

**Security Council**

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.2662
13 February 1986

ENGLISH

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND
SIX HUNDRED AND SIXTY-SECOND MEETINGHeld at Headquarters, New York,
on Thursday, 13 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
VenezuelaMr. HOGUE
Mr. GARVALOV
Mr. LI Luye
Mr. BIERRING
Mr. BROCHAND
Mr. GBEHO
Mr. RABETAFIKA
Mr. KASEMSRI
Mr. MOHAMMED
Mr. SAFRONCHUK
Mr. AL-SHAALI

Sir John THOMSON
Mr. OKUN
Mr. AGUILAR

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

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

The meeting was called to order at 11.35 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 Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Botswana, Cuba, Egypt, Ethiopia, the German Democratic Republic, Guyana, Hungary, India, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Lesotho, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Senegal, South Africa, Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, 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. Zarif (Afghanistan), Mr. Djoudi (Algeria), Mr. de Figueiredo (Angola), Mr. Legwaila (Botswana), Mr. Velazco San José (Cuba), Mr. Badawi (Egypt), Mr. Dinka (Ethiopia), Mr. Huckle (German Democratic Republic), Mr. Karran (Guyana), Mr. Endreffy (Hungary), Mr. Verma (India), Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani (Islamic Republic of Iran), Mr. Van Tonder (Lesotho), Mr. Azzarouk (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), Mr. Dos Santos (Mozambique), Mr. Icaza Gallard (Nicaragua), Mr. Garba (Nigeria), Mr. Shah Nawaz (Pakistan), Mr. Samudio (Panama), Mr. Sarré (Senegal), Mr. von Schirnding (South Africa), Mr. Birido (Sudan), Mr. El-Fattal (Syrian Arab Republic), Mr. Karoui (Tunisia), Mr. Skofenko (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic), Mr. Fom (United Republic of Tanzania), Mr. Golob (Yugoslavia), Mr. Ngo (Zambia) and Mr. Mudenge (Zimbabwe) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

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

The Council has before it the text of a revised draft resolution (S/17817/Rev.1), submitted by the Congo, Ghana, Madagascar, Trinidad and Tobago and the United Arab Emirates.

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

Mr. KAROUI (Tunisia) (interpretation from French): Permit me first of all, Sir, to offer you my sincere and warm congratulations and best wishes for success on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for February. Your fraternal country, Congo, is known for its dedication to the principles of the Charter and to the strengthening of international peace and security. We therefore have high hopes that the Council's deliberations will achieve positive results under your wise guidance.

I wish also to congratulate the Permanent Representative of the People's Republic of China for the effective and able manner in which he conducted the work of the Council last month.

The current situation in southern Africa is the direct outcome of the policy of aggression carried out by the South African régime. My country is gravely concerned at the violence recently unleashed by the Pretoria régime against the opponents of apartheid in South Africa, which has spread throughout the country, even into the townships and villages. A campaign of terror and open violence is being unceasingly waged by the racist régime's security forces with a view to crushing the heroic resistance of the South African people to the apartheid system.

While Pretoria carries out undaunted its campaign of repression against internal opposition and forces for change, it has also intensified its acts of aggression, subversion and destabilization against the front-line States. That intervention by the apartheid régime in southern Africa, in the form of military incursions, murder, destabilization, mass arrests and the imposition of a state of emergency, is nothing more than a strategy employed by Pretoria to preserve and perpetuate white domination by expanding its hegemony throughout the region.

Intensified repression against the oppressed populations of South Africa is paralleled by consolidation of the illegal occupation of Namibia, blatant aggression against neighbouring countries through direct military incursion or

(Mr. Karoui, Tunisia)

through the use of so-called dissident elements recruited, trained, equipped, financed and commanded by the Pretoria régime.

Continuing its delaying tactics and its harmful policy of apartheid, the racist régime of Pretoria announced a week ago alleged reforms. In fact, these constitute nothing but an insidious attempt to mislead the international community and distract its attention from the real problems. The odious apartheid régime can be neither improved nor reformed: it must be abolished.

In his 31 January 1986 speech to his country's Parliament, President Botha announced a series of measures he described as "historic". Although this results from the pressure brought to bear by the international community upon Pretoria, it is none the less regrettable that it is not in conformity with the legitimate aspirations of the South African people. Indeed, it is confirmation - if confirmation were needed - of the hypocritical nature of the apartheid régime.

While claiming that he wants to negotiate with the representatives of the various racial groups in order to arrive at a new constitutional arrangement based on a democratic system of government, Mr. Botha is actually ignoring the black majority, which accounts for more than 72 per cent of the population. The South African President has spoken of a single citizenship for all South Africans, while in reality working to maintain the segregated system. He clings to the idea of a unified South Africa without renouncing his policy of creating bantustans and homelands.

Moreover, the national statutory council offered by President Botha as an earnest of participation in central government, although open to all, cannot replace universal suffrage and the exercise by the black majority of its inalienable rights. A national statutory council, with a strictly advisory role, cannot reflect the true will of the majority and would be a sham body designed to lay a veneer of legitimacy on the shameful policy of apartheid.

(Mr. Karoui, Tunisia)

The South African President has also announced the elimination of the pass laws, which his régime will replace with other identity documents in order, he said, to ensure orderly urban planning. It goes without saying that this measure will in no way improve the lot of South African blacks unless it is accompanied by genuine recognition of their civil, political and other rights.

It is our view, therefore, that the measures recently proposed by Mr. Botha are, in the final analysis, yet another manoeuvre intended to trick international public opinion and to prolong indefinitely the suffering of the black majority.

The struggle of the oppressed majority in South Africa cannot be separated from that of the heroic people of Namibia under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO). The Pretoria régime, which doggedly pursues its inhuman practices against the black population, is not about to relax its grip, despite the unanimous decisions of the Security Council and repeated appeals by the international community.

We hardly need recall that the Security Council has already handed down its verdict by adopting, in 1978, resolution 435 (1978), which defines the framework and modalities for a just solution to the problem of Namibia. In our view, that resolution remains the corner-stone of any solution intended to establish peace and stability in the region.

It is no surprise that South Africa is proving reluctant to endorse Namibian independence. We have long understood that reluctance to be a determined rejection of any solution in keeping with justice and law - ideas which are alien to the philosophy of the apartheid régime. What is surprising is the blind stubbornness of the apartheid régime, which, failing to grasp the true scope of today's events in South Africa, could, unless something is done in time, put the country - indeed, the whole of southern Africa - to fire and sword.

(Mr. Karoui, Tunisia)

We believe that the excesses of the apartheid system are now the most striking proof of its panic. Whether we speak of its repeated aggression against its neighbours or the outrageous conditions demanded by South Africa for the freeing of all political prisoners, we see a clear determination by the South African régime to ignore the real problem: the out-and-out abolition of the apartheid system.

Eight years after the adoption of resolution 435 (1978), South African forces remain on Namibian soil. As long ago as 1983 the Security Council decided that if South Africa continued to delay the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) the Council would consider adopting appropriate measures under the United Nations Charter.

In issuing that warning to the stubborn Pretoria régime, the Council was acting within its competence under the Charter of the United Nations. Unfortunately, we are obliged to note that that régime continues to turn a deaf ear to the decisions of the Security Council and to flout them.

(Mr. Karoui, Tunisia)

The spirit of solidarity that has characterized our debates should move the members of the Council to have recourse to the provisions of the Charter - in particular, comprehensive and mandatory sanctions, which in our view are the final resort that can make South Africa take the right direction.

Tunisia believes that a firm and unanimous decision, a decision in keeping with international legality, is the sole alternative to a conflagration in southern Africa, with unforeseeable consequences. Therefore, it is in the international community's interest to transcend narrow considerations of the moment by working together to eradicate the underlying causes of the serious situation afflicting southern Africa.

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

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

Mr. DOS SANTOS (Mozambique): Mr. President, it is appropriate that I should thank you and the other members of the Council for having acceded to my request to be allowed to appear before this body at a time when it is discussing an issue of vital importance to my country.

My delegation is pleased at seeing you, a son of Africa and a representative of a prestigious country, Congo, presiding over the the affairs of the Council during the month of February. We have full confidence in your wisdom and diplomatic experience and, above all, in your sensitivity to the matter before us today. We are in good hands indeed.

I take this opportunity also to pay a tribute to your predecessor, Ambassador Li Luye of the People's Republic of China, for the able and intelligent manner in which he handled the business of the Council last month.

(Mr. Dos Santos, Mozambique)

Through the delegation of the United States of America, I wish to extend our condolences to the families of the seven astronauts who perished in the tragic accident that befell the space shuttle "Challenger".

Here we are again bringing before the Security Council the plight of the sons and daughters of Africa inhabiting the southern region of the continent. Here we are presenting once more before this prestigious body the aspirations and dreams, but above all the concerns, of more than 420 million people of different colours, religions and beliefs congregated in the Organization of African Unity (OAU).

We are the voice of reason, peace and justice. We represent one of the members of the world family - the African continent. Our mandate is clear and simple: we have come to warn the family of nations, of which we are a member, of the dangers of war threatening southern Africa. We do not bring with us a new diagnosis or another X-ray of the situation in southern Africa. The virus that is scourging the subregion has already been identified. It is called "apartheid" and its agent is the white minority régime of South Africa. This virus is responsible for the massacre of innocent and defenceless people. We have come here as one goes to a physician with a demand for another prescription. We are here to say that the prescriptions given in the past by the Council did not work. The simple fact that we are gathered here today is the best testimony to that. It is therefore logical that we should demand from the Council the adoption of measures which are stronger in nature and of immediate effect.

The situation in southern Africa is at one and the same time complex and clear. We the people of the region are being victimized by an undeclared war imposed upon us by the neo-Nazi régime of South Africa. As we address this Council, gangs of armed bandits conceived and supported by South Africa are maiming, mutilating and sowing death in our countries. Our economic and social infrastructures are being destroyed.

(Mr. Dos Santos, Mozambique)

Yes, as we sit here today, at this very hour, South African forces still occupy parts of southern Angola. The people of Namibia are still denied their inalienable right to self-determination, freedom and independence. In South Africa, the white minority régime has declared a war against its own citizens. Freedom, equality, justice and the black majority are strangers who still have not met. The issue, therefore, is as simple as this: we are facing a war situation, the source of which can easily and clearly be pinpointed. The extinction of this source would bring peace and stability to the region.

The history of our region, and indeed of the whole African continent, is a history of a cycle of violence established a long time ago. Many centuries ago, the dignity and freedom of our ancestors were trampled upon by colonial aggression, domination and exploitation. Our beloved continent was ravaged by the brutality of slave wars and colonial conquest.

We are a continent of survivors. We have survived slavery and the wars of colonial conquest. Our forefathers stood up, almost barehanded, and waged an uncompromising struggle against foreign occupation and its destructive effects on our people. They brought hope where there was none. They gave a different future to our sons and daughters. Above all, they refused to be humiliated, discriminated against and exploited. Therefore, we are also a continent of heroes - the heroes of liberation. We are the heroes of peace.

The defeat of the colonial empire in Mozambique and Angola, the victory of the people of Zimbabwe brought a new situation not only to the region but to the world at large.

The apartheid régime is on the verge of collapse. In its agony, that régime is going to take with it to its death many of us - even some of those who are trying to cushion it. As the situation gets worse inside the country, many unimaginable fabrications will be invented to justify apartheid's desperate actions.

(Mr. Dos Santos, Mozambique)

If there is anything logical and predictable about colonial régimes, and such is the case with South Africa, it is their ingenuity in misrepresenting reality. Yes, they are very consistent in their attempts to divert the attention of the international community from the truth. We know it from our own experience. The tactic of using indiscriminate violence against neighbouring States under the pretext of harassing and destroying the so-called bases of the African National Congress (ANC) is as fallacious as it is ridiculous. The truth of the matter is that apartheid has condemned the majority of the people of South Africa to the most severe sentence man has ever conceived - death and massacre, to put it bluntly. What could the apartheid régime do that would be worse than that?

Each massacre strengthens the people's detestation of apartheid and impels them to more united and concerted actions to escalate their struggle for a new South Africa. What a hopeless and desperate situation the apartheid régime finds itself in.

It has already been demonstrated how disingenuous it was of South Africa to attribute its unenviable situation to a supposed armed conspiracy among neighbouring countries. In the circumstances I shall limit myself to just a few complementary remarks.

The ANC, whose bases are supposedly located in our countries, is the pioneer of the liberation movement in Africa. It was founded in 1912, long before the creation of FRELIMO, ZANU and the MPLA, and indeed any other liberation movement in Africa - and, I must add, even before any of the leaders of the liberation movement in Angola, Mozambique and Zimbabwe were born.

When the ANC decided to launch the armed struggle in 1961, after it had been banned from South Africa, FRELIMO and ZANU were not yet in existence, and the MPLA was still a baby of about four years of age. Naturally, it had not yet launched the armed struggle.

(Mr. Dos Santos, Mozambique)

Yes, when the office of the then Minister of Agriculture in Pretoria was bombed, our countries were still under colonial rule. No South African refugee was in colonial Mozambique and Southern Rhodesia. We were not there when the offices of Die Nataller, the official organ of the Nationalist Party in Natal, were bombed.

In 1963, Nelson Mandela was condemned to life in prison, accused of being responsible for the liberation struggle. Rivonia is not located in Mozambique, nor in Botswana or Zimbabwe. It is clear from these explanations that the countries of the region have nothing to do with the situation in South Africa.

What, then, is our crime? After all, South African refugees are to be found all over the world, including in the capital cities of South Africa's allies. In their diaspora the dispossessed people of South Africa have found a refuge in many countries that honour the principles and objectives of the Charter of the United Nations and those of other relevant instruments dealing with the question of refugees.

The war of aggression waged by South Africa against our countries cannot be explained by geographic contiguity between our countries and South Africa. Again, that is something for which we cannot be held responsible. After all, we were not there when the partition of Africa took place in Berlin. South Africa never launched any act of aggression against the Portuguese in Mozambique or the rebel and racist régime of Rhodesia. On the contrary, the racist régime sent its troops into those territories to help the colonial régimes fight the liberation movements in those countries. The issue was the attempt to prevent us from acceding to independence.

The constant war of which we are victims is directed against our political and economic independence. It is a war against the free and just societies that we represent. Yes, our ideals, our aspirations and our dreams frighten the anachronistic régime, because they shake the apartheid régime's very foundations.

(Mr. Dos Santos, Mozambique)

We dream of peace; we dream of prosperity; we breathe words of equality and freedom. It is very ironic that the representative of a Government that recruits, trains, arms and infiltrates armed bandits into our countries should come here and say that there can be

"no peace and no stability in our region as long as countries knowingly harbour terrorists who plan and execute acts of terror against a neighbouring State." (S/PV.2652, pp. 48, 49-50)

Of course there can be no peace, because South Africa is sending bandits into Mozambique, Angola and Lesotho. There can be no peace while South Africa occupies parts of southern Angola and Namibia.

More ironic, however, is the fact that South Africa, a country that manufactures a lot of conventional weapons, a country that possesses nuclear weapons, should assert that neighbouring States have acquired military supremacy. Yes, neighbouring countries have acquired supremacy over racist South Africa, but that supremacy is neither military nor economic in nature. It is a moral supremacy, and no military build-up or frantic amassing of weapons of war will tilt that balance.

Speaking in this Council a few days ago, the representative of the Pretoria régime, quoting the so-called State President, said that "the wheel of reform is turning". It has already crushed more than a thousand defenceless people to death in the last year alone. It has brought about the moving processions of thousands and thousands of people to cemeteries to bury their loved ones. It has crushed pall-bearers on their way to cemeteries to death. It covered those pall-bearers with a pall. That ugly, faceless wheel follows the dead, the victims of apartheid, in hot pursuit, with its armoured carriers, and it crushes them to death. Not even in death can the South African people be spared the wrath of apartheid. The dead are supposed to rest in peace, but not in apartheid South Africa.

(Mr. Dos Santos, Mozambique)

The apartheid régime is as afraid of the dead as it is of the refugees, for the dead seem to be as dangerous to the system as the refugees. It reminds me of a colonial administrator who used to spank the deceased for allegedly escaping paying taxes because of their death.

C. We have long maintained that apartheid cannot be reformed. It should be dismantled. No measure is likely to bring peace in South Africa unless it addresses this crucial issue. There are simple solutions to the problems confronting South Africa. There are either real, genuine, correct solutions, or there are wrong, misconstrued solutions, and what the apartheid régime has done so far is to opt for the latter.

I do not agree with the representative of that régime when he says that there are no ready examples and models for them to reproduce. There definitely exist ready, fresh examples and models for him not to reproduce - nazism, fascism. There are many mistakes not to be repeated. Just think about the lessons of Angola, Mozambique and Zimbabwe. After all, the person who said that no majority rule would be established in Zimbabwe in a thousand years and later changed that to "not in his lifetime" is now living in free and independent Zimbabwe.

At the beginning of my statement I said that we have come to this Council as one goes to a physician to ask for a prescription. We bring to this Council some suggestions as to what the contents of such a prescription should be.

(Mr. Dos Santos, Mozambique)

First, the Council should not allow the apartheid régime to continue unchecked. The only way to prevent its doing so is to adopt strong measures as prescribed in the relevant chapters of the United Nations Charter.

Secondly, the allies of apartheid should realize that the time has come for them to deal with those in whose hands rests the future of South Africa, those who have the final answers to the problems now affecting apartheid South Africa.

Thirdly, a peaceful solution to the problems in South Africa demands that the minority régime be prepared to take the following steps: the abolition of apartheid, and not reform; the unconditional release of Nelson Mandela and other political prisoners and detainees; the lifting of the ban on political organizations and other mass associations; the undertaking of negotiations with the legitimate and authentic representatives of the majority of the people in South Africa - any deal with the puppets will not work: it did not work in Zimbabwe, and it is not going to work in South Africa; a strong and genuine commitment by the South African régime to the establishment of a free and democratic society in South Africa.

Steps other than those I have enumerated, such as the so-called reforms, will be regarded as cosmetic and unacceptable. For this reason the answer to the question raised by the representative of the minority régime as to whether the announced changes are cosmetic or not is an emphatic yes.

We, the countries of the region, want to live in peace - that peace that our ancestors taught us to cherish most, that peace swept away by the colonial conquest and subjugation.

That is what we have here come for. We do not want southern Africa to be a stage for conflict with unforeseeable consequences. Indeed, we want to assure you, Mr. President, and the other members of this Council that we will not be the ones to trigger such a conflict.

(Mr. Dos Santos, Mozambique)

However, we will not tolerate aggressions against our sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity. We stand ready to co-operate with whomever wants to play a constructive role in the efforts aimed at restoring peace in the region.

We therefore welcomed the meeting of the front-line Ministers and of the European Economic Community (EEC) held recently in Lusaka, which followed the meeting that took place in 1984 between the Foreign Ministers of the front-line States and those of the Nordic countries.

We hope that the atmosphere of cordiality and understanding in which the meeting was held will inspire the countries represented in the EEC to play a much more active and positive role in the efforts aimed at the eradication of the apartheid system.

The notion of co-operation, as we see it, is very involving: it demands that those who wish to co-operate disassociate themselves from the apartheid régime and be on the side of those who uphold justice, freedom and equality.

It is in this context that we have learned with profound dismay of the reports that military aid will be made available to those on the pay-roll of apartheid South Africa who continue to intensify their criminal acts against the sisterly country of Angola, sowing misery, death and destruction.

Any foreign involvement in the internal affairs of the People's Republic of Angola, directly or through third parties, is a hostile act against the Organization of African Unity (OAU), an outrageous insult to Africa's dignity, and a direct challenge to our continental organization.

No wonder, then, that the new year saw the light of day in such an inauspicious manner in southern Africa. Racist South Africa's economic pressures against neighbouring countries have turned into open economic blockades.

(Mr. Dos Santos, Mozambique)

Apartheid's recent gratuitous threats against its neighbours could not be more defiant and arrogant.

The international community cannot and should not be seen as an accomplice. Time for a relatively peaceful abolition of apartheid is not in our favour. Let us take urgent and positive strides towards a free South Africa as quickly as possible. Let us take a solemn oath to do everything in our power, both individually and collectively, to ensure that after the 1986 sun touches the western horizon a bright new dawn shines, with the brilliance of a thousand suns, over the lands of South Africa.

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

I shall now make a statement in my capacity as representative of the Congo.

It is no exaggeration to state that the continuing and tragic hotbeds of tension in Africa are not all of equal interest. Among the pieces of the puzzle, some conflicts bear no comparison with others. That is clearly true of the continuing acts of aggression that are the main expression of the South African policy of apartheid and have been expanded into more sophisticated forms since the legislative victory of May 1948 of the Afrikaner Nationalist Party of Dr. Malan. Apartheid is a topic which greatly troubles and concerns the international community. The existence of apartheid threatens peace and international security.

Under the apartheid system, equal opportunity and equal rights for all South Africans is inconceivable; this is particularly true in the case of non-white South Africans.

The régime of apartheid, actively supported by international imperialism, incites racial hatred against the majority, brings about destruction and brutalizes and oppresses. Day-to-day reality is most instructive regarding its atrocities and

(The President)

increased acts of violence. Apartheid crushes individuals, enslaves them, eliminates in order to survive, and totally denies the coloured communities and the black majority of the South African population full exercise of citizenship. No modern State has championed to such an extent as the racist régime of South Africa, and with such contempt for man, the horrendous moral, political and human chaos existing among the majority of its own population.

In such conditions, no campaign could be more just and vigorous, and none more inspiring and popular, than that dictated by the most fundamental of causes - respect for the dignity of man, recognition of the legitimate rights of others and equality of inalienable rights.

Not only foreign-policy doctrines are difficult to reform; the same is true of the system of apartheid. Not reform, but the abolition of apartheid is demanded by universal conscience and the international community.

Moreover, since South Africa was transformed into a huge bloody arena and its captive people imprisoned in long and institutionalized violence, the attitude of South African leaders in power, or in the corridors of power in Pretoria, factions of both the right and the left of the party, has been one of active hostility towards the black community, which is the majority.

(The President)

Let there be no mistake. The facts show that, even on a purely legal basis, in South Africa there has been no constitutional development, no serious reform, no "far-reaching proposals of historic importance" - as stated by the Permanent Representative of South Africa to the Security Council - no power-sharing on the basis of the democratic principle of one man, one vote.

Once again, the question is not one of reforming apartheid. This system, which has been condemned as a crime against humanity, must be abolished. Apartheid is a threat to peace and to international security. A new form of apartheid, the policy of post-apartheid, is one that John Vorster had ostensibly adopted, and before Vorster, Verwoerd too. Now Botha is doing the same thing - as if by mere coincidence just on the eve of a meeting considered as South Africa's last chance with its international creditors.

Despite repressive legislation this new manoeuvre has failed. The racist South African régime is left with nothing to propose other than a state of emergency. It is no longer credible; its power has been discredited.

The necessary return to calm, the future of South Africa, is contingent upon the abolition of apartheid; the freeing of all political prisoners, including Nelson Mandela; recognition of anti-apartheid movements and leaders; the ending of the state of emergency; and the lifting of other repressive measures.

My delegation wished to express its Government's views against the apartheid of the racist régime of Pretoria and to press for its total abolition.

Hence the delegation of the Congo can only condemn the major consequences flowing from this kind of political thinking. First of all we condemn oppression motivated by the systematic will to dominate and cause ruin, to persecute, to humiliate, to destroy through the use of legislation proclaiming various kinds of ambitious or ludicrous reforms.

(The President)

Then there is the treason of dissident groups transformed into terrorists and manipulated by Pretoria. Finally, there is military aggression and the political and economic destabilization of independent neighbouring States. Pretoria's methods here are equally well known.

From threats to acts of aggression, from interference to acts of destabilization, the racist régime has continued to expand its inhuman system. The existence of apartheid is unquestionably a threat to international peace and security in the southern region of Africa. There is a great risk of war. The crime of independent States under threat is their love of peace and their respect for international obligations. By giving asylum to South African refugees fleeing from the cruelty of the apartheid system, these States are exposing themselves to military acts of aggression on the part of Pretoria.

The racist Government of South Africa is backed in its acts of madness by the great understanding shown it by powerful Western allies that accord pride of place to its strategic position, its major reserves of precious minerals and its loyalty to the Western camp in the anti-communist crusade.

It is also a fact that the South African racists call on dissidents from Governments of neighbouring States to carry out terrorist acts in the region. The recent visit to the United States of America of one of the terrorist chiefs in the pay of South Africa, Jonas Savimbi, aroused anger and indignation among States and peoples of Africa.

In that respect my delegation would like to give the Council a brief comment taken from the Congolese press:

"The world is drowning in a flood of hypocritical and moralistic comments on violence and terrorism.

(The President)

"Every day Western Governments carry out a feverish campaign against terrorism, its perpetrators and the countries that support them. Every day leaders impose economic boycott measures directed against all those they suspect of sympathy towards terrorists. Indeed, we should like to believe that they are sincere and inspired by noble intentions.

"However, those same countries and those same leaders have done nothing and continue to do nothing to root out the causes of violence. What have they done to assist the Palestinians in recovering a homeland, or the South African blacks in securing their human rights, or the oppressed throughout the world in breaking the chains that crush them?

"And now these 'apostles of non-violence' officially receive a rebel leader, a man who did not hesitate to become the devil's ally to destabilize an independent and sovereign State, a member of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), of the non-aligned movement and of the United Nations. And official circles are promising millions of dollars and military matériel to an unscrupulous individual determined to destroy his country, which has barely emerged from a long nightmare. Those circles have lost all credibility in claiming to denounce and combat terrorism."

There is international consensus on independence for Namibia. Mr. Botha's South African power is opposed to that. We recall that John Vorster yielded both on Angola and as regards Ian Smith in Rhodesia. He was violently criticized within his own Government and by the General Staff, Nationalist Party organs and the whole South African establishment. He did not remain long in office, and Mr. Botha, who had been Defence Minister for many years, came to power in Pretoria. To be sure, Mr. Botha has not gone back on giving up Rhodesia, a decision taken by his predecessor in 1976. On the other hand, he is opposed to a solution of a foreign

(The President)

policy question involving South Africa, namely, independence for Namibia. However, this is certainly not the case of a South African Province but of a former German colony that is now under an international Mandate.

My delegation is speaking out in the Council because South Africa, which has subscribed to the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter, is refusing to apply them. For Mr. Botha the only strategy that preserves both the vital interests of apartheid and its links with international imperialism, with the West, is to play for time, to consolidate in Windhoek his presence through the régime now in place and to oppose Security Council resolution 435 (1978). As numerous speakers have pointed out, as long as our aspirations, which derive their legitimacy from morality, from the obligations of the Charter and, in short, from international law, are not met, my delegation will have no other recourse than to come before the Security Council. We have placed our trust in the unswerving support for all Africa witnessed in the work last February at the meeting held in Lusaka of the Ministers of the front-line States and those of the European Community.

Only pressure aimed at a series of comprehensive objectives, pressure in the form of genuine sanctions, will lead to a speedy elimination of apartheid and the advent for all of a new South Africa without distinction as to race and with equality of opportunity, mutual respect, peace and co-operation in southern Africa.

(The President)

I now resume my functions as President of the Security Council.

It is my understanding that the Council is ready to proceed to vote on the draft resolution before it. Unless I hear any objection, I shall put it to a vote. There being no objection, it is so decided.

I shall first call on members of the Council who wish to make statements before the vote.

Mr. BROCHAND (France) (interpretation from French): Many aspects of the situation in southern Africa have been considered during this series of Security Council meetings: first, the turmoil and repression in South Africa that continue owing to the continuing policy of apartheid; secondly, ongoing threats to the stability and security of the States in the region, particularly against countries neighbouring South Africa that receive refugees fleeing from the apartheid régime; and, thirdly, South Africa's refusal to end its illegal occupation of Namibia in accordance with the conditions set forth in Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

Once again the debate has revealed the relations that exist between those various elements and shed light on the fact that the situation in the area as a whole has deteriorated. For its part, France is very concerned at that deterioration.

My country's position on the various aspects of this overall question has been set forth on a number of occasions, and again recently, very clearly: only the dismantling of apartheid can be considered an appropriate solution to the problems of the region.

My delegation shares Africa's concern. Generally speaking, we endorse the analysis of the situation put forward in the Council by its representatives - most notably the representative of Togo, speaking on behalf of the African Group, and

(Mr. Brochand, France)

the representative of Senegal, on behalf of the presidency of the Organization of African Unity (OAU).

The draft resolution which is before us reflects that analysis. My delegation will vote in favour of it, notwithstanding the reservations on one particular point therein that we have made known to its sponsors. My delegation welcomes the fact that the debate can conclude with a clear warning to South Africa.

Once again the international community expresses its gravest concern, and demands the immediate eradication of apartheid by South Africa, that the front-line States no longer be made to suffer from South Africa's policies, and that it accept without delay the United Nations settlement plan for Namibia.

It is only thus that security, stability and harmony will be restored to southern Africa.

Sir John THOMSON (United Kingdom): This has been an unusual debate. In our many debates on southern Africa over the past two years, the Security Council has focused on specific countries and specific problems and has on most occasions been reacting to specific events. The request for the present debate, on the other hand, has caused some puzzlement, including to my delegation. We were not sure what had prompted the request, which was made before the statement on 31 January by the South African President and only a month after the adoption of Security Council resolution 580 (1985) on relations between South Africa and one of its neighbours.

We were given to understand that the debate was intended to be an exercise in preventive diplomacy, with the objective of deterring any further breaches of sovereignty and territorial integrity by South Africa - and that was an objective we shared. My Government's belief that the Security Council should not merely react to events but should seek to play a greater part in averting crises through preventive diplomacy is well known. In so far as this debate provided an

(Sir John Thomson, United Kingdom)

opportunity for the Security Council to examine the nexus of South African problems in greater depth than is sometimes possible and to engage in preventive diplomacy it was welcomed.

However, if preventive diplomacy is to be effective its timing and content must both be tailored carefully to the objective. Unfortunately, the timing of this debate appeared to be almost accidental and it has followed an uncharted course.

It is at best gratuitous and at worst counter-productive to use a serious debate on a subject of great concern to members of the Security Council and of the African Group for the purpose of attacking other Members on completely unrelated questions. My delegation failed to see the relevance to southern Africa of many of the points raised in some of the statements in the debate - for example, the references to the Mediterranean, to Central America, and even to Afghanistan. The Council has heard polemical statements nominally under this item from certain speakers who have displayed a marked reluctance to have the Security Council give proper consideration to large-scale conflicts in which their own countries are involved.

To treat this Council as an off-season General Assembly does not enhance its status and dignity or correspond to the purposes for which the Security Council was established under the Charter. Rather than use the complex problems of southern Africa as an ideological debating ground, we believe that over the past week and a half the Council should have concentrated its efforts on a search for constructive and peaceful solutions to those problems.

The United Kingdom's policies on southern Africa have been elaborated in partnership with other States Members of the United Nations at meetings of States members of the European Community, the Commonwealth Heads of Government, the

(Sir John Thomson, United Kingdom)

Southern African Development Co-ordination Conference and, most recently, at the first ministerial meeting between the members of the European Community and the front-line States. The communiqués of those meetings have been distributed as United Nations documents, and colleagues from those groups speaking in this debate have expressed positions which we share.

It has not been necessary, therefore, for us to reiterate our stance in broad terms. But I associate my delegation closely with the statement by the representative of Australia and with the emphasis he gave to the Commonwealth Eminent Persons Group. We wholeheartedly support his appeal to all Governments, organizations and individuals concerned to assist the Group to carry out work which could have a significant impact.

Likewise, we agree with the emphasis given by the representative of Botswana and the Permanent Representative of Zambia to the meeting of the Economic Commission and the front-line States in Lusaka, in which the President and the Government of Zambia played such an important part as hosts. The meeting gave 18 countries directly involved in different ways in the region a chance not merely to exchange views but to review the many problems in the light of shared objectives and close partnership. It was an historic and successful event for which great credit is due to the front-line States.

(Sir John Thomson, United Kingdom)

Also highly relevant to this debate and the draft resolution, as almost all speakers have pointed out, are the speech of 31 January by the South African State President and the policies his Government is introducing. Members of the Council have been gravely disappointed in the past by the actions of the South African Government. They are understandably wary. They have repeatedly emphasized that the South African Government will be judged by its actions, not its words, and that it is urgently necessary not merely to tinker with the present system but to remove apartheid in its entirety and provide for a democratic, non-racial and just society within South Africa. Those are points that we hold in common with other members of the Council.

We have paid careful attention to the statements by the South African President, especially that of 31 January, and by his Permanent Representative. Like the representative of Australia, we earnestly hope that those statements will be interpreted satisfactorily and translated into action, and that dialogue for change will be opened with genuine representatives of the black community. In particular, we hope to see the release of Nelson Mandela and other political prisoners, the removal of bans on political organizations and restrictions on the media and the termination of the state of emergency. As was stated in the Commonwealth Accord, that can best take place in the context of a suspension of violence on all sides.

Over the past year the eyes of the world have been turned on South Africa as never before. A heavy responsibility rests on those who at present hold power there to develop further the measures announced in President Botha's speech and in other official statements, and to take account forthwith of the legitimate aspirations of all the people of South Africa - in short, to dismantle apartheid and establish South Africa irrevocably in the new era of which the South African Permanent Representative spoke.

(Sir John Thomson, United Kingdom)

It was my delegation's wish to vote in favour of a draft resolution which took proper account of those serious considerations. I must say frankly, though, that the regret I expressed earlier with regard to the conduct of the debate applies in equal measure to the way in which the draft resolution has been handled. Two days ago members of the Council were given a working paper which reiterated the right of all States to give sanctuary to the victims of apartheid, demanded the immediate eradication of apartheid and expressed fundamental principles governing relations between States in a helpful and appropriate manner. On the morning of 11 February, you, Mr. President, sought the views of my delegation on that working paper. We made it clear that we saw it as providing the basis for the sort of unanimous resolution we hoped the Council would adopt, and we offered our suggestions on certain ways in which the text might be improved.

I do not believe any delegation had fundamental problems with the working paper. We consider a draft resolution based on that paper would have served the Council's objective of preventive diplomacy. We were therefore greatly disappointed that later the same day, with no further intervening discussion, a draft resolution of a substantially different character should have been tabled. We have continued to make every effort to secure a draft resolution for which all members could vote. We stated absolutely the view expressed in the Council yesterday by the Permanent Observer of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), that it would be desirable for a resolution to be adopted unanimously in order to send

"a serious and categorical message to Pretoria." (S/PV.2661, pp. 18-20)

That is why we regret that, despite your own long and patient efforts, Sir, our mutual wish for a unanimous resolution has been frustrated and that unnecessary division has been snatched from the jaws of consensus.

(Sir John Thomson, United Kingdom)

My delegation will abstain on the draft resolution, above all because we do not consider that preventive diplomacy is achieved by couching a draft resolution in terms that do not accurately address the evolving situation in southern Africa and that invite rejection by those to whom it is directed. We of course concur with the general principles reflected in the draft resolution, but believe it errs in the way in which it purports to prejudge future events. Its purpose should have been to prevent, not to provoke, and that could so easily have been achieved. An opportunity has been missed. The Council's inability to reach agreement stands in stark contrast with, for example, the successful outcome of the European Community-Front-Line States meeting that immediately preceded this debate. My delegation hopes that future efforts to achieve unanimity in the Council in the search for peaceful solutions will be more successful.

Mr. OKUN (United States of America): My delegation has approached this debate on the situation in South Africa and the draft resolution with the utmost seriousness. My Government shares with many other members of this body the view that the Security Council should work to bring about peaceful transition in South Africa to a just and humane relationship between people of different races. It also shares the view that the escalation of violence within and between the nations of southern Africa is deplorable because it endangers the peace and security of the region. Therefore, my delegation regrets that during the debate some speakers have made misleading and even untrue allegations about the policies of my Government towards the region.

My delegation is also surprised that a few speakers should continue to deliver tirades against the evil acts of "the West" in Africa. Those attacks serve only to diminish the significance of the problem at hand. We are assembled here not to exchange insults but rather to promote the principal task of the Security Council - the peaceful resolution of serious regional disputes.

(Mr. Okun, United States)

My delegation is encouraged that many speakers have highlighted what should be our main concern - the systematic humiliation of Africans because of race. As one speaker put it,

"To the millions of black Africans whose very humanity is denied under the apartheid system, the 'great debate' on the respective virtues of free enterprise and centrally planned economies is one which is hardly a preoccupation at this moment in history." (S/PV.2654, p. 31)

Those are heart-felt words, uttered with dignity. In one respect they address the core of the tragedy under discussion today. The heart of the struggle in Africa is the competition between freedom and tyranny, between open societies and closed ones. As Secretary of State Shultz recently remarked to the Poets, Essayists and Novelists (PEN) International Congress in New York,

"one of the most powerful trends in the world favors freedom".

Africa is no exception.

The real battle in southern Africa is being waged over representational government. Anyone who knows the history of my country cannot believe for a moment that the United States sees its interests as being served by the perpetuation of apartheid. I would go further and say that a significantly increasing number of white South Africans are also coming to realize that apartheid is doomed. They are beginning to recognize that the dismantling of the apartheid system must take place as rapidly as possible if their strife-torn country is to avoid a wider conflagration, greater intimidation and a more controlled and repressive society. We hope that South Africa can be transformed peacefully into a nation of justice and equality and of rule based on the consent of all its people.

(Mr. Okun, United States)

My Government is working to avoid violence. That is why we oppose renouncing dialogue with any of South Africa's leaders, either those in the Government or those who speak for black opinion. That is why we call for the withdrawal of all foreign forces from areas where they contribute directly to the insecurity of the region. That is why we support fully the independence of Namibia, under Security Council resolution 435 (1978), and are working to achieve that goal.

(Mr. Okun, United States)

There is much in the draft resolution before us with which we agree. Indeed, it would not have required much of the sponsors to have attained a consensus text. They initially put forward informally a text which could have been the basis of a consensus. Unfortunately that draft text was replaced by another one which marked a significant step away from areas of agreement. It contained several new paragraphs which created additional, and more serious, problems for us, and no effort was forthcoming to narrow the gaps by formulating the text in a manner which avoided unnecessary disagreement. For example, it is neither necessary nor helpful to denominate uses of force by a State as terrorism. It is sufficient to say that the use of force by a State is contrary to the Charter.

Moreover, the draft resolution does not advance matters when it calls only on South Africa to respect international borders. Respect for territorial integrity is an important principle in no small measure because it is a universal principle, one applicable to all and not just to some.

The draft resolution incorrectly implies that outside assistance is the main cause of destabilization of some States in the region. It is my delegation's view that Governments which rely on foreign troops to maintain themselves in power against the opposition of a significant portion of their own people are inherently unstable. Their stability would be enhanced if they entered into a dialogue with opposition groups in their own nations.

In spite of those negative aspects of the draft resolution, which prevent us from casting an affirmative vote, we share many of the views contained in it. We agree that peace will come to southern Africa only when apartheid ends and there is no illegal occupation of territory, and we join in urging all States in southern Africa to respect the rights of their citizens and not intervene in the internal affairs of their neighbours.

(Mr. Okun, United States)

We therefore appeal to all concerned Governments: Let us end the futile debate that characterizes these meetings and sit down to work with one another. We all seek the same goal. There are no hidden agendas on our part. We want apartheid to disappear from the face of the earth, peacefully but quickly - and I repeat, quickly. The front-line States and South Africans of all races know this is the American view.

Before closing, I wish to address briefly the recent visit of Jonas Savimbi to the United States. Many representatives present have criticized Mr. Savimbi's visit to my country. In the resolution of disputes, however, it is necessary that all parties be approached. There must be an end to violence in Angola, but that cannot be achieved unilaterally. Legitimate nationalist organizations with legitimate aspirations must be factored into the Angolan equation. We have repeatedly stated the obvious: Angolans must sit down and reconcile their differences. Such an approach heralds absolutely no change in our policy of seeking negotiated solutions that incorporate, as I said before, both the withdrawal of all foreign forces and independence for Namibia under Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

We shall maintain contact with all sides to the disputes in southern Africa. We believe that failure to do so makes it harder, if not impossible, to resolve those disputes, and opens the door to monolithic totalitarian solutions based on violence and repression. An end to all forms of apartheid; peace and stability in Angola; independence for Namibia under Security Council resolution 435 (1978); the withdrawal of all foreign forces: that is an ambitious list. We have made progress, however slow and painful. The United States will not turn away from its responsibilities, and we ask the help of all.

(Mr. Okun, United States)

My Government would have preferred to vote in favour of the draft resolution under consideration to demonstrate the resolve of this Council and of my Government to eradicate the bankrupt system of apartheid. In past days, however, as I mentioned, the draft resolution became increasingly unbalanced. Since my delegation's efforts to restore that balance did not succeed, we shall abstain.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I shall now put to the vote draft resolution S/17817/Rev.1.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Australia, Bulgaria, China, Congo, Denmark, France, Ghana, Madagascar, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela

Against: None

Abstaining: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The result of the voting is as follows: 13 votes in favour, none against and 2 abstentions. The draft resolution is therefore adopted as resolution 581 (1986).

The representative of Togo has asked to speak. I invite him to make a statement.

Mr. KOUASSI (Togo) (interpretation from French): This debate, in both its qualitative and quantitative dimensions, has shown the extent to which the international community is rightly concerned about the explosive situation developing in southern Africa, which seriously affects and dangerously threatens world peace. That alone justifies Africa's having asked that the Security Council be convened.

(Mr. Kouassi, Togo)

After 10 days of debate, the Security Council has just concluded its consideration of the situation in southern Africa with the adoption of resolution 581 (1986). On behalf of the Group of African States, and on behalf of Africa, I wish whole-heartedly to thank the numerous speakers who participated in the Council's debate. I wish in particular to thank all Council members who spoke in support of Africa and, particularly, of the oppressed peoples of South Africa and Namibia.

We are grateful to Denmark for the measures it has adopted and for those it plans to adopt this year to put an end to all economic relations with South Africa. We also thank the member States of the European Economic Community for their latest positive contribution to the establishment of peace in southern Africa during the meeting between Foreign Ministers of the front-line States and European Community countries, held at Lusaka on 3 and 4 February.

It will be no surprise that we would have preferred a stronger, firmer resolution directed at the Pretoria régime. However, the resolution the Council has just adopted by a impressive majority, sends a clear message to the apartheid régime. South Africa must immediately dismantle its abominable apartheid system. South Africa must abandon its illegal occupation of Namibia, its policy of aggression and destabilization against neighbouring countries, and its threats to those countries.

(Mr. Kouassi, Togo)

We are disappointed at the abstentions by certain States members of the Council on a resolution which is, in fact, very moderate. We are disappointed because we feel that it is not fair to proclaim opposition to apartheid and, at the same time, deny the Security Council the means to put an end to it.

None the less, Africa continues to place its trust in the Security Council. It hopes that at a future stage all the members of the Council, in particular the permanent members, will be prepared to adopt concrete enforcement measures against the racist Pretoria régime.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): There are no further speakers. The Security Council has therefore concluded consideration of the item on its agenda.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.