of State terrorism has the approval of certain imperialist circles and is encouraged by overt sympathy. This can be seen at present by the VIP treatment given to the chief of a terrorist organization kept by the South African racists.

As is well known, the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries has consistently and strongly condemned the machinations of that organization as well as its endeavours to win new financial backers. Those

(Mr. Hucke, German Democratic
Republic)

conniving with the apartheid régime and its puppets belong to the same aggressive circles whose peace-threatening plans and actions are heating up tensions in the Mediterranean, Central America, the Middle East or in other parts of the world. They do not shrink from blackmail, force and boycott measures to reach their aims and to intimidate those States whose policies and path to development are not to their liking.

The present policy pursued by the régime of apartheid is by no means an expression of strength. It is rather a reaction to the successes achieved by the liberation struggle of the peoples of southern Africa.

The liberation movements and all democratic forces successfully continue their struggle against the racist régime, which is seen as illegal internationally and whose political isolation has never been so great as it is today. However, this must by no means be a reason to underestimate the dangerousness of the apartheid fanatics who try their utmost to delay the historically doomed defeat of this régime. Their aggressive course directed against all progressive developments in the region has assumed new dimensions. This can also be seen from the actions against Lesotho. The repeated acts of military aggression by South Africa against Lesotho are closely related with the latest events in that country.

The German Democratic Republic would like to take this opportunity to express the hope that the Government of Lesotho will be in a position, as it was before, to defend the independence and sovereignty of the country and to continue the struggle against the apartheid régime jointly with the front-line States and all peace-loving, democratic forces.

In view of the further aggravation of the situation in southern Africa, we reiterate our demand for the elimination of the policy of apartheid. This requires

(Mr. Hucke, German Democratic Republic)

ending all support for the racist régime. What is imperative is to increase further international pressure on South Africa.

The imposition of comprehensive economic sanctions against South Africa, as recently demanded by the annual session of the Southern African Development Co-ordination Conference (SADCC) in Harare, would constitute an important and effective step in that direction.

My country, the German Democratic Republic, sides in unswerving solidarity with the front-line States, the African National Congress (ANC) and other anti-apartheid forces. From this forum we renew our demand for the immediate and unconditional release of Nelson Mandela. Our support goes equally to the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) in its struggle for an independent Namibia. The relevant decisions of the United Nations, including Security Council resolution 435 (1978), are a realistic basis for solving the problem. The United Nations must shoulder its full responsibility. It must not allow the question of Namibia to be pushed into the background by South Africa and certain imperialist quarters.

Let us jointly make all efforts so that the peace for which the peoples of Namibia, Angola and the other States in southern Africa have been aspiring for so long will prevail at last.

The International Year of Peace proclaimed by the United Nations should mobilize ever more forces for the support of the legitimate struggle led by these peoples. Resolute action against the forces of aggression and war and for the protection of peace is urgently required. We think that today it is more necessary than ever before to dismantle hotbeds of conflict and tension in all parts of the world. This is true of Central America as it is true of the Mediterranean and the Middle East, where peace and security are dangerously threatened. And, not least,

(Mr. Hucke, German Democratic
Republic)

this is also true of the southern part of the African continent, which will remain unstable and a danger to peace and security as long as the régime of apartheid is not eliminated.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I thank the representative of the German Democratic Republic for the kind words he addressed to me and my country.

The next meeting of the Security Council to continue consideration of the item on its agenda will be held this afternoon at 4 p.m.

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.