



## Security Council

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.2686  
23 May 1986

ENGLISH

---

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

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Friday, 23 May 1986, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. GREHO

(Ghana)

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

Mr. HOGUE  
Mr. GARVALOV  
Mr. LIANG Yufan  
Mr. ADOUKI  
Mr. BIERRING  
Mr. de REMOULARIA  
Mr. RABETAFIKA  
Mr. KASEMSRI  
Mr. ALLEYNE  
Mr. SHUSTOV  
Mr. AL-MOSFIR  
  
Sir John THOMSON  
Miss BYRNE  
Mr. AGUILAR

---

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

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

The meeting was called to order at 4.25 p.m.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

THE SITUATION IN SOUTHERN AFRICA

LETTER DATED 21 MAY 1986 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF SENEGAL TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL REQUESTING "AN URGENT MEETING OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL IN ORDER TO CONSIDER SOUTH AFRICA'S AGGRESSION AGAINST BOTSWANA, ZAMBIA AND ZIMBABWE" (S/18072)

The PRESIDENT: In accordance with decisions taken by the Council at previous meetings on this item, I invite the representative of Senegal to take a place at the Council table; I invite the representative of Zambia to take a place at the Council table; I invite the representatives of Argentina, Botswana, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, India, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, South Africa and the United Republic of Tanzania to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Sarré (Senegal) and Mr. Ngo (Zambia) took places at the Council table; Mr. Muñiz (Argentina), Mr. Legwaila (Botswana), Mr. Oramas Oliva (Cuba), Mr. Cesar (Czechoslovakia), Mr. Ott (German Democratic Republic), Mr. Krishnan (India), Mr. Treiki (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), Mr. von Schirnding (South Africa) and Mr. Chaqula (United Republic of Tanzania) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of the Islamic Republic of Iran, the Syrian Arab Republic and Zimbabwe in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In accordance 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,

(The President)

in conformity 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. Rajaie-Khorassani (Islamic Republic of Iran), Mr. Al-Atassi (Syrian Arab Republic) and Mr. Mudenge (Zimbabwe) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

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

Mr. de KEMOULARIA (France) (interpretation from French): Mr. President, may I first of all say, as have my colleagues, how very pleased my delegation is to see you presiding over the Council. Since you have joined us feelings of the most cordial friendship have developed which reflect the excellent relations that exist between your country and mine. I hope and I am convinced that your presidency will be most successful.

I shall not refer in detail to the events which led to the present series of meetings of the Security Council. Once again South Africa has used armed force to launch attacks against the territory of its neighbours. After Angola, it was Botswana and Lesotho in 1985; now it is Zambia, Zimbabwe and once more Botswana that are victims of that aggressive policy.

As soon as it learned of these incursions by South African armed forces against sovereign countries, the French Government condemned them most firmly. Our embassy in Pretoria was instructed to convey that firm condemnation to the Government of South Africa and to lodge a strong protest against military actions that endanger the peace and stability of the region.

I extend my Government's sympathy to the Governments of those three countries and its condolences to the victims and their families.

The attacks of 19 May on targets in the capitals of three countries of southern Africa demonstrate the level of serious tension and danger that the situation in South Africa and in the region has reached.

These military actions have taken place at a time when South Africa's neighbouring countries are demonstrating great moderation in their relations with the Pretoria Government. Those countries are facing with dignity and generosity the problems posed by the growing flood of refugees fleeing the tension and violence within South Africa.

(Mr. de Kemoularia, France)

The policy of apartheid of the Government of South Africa constitutes the very cause of the troubles afflicting that country and the region as a whole. France has spared no effort, as the Council is aware, to induce the South African Government to put an end to that policy. The French delegation is firmly convinced that armed action by South Africa beyond its borders can in no way resolve the problems of southern Africa. It is above all important to dismantle apartheid through dialogue and negotiation.

Efforts to create the conditions for that dialogue were under way in the region when the attacks took place. My delegation can only hope that those efforts will continue and that they will make possible a peaceful transition by South Africa towards a democratic, non-racial régime.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of France for the very kind words he addressed to me.

Mr. RABETAFIKA (Madagascar) (interpretation from French): In congratulating you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council, I cannot fail to refer to the special ties that exist between our two peoples and Governments, which are characterized by the similarity of positions and the close co-operation of our two delegations. I have known you personally for a long time now and, at the risk of offending your inherent modesty, I must pay a tribute to your foresightedness, sense of moderation and negotiating talents, as well as to your persistence and courage. Our delegation is very pleased to see you presiding over the Council.

I am told that last month - and I am sorry that I was not here - was a very busy and trying one in many ways and that the Permanent Representative of France, Mr. Claude de Kemoularia, guided the proceedings of the Council with his customary skill, vivacity, sensitivity and courtesy. On behalf of my delegation, I should like to express to him our gratitude and our particular appreciation.

(Mr. Rabetafika, Madagascar)

The Permanent Representative of Senegal, on behalf of the current Chairman of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), has requested that during the present emergency meetings the Council should consider the South African acts of aggression on 19 May against Botswana, Zambia and Zimbabwe. The facts are clear. Full responsibility has been claimed by the authorities of the racist régime and we feel that it is no longer necessary to determine whether these were or were not acts of aggression. If doubts persist, suffice it to refer to the definition of aggression and to recall the firm and unequivocal condemnations of those that sometimes plead mitigating circumstances for the benefit of the racist régime. The unanimous condemnation by international public opinion should be stressed, for this is already a form of isolation which some would like to spare the racist régime.

As for the justifications put forward by Pretoria, it is very easy to refute them one by one. Attempts have been made to put these acts of aggression within the framework of the struggle against international terrorism. We shall not deal here with our differences concerning the definition of this phenomenon, but will merely recall that the United Nations has discussed this for years now without being able to achieve a consensus. Two things come to mind. Those among us who, in the light of the present political environment, could have backed the South African hypothesis, rejected it from the very outset.

(Mr. Rabetafika, Madagascar)

Thus they recognized that the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC) is not a terrorist organization and that by supporting its action Botswana, Zambia and Zimbabwe are not guilty of any crime. Secondly, it is morally and politically unacceptable that a régime that is guilty of terrorism against the African majority of the country - 1,600 dead in 20 months - and against neighbouring States should claim participation of any kind in the struggle against international terrorism. Then shame no longer exists and nonsense reigns supreme.

Mention has also been made of the facilities made available to the ANC, facilities which would not have existed if, following the Sharpeville massacre, that organization had not been banned from South Africa. In any case, no proof has been given us that those facilities - a villa, a two-room office, a refugee camp - were used by the ANC to launch armed attacks against the racist régime. It was also stated that the arms and ammunition "found" in South Africa could have come only from the north and therefore it was necessary to block that route by attacking a capital city more than 500 kilometres from the South African border.

Who could possibly believe that a police régime, so concerned about its so-called security could not have seized those weapons at the border? As for the argument of self-defence, we reject it, for we have already had occasion to stress that defence of territory takes place within borders and not by means of adventurist expeditions.

I do not wish to take up too much of the Council's time. We understand what is at stake; we cannot shirk our duty to condemn the racist régime of South Africa for the recent acts of aggression against Botswana, Zambia and Zimbabwe and at the same time to reaffirm our solidarity with those countries. We must then draw the necessary conclusions from that condemnation, basing ourselves primarily on our Charter.

(Mr. Rabetafika, Madagascar)

The South African régime has been condemned by the Council on numerous occasions and for the most valid reasons. It has many times been found guilty of acts of aggression committed against neighbouring States. It has not fulfilled its obligations under the Charter, and it has consistently violated the principles of the Charter. Therefore, Article 6 is applicable to it. It may be said it is not the expulsion of South Africa that is on the Council's agenda, but South Africa's acts of aggression against three Member States. That must be admitted, but we must recognize that the matter we are considering at the present time falls precisely within the ambit of Article 39. We made recommendations regarding the measures to be taken by States, individually and voluntarily, following an earlier act of aggression by South Africa. The time has therefore come to decide what measures will be taken in accordance with Article 41.

Positions regarding the isolation of South Africa's régime and the sanctions to be applied to it are well known. We do not want, at this stage, to prejudge the reactions of any party, but we should like to make it clear that it is the Pretoria régime that has itself chosen isolation and, by its unacceptable actions, drawn upon itself the sanctions of the international community. Moreover, in our statements we have all expressed our concern regarding the security of southern Africa and the negative repercussions of regional instability on international peace and security. We are all agreed that the system of apartheid must be in one way or another dismantled. We all hope that Namibia will accede to true independence.

We believe that this unanimity, if sincere, should be evident when we deal with the question of depriving the South African régime of the means of perpetuating apartheid, promoting regional hegemony in the service of apartheid or depriving peoples of their rights in the name of apartheid. If the Pretoria régime



(Mr. Rabetafika, Madagascar)

is strengthened in its belief that it can act with impunity, we too will be responsible for the systematic use of generalized violence, and negotiated, peaceful solutions will become a fond memory - in other words, the Council will have failed in its collective task of maintaining international peace and security.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Madagascar for the very kind words he addressed to me.

Sir John THOMSON (United Kingdom): Mr. President, your abilities are well known, not only to the members of the Council and to myself personally, but also to a very large number of my compatriots. You represent your Government with force, clarity and eloquence. Your country, Ghana, and the United Kingdom have many and exceptionally close ties. For all these reasons, Sir, it is a pleasure for me to welcome you and congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency.

Your predecessor, my friend the Ambassador of France, performed brilliantly in a series of rather unusually difficult circumstances in the month of April. This was no more than we expected. We have all come to appreciate the individual qualities of each member of the Council and it is a happy arrangement that the presidency should rotate monthly. It gives us all a better appreciation of the importance of impartiality and fairness.

I come to a sad subject. My country, Britain, shares the outrage of our Commonwealth partners in Botswana, Zambia and Zimbabwe at the attacks carried out within their countries by the South African Defence Forces. In the words of my Prime Minister, we totally and utterly condemn those raids. We have expressed to our Commonwealth friends not merely our sympathy but our support. We have stood by them, we have been active in our help to them, we shall continue to stand by them.

(Sir John Thomson, United Kingdom)

Let South Africa be in no doubt of this. Let South Africa understand that we have never countenanced and shall never countenance cross-border violations and South Africa's illegitimate use of force against its neighbours. The recent threats to renew such attacks are totally unacceptable to my Government.

These attacks have been condemned in the United Kingdom and throughout the international community. Acts such as these can only deepen South Africa's isolation. They are tragically contrary to the long-term interests of all - I repeat, all - South Africans.

(Sir John Thomson, United Kingdom)

How can anyone show understanding of an attack, for example, against a refugee camp in Zambia which is administered by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees? How can anyone show understanding of yet another raid on Botswana, a country which poses no conceivable threat to South Africa and indeed maintains minimal armed forces - a raid which occurred in the middle of discussions between the Governments of Botswana and South Africa designed precisely to prevent such occurrences? These acts raise immediately a question of good faith. How can anyone show understanding of South African complaints about bombs in their own country when they themselves plant bombs in the neighbouring capital of Harare? As I have said repeatedly in this Council and as recent events within South Africa have so tragically reinforced, violence of this kind begets more violence. The South Africans should recognize that they have more interest than anyone else in promoting peaceful political evolution.

These attacks must be condemned by the Council; they must be condemned unanimously so that the South African Government will understand that there is no support at all for its policy of destabilization and aggression. Similarly, it is important that the resolution as a whole should be a unanimous expression of insistence by the international community that apartheid should be brought to an end peacefully. The South African attacks have raised questions of the utmost seriousness which the people of South Africa themselves must answer. Even the South African press - for example, the Cape Times newspaper in its editorial of 21 May - has said that no convincing military rationale had been offered for the attacks.

What judgement was made by those who ordered those attacks? What was their objective? What sort of future do those now in power in South Africa want? How can it possibly make sense to violate the sovereignty and territorial integrity of

(Sir John Thomson, United Kingdom)

Commonwealth neighbours when those same Commonwealth neighbours and their partners are doing all they can to avert further bloodshed and violence, indeed to promote a process of dialogue which would lead to the ending of apartheid in the context of a suspension of violence on all sides?

These are very serious questions. They are the questions on which the happiness and prosperity of white and black South Africans are going to depend. Those who gave the orders for these raids, precisely at the time when the Commonwealth group of eminent persons was travelling on its crucial mission between Lusaka and Cape Town, made a grave miscalculation. Time is very short if the Commonwealth initiative is to succeed in its objectives. I hope that the South African Government realize that if they frustrate the Commonwealth initiative they can expect no support from any quarter. They must realize that the British people abhor apartheid. We are willing to help to end it peacefully, but there is a limit to this willingness if the South African Government will not co-operate.

At Nassau, last October, Commonwealth Heads of Government agreed to review progress and to consider their further actions after a six-month period. Arrangements are already being made for a meeting to that end. In this context, I would remind the South African Government of what I said in the General Assembly on 29 October. I noted that change in South Africa would come about principally as a result of the tremendous pressures within, rather than through external sanctions. But I said that those of us outside South Africa had at the same time an important part to play. I said that we should encourage those who were actively seeking to make constructive changes. While taking positive steps of many kinds, I said that we must maintain strong pressures for change. At the present time, these pressures include the mandatory arms embargo and the measures adopted by my Government and our partners in the Commonwealth and the European Community. I emphasized that the

(Sir John Thomson, United Kingdom)

objective of our policy was to impress upon the South African Government the urgency and absolute necessity of implementing the five points set out in the Commonwealth Accord.

Those points were that South Africa must (a) declare that the system of apartheid will be dismantled and specific and meaningful action taken in fulfilment of that intent; (b) terminate the existing state of emergency; (c) release immediately and unconditionally Nelson Mandela and all others imprisoned and detained for their opposition to apartheid; (d) establish political freedom and, specifically, lift the existing ban on the African National Congress and other political parties; (e) initiate, in the context of a suspension of violence on all sides, a process of dialogue across lines of colour, politics and religion, with a view to establishing a non-racial and representative government.

A great deal remains to be done if those five points are to be enacted, and there is not much time in which to do it. By its actions this week, the South African Government have made the task of the Commonwealth group much harder. This is inexcusable. If the South African Government - I say "if" - made those attacks with the deliberate intention of undermining the Commonwealth group they will find that they have undermined the future of their own people. General Obasanjo, one of the group's co-chairmen, has said that while the group is not yet dead and buried, it has been badly hurt. He said that the ball was now in the court of the South African Government. That is true, and their reply must be constructive. The other co-chairman, Mr. Malcolm Fraser, has also said that there is still hope for the Commonwealth exercise. There had better be, or the future of white South Africa is bleak.

(Sir John Thomson, United Kingdom)

I urge the South African Government to consider very seriously - for it is the future of their people which is at stake - the consequences, both domestically and internationally, should they not now respond in a positive sense to the Commonwealth group. They should take nothing for granted - certainly not the support of my country. The prospects for South Africa will be dismal if it does not assist this major international effort, which is designed to avert further violence and to promote peaceful and just solutions, to succeed.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of the United Kingdom for the kind words he addressed to me.

(Mr. BIERRING (Denmark): May I begin by extending to you, Sir, my congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of May. Representing a country with long-standing ties of friendship and co-operation with Denmark, you can be assured of our co-operation in your most able efforts to guide the Council towards constructive results.

(spoke in French)

I would also express my delegation's sincere appreciation of the way in which your predecessor, the Ambassador of France, discharged his weighty responsibilities. If the late Raymond Aron described himself as a committed "spectator" of international politics, Mr. de Kémoularia fully deserves to be described as a committed "actor" in those politics.

(continued in English)

We all in this Council share, I believe, a feeling of strong indignation and frustration at having to consider yet another totally unprovoked and unwarranted act of aggression by South Africa against neighbouring countries.

South Africa's recent armed raids into neighbouring Botswana, Zambia and Zimbabwe reflect a total disregard of some of the most basic principles of international law and of the Charter of the United Nations. Denmark has close links of friendship and co-operation with all three countries and we are outraged that they have been subjected once more to aggressive acts by the South African apartheid régime. My Government has expressed its condolences to the President of the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC) as well as to the Governments of Botswana, Zambia and Zimbabwe, and together with our partners in the European Community we have strongly condemned these attacks.

(Mr. Bierring, Denmark)

It is particularly abominable that a refugee camp of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) was chosen as one of the South African targets. The continuing ruthless persecution by the South African authorities has forced large numbers of people to flee their native land and seek refuge in the neighbouring countries. In accordance with the best humanitarian traditions, these countries have received the refugees with hospitality and generosity. South Africa has, however, by its actions shown nothing but contempt for these humanitarian efforts.

Notwithstanding the unanimous international condemnation of these attacks, South Africa has apparently decided to make them part and parcel of its deliberate policy of violence and aggression. In his statement after the raids, the President of South Africa warned that South Africa will strike again and has the capacity and the will to break the ANC. Instead of heeding the international call for the lifting of the ban on the ANC, the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania (PAC) and other political parties, the South African Government persists in its ruthless, but vain, efforts to destroy these organizations, thereby once again highlighting the incredibility of its alleged desire for fundamental change in the country. That is all the more regrettable at a time when serious and sincere efforts are being made by the Commonwealth Group of Eminent Persons.

As long as South Africa remains contemptuous of the unified calls of the international community for the eradication of the system of apartheid, for the independence of Namibia and for respect for the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of its neighbours, there is no alternative but to increase pressure on the South African Government. Fortunately there is an increasing



(Mr. Bierring, Denmark)

international understanding of the need to implement measures against South Africa. Denmark remains convinced that the imposition of mandatory sanctions in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter of the United Nations is the most adequate instrument for the international community to apply in order to achieve peacefully the objective of bringing injustice, inequality and aggression in southern Africa to an end. However, we participate actively in the other endeavours together with our Nordic neighbours and with our partners within the European Community as well as within this world Organization. On a national level we have already adopted far-reaching measures which in the course of this year will result in a general cessation of economic relations between Denmark and South Africa. The Danish restrictive actions against the Government in Pretoria constitute the most far-reaching measures that have so far been introduced by any country. This line of action should also be seen as an attempt to inspire others.

Faced with South Africa's continued disregard of the resolutions of the Security Council, we must seek unanimous action aimed at preventing a disaster in southern Africa. Let us not miss this opportunity of speaking with one voice.

South Africa must be made to understand that it is only through dialogue and a sincere search for justice that peace can be established in the region.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Denmark for his kind words addressed to me.

Mr. SHUSTOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): First, I should like to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council and to wish you success in guiding its proceedings this month. From years of work in the United Nations I am familiar

(Mr. Shustov, USSR)

with your great professional qualities, and I am therefore convinced that in you the Council has an extremely skilled and authoritative leader.

I wish to express my gratitude also to your predecessor in the presidency in April, the Permanent Representative of France to the United Nations, Ambassador de Kémouliaris.

The world once again has become a witness to escalation of violence in South Africa. On the eve of the celebration by the peoples of the African countries and by all progressive mankind of the Day of the Liberation of Africa, on the eve of the special session of the United Nations General Assembly that will be called upon to deal with urgent problems of the economic development of the African continent, a blatant challenge has been hurled not only at the African countries that have become the victims of unprovoked aggression, but also at the entire world community of States. Utter disregard has been shown for the norms of the international legal order and for civilized conduct. The armed attack, resulting in loss of life and destruction, was carried out by the racist régime against Zimbabwe, Zambia and Botswana. But this aggression is a criminal act not only directed against three African States, but threatening peace and security throughout the world. This new evil deed of the South African military clique has become yet another link in the chain of unbroken acts of aggression by the racists against independent African peoples.

The intent of the Pretoria régime is perfectly obvious: by the force of arms to intimidate three States of the continent and force them to renounce support for the just cause of the patriots of South Africa, to subject the peoples of these countries to Pretoria's will. The apartheid régime is trying to prolong its existence through bloody, brutal acts carried out within South Africa and by acts of aggression directed against neighbouring countries.

(Mr. Shustov, USSR)

This once again confirms the irrefutable truth that racism in its State form represents a serious threat to the peace and security of peoples, that it cannot be reformed, that it must be immediately and completely liquidated.

In connection with the bandit-like raid of the South African commandoes on sites located in the capital of Zimbabwe, Harare, and around the capital of Botswana, Gaborone, and also in connection with the South African air strikes on the South African refugee camps near the capital of Zambia, Lusaka, the Soviet Government immediately issued a special statement. In that statement, which was distributed as a Security Council document, we read the following:

"The Soviet Union resolutely condemns the attack by the South African racists on Zimbabwe, Botswana and Zambia. True to its policy of support for the universal peace and security of peoples, it emphatically calls for the immediate cessation of the criminal policy of terror and violence pursued by the South African authorities". (S/18070, p. 2)

If we try to assess the scale of the most recent act of aggression by South Africa, we cannot fail to agree with The New York Times that the co-ordinated raids represented the broadest military operation by Pretoria in the past 25 years.

(Mr. Shustov, USSR)

The Soviet delegation shares the view expressed by many representatives who have declared here in the Security Council that this latest crime of the South African military clique is an act of State terrorism against neighbouring countries. In the southern part of the African continent the racists and imperialists intend to turn to the attack against all of free Africa to reverse the process of national liberation and then to counterattack in order to reaffirm their neocolonialist domination.

The aggressive acts of the Pretoria racists and the acts of their protectors across the Atlantic Ocean, which are similar in both style and method, are directly linked. The policy of State terrorism being implemented by the American Administration, including the recent barbaric attack on Libya and its unceasing threats directed to other freedom-loving States, serves as a model to be imitated by the South African régime, which the White House has declared to be a historic ally of the United States.

It is no mere coincidence that, at the very moment South Africa is striking one aggressive blow after another against the front-line States, that country should be rolling out the red carpet in Washington for the bandit Savimbi and increasing its assistance to anti-government groups acting in the territories of Angola and Mozambique by supplying them with the most modern weapons. All those co-ordinated actions are part and parcel of the policy of so-called constructive engagement. Incidentally, at yesterday's meeting of the Security Council the statements by the delegations of the United States and South Africa were remarkably similar in both content and in spirit. Similar attempts were made to justify armed actions against other States by referring to the need to struggle against terrorism. Similar threats were made against other States that "conclusions would be drawn" and that, under the pretext of "self-defence", there might be a

(Mr. Shustov, USSR)

repetition of actions already taken against them. Those examples are manifestations of the policy of "constructive engagement" in action.

We are all accustomed to the fact that the United States never hesitates to employ political, economic and other sanctions against countries struggling to attain national liberation and independence or against socialist States. Cuba, Nicaragua, Poland, Libya and a number of other countries are cases in point. However, when it comes to South Africa, the United States suddenly regards sanctions against as inapplicable. As was stated by the representative of the White House following South Africa's raid on three African countries, "We do not believe sanctions are a solution."

The imperialist Powers pander to South Africa's outrageous acts. That country is trying to block the aspirations of the African countries to conduct their affairs free from outside interference and to consolidate their efforts at overcoming the acute social, economic and political problems they inherited from their colonial past. In the Security Council those same forces are blocking the adoption of effective and binding measures against the South Africa aggressors.

The Soviet Union is convinced that only by eliminating the inhuman system of apartheid in South Africa and the southern part of the vast African continent, a region represented by more than 50 States in the United Nations, can lasting peace triumph and relations of co-operation and good-neighbourliness be established. In stating that position at his recent meeting with the President of Mozambique, His Excellency Samora Moisés Machel, the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Mikhail Gorbachev, emphasized the following:

"At the twenty-seventh Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, we stated that the Soviet Union favours the political settlement of international crises and is prepared to step up the collective search for means to settle

(Mr. Shustov, USSR)

conflict situations in various regions of the world. This also refers to South Africa. All that is required is to abandon the futile efforts to use the conflict in that region as a pretext to interfere in the internal affairs of sovereign African States and to take into account the legitimate interests of the peoples living there. We are prepared, together with all interested parties who favour freedom, justice and peace in South Africa in deeds and not merely in words, to engage immediately in working out the appropriate measures. The peoples of the front-line States, the patriotic forces of Namibia and South Africa, headed by SWAPO and the ANC, can be certain of the unswerving solidarity of the Soviet Union and of its support for their just cause."

The Soviet Union's solidarity with the peoples of Angola and other front-line States that have been striving for independence was compelling expressed during the visit this month of the President of the People's Republic of Angola, His Excellency José Eduardo dos Santos, to the Soviet Union. The joint Soviet-Angolan statement regarding the situation in South Africa points to the sole realistic and reliable way to establish peace in that country. The communiqué states:

"The situation in South Africa requires an immediate political settlement. To that end it is necessary first and foremost to put an end to the aggressive policy of the racist Pretoria régime against the front-line States, as well as to its interference in their internal affairs and the use of bands of terrorists and mercenaries. The United States Administration must stop granting military and any other form of assistance to the puppet bands of UNITA and renounce its attempts to put political and economic pressure on the sovereign States of Angola and Mozambique."

(Mr. Shustov, USSR)

The Soviet Union calls on the Security Council not only formally to condemn the South African attack on Botswana, Zambia and Zimbabwe but also to adopt the most determined and energetic measures to halt the criminal policy of terror and aggression being pursued by the South African authorities against neighbouring States. As was stressed in the statement issued by the Soviet Government on 20 May 1986, the interests of the peaceful future of our planet require compliance with the demands of the world community regarding the application of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter against the racist régime of South Africa.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics for the kind words he addressed to me.

Mr. AGUILAR (Venezuela) (interpretation from Spanish): Mr. President, it is a great pleasure for us to be working under your able leadership this month. In the few months that we have served by your side in the Council we have been able to observe your professional competence, your intelligence, your understanding and your unswerving sense of courtesy. We are convinced, therefore, that you will be very successful in the important and delicate tasks entrusted to you. For our part, we extend to you once again the pledge of our broadest co-operation.

(Mr. Aguilar, Venezuela)

Friendship, but above all justice, gives us the pleasant duty of warmly congratulating the Permanent Representative of France, Ambassador de Kéroularia, on his excellent work as President of the Council in April, which, as we all know, was a particularly difficult month because of the number of meetings the Council held and the complexity of the issues considered.

We do not have precise information - such information may not be available - on the time and money the United Nations has spent in considering the painful situation which has existed for many years now in southern Africa and which stems from the odious policy of apartheid officially adopted by the Government of South Africa in 1948 and rigorously applied since then. An examination of those figures would produce striking information, but that is not needed for us to reach the conclusion that the United Nations, in spite of its efforts, has been unable to persuade the racist Pretoria Government that its policy of apartheid is clearly counter to the purposes and principles of the Charter. In fact, the innumerable resolutions of the Council, the General Assembly and many other United Nations bodies have had no effect.

It is also clear that the policy followed by some States of trying to change the South African Government's attitude through persuasion and dialogue has produced no tangible results. The most recent proof of that policy's failure is that fact that the acts of aggression against neighbouring countries which we are now considering took place precisely while the Commonwealth committee of eminent persons was at work.

If any doubt remained as to the attitude of the racist minority governing South Africa, the statement yesterday afternoon by the representative of that Government clearly demonstrated that very little, or nothing, can be achieved through those efforts. Once again we heard words, vague promises, but no concrete commitment that could give us reason to hope that that Government is at last ready



(Mr. Aguilar, Venezuela)

to change its behaviour. On the contrary, we see from that statement that the South African Government is continuing its policy of internal repression and external aggression.

Bearing in mind that the policy of apartheid has been on the United Nations agenda since 1946 and that, in spite of repeated appeals, nothing has been accomplished in those 40 years, it is clear that the time has come to apply more effective measures than those used so far.

Our position is very clear. Suffice it to recall that in our statement at the 2659th meeting of the Council, in the debate on 11 February this year on the situation in southern Africa, we reached that very conclusion and proposed the implementation of appropriate enforcement measures under Chapter VII of the Charter. We therefore completely agree with the moderate proposal in paragraph 6 of the provisional draft resolution submitted by the non-aligned members of the Council that the Council, acting in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter, determine that the policies and acts of racist régime of South Africa constitute a threat to international peace and security, and decide to impose the following selective economic and other sanctions against the South African régime as an effective means of combating the apartheid system and bringing peace and stability to southern Africa: suspension of all new investments in South Africa; prohibition of the sale of krugerrands and all other coins minted in South Africa; suspension of guaranteed export loans; restriction in the field of sports and cultural relations; prohibition of all new contracts in the nuclear field and prohibition of all sales of computer equipment.

So far I have referred basically to the apartheid policy, for the simple reason that we are convinced that the acts of aggression by the Pretoria Government against Botswana, Zambia and Zimbabwe, which are the specific subject before the Council at this series of meetings, are but a corollary of that policy, which, as

(Mr. Aguilar, Venezuela)

has been rightly said so many times, is the fundamental cause of the tragic situation pertaining in southern Africa.

Of course, we strongly condemn those acts of aggression, and we share the sorrow of the Governments and peoples that are the victims at the painful human losses they have suffered. We also agree that full and adequate compensation to those countries for the material damage they have suffered should be demanded from the Government of South Africa. We reaffirm our solidarity with the people of South Africa and its legitimate struggle for the complete dismantling of apartheid and the establishment of a multiracial, fully democratic society, based on self-determination, the principle of government by the majority and the full and free exercise of universal suffrage by all the groups that make up South Africa's population.

To sum up, we support the provisional draft resolution, as a whole, submitted by the non-aligned members of the Council and shall therefore vote for it in its original version or with amendments that may be agreed between the members of the Council.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Venezuela for the kind words he addressed to me.

Mr. ADOUKI (Congo) (interpretation from French): On behalf of my delegation, I warmly congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of May. My delegation also pays a tribute to Mr. Claude de Kémoularia, the Permanent Representative of France, your distinguished predecessor as President.

The raids carried out by South Africa on 19 May in Zambia, Zimbabwe and Botswana, like the earlier raids beyond its borders, were in flagrant violation of international law and the provisions of the Charter. They have provoked profound indignation and justified anger throughout the world. The Congo condemns

(Mr. Adouki, Congo)

those acts of aggression against those three friendly countries, members of the Organisation of African Unity (OAU) and Member States of the United Nations, just as in the past it has condemned aggression against other neighbouring States in the region.

The South African racists have once again shown their true nature, by refusing to heed appeals to reason by the international community. These premeditated, repeated raids on neighbouring independent States have shown that the champions of apartheid are trying to save their racist régime. In so doing, they present a serious threat to peace and security in the region and a challenge to the international community and the Security Council.

The arrogance of the apartheid régime could not be more flagrant. But internal acts of repression, State terrorism, the high-handed way in which the Pretoria régime is so accustomed to acting, cannot ensure its survival in any form. Apartheid, the fundamental cause of disorder in the region, will be dismantled.

(Mr. Adouki, Congo)

Hence our Council must, in solidarity with the national liberation movement in southern Africa and with the Governments and the families of the victims, draw the necessary lessons from the tragic events of the past few days. In the interest of peace, the Council's message must therefore be clearly against the policy of armed aggression and against the policy of destabilization in southern Africa. My country will associate itself with any action by the Council to that end.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of the Congo for the very kind words he addressed to me.

Mr. KASEMSRI (Thailand): On behalf of the Thai delegation, it gives me great pleasure to extend to you, Sir, our warm congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month. Your well-known qualities as an experienced diplomat and a learned scholar have impressed your colleagues who have also come to appreciate the dedicated and dignified manner in which you handle some important issues at the United Nations. Your country, Ghana, a good friend of Thailand, has been and remains a strong advocate of decolonization and self-determination for peoples still under alien domination and foreign occupation. It is therefore fitting that its distinguished representative should be presiding over the Council's deliberations at this juncture.

Permit me also to convey, on behalf of my delegation and on my own behalf, our deep gratitude to your predecessor, His Excellency Ambassador Claude de Kémoularia, Permanent Representative of France, for his presidency of the Council during the eventful month of April. Among his many unforgettable qualities, we admire in particular his perspicacity and panache.

The already tense situation in southern Africa has been aggravated by the brazen armed attacks on Botswana, Zambia and Zimbabwe. These acts of aggression perpetrated by the racist Pretoria régime against these three States are blatant violations of the Charter of the United Nations and international law. They

(Mr. Kasemsri, Thailand)

constitute the latest violations by South Africa of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the front-line and neighbouring States. These reprehensible acts undermine the stability of the whole region, thus endangering international peace and security.

My delegation condemns the South African actions in the strongest possible terms. It also notes that South African aircraft attacked a refugee transit centre which is under the supervision of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. Since Thailand is familiar with the refugee problem in its part of the world, it regards such an attack as criminal and shares the outrage of the world community in this regard. My delegation also wishes to register its abhorrence at the loss of life and damage to property caused by the South African bombing and commando raids into the three countries. We wish to convey our deep condolences to the Governments and the bereaved families concerned.

Here I should like to quote the statement of the Foreign Ministry of Thailand, as follows:

"The Royal Thai Government has learnt with deep regret that on 19 May 1986 the Pretoria régime blatantly used its air and ground units to attack Botswana, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

"The Royal Thai Government strongly condemns these latest acts of aggression in flagrant violation of the Charter of the United Nations and international law, posing a serious threat to international peace and security.

"In expressing its warm condolences and deep sorrow to the peoples of Botswana, Zambia and Zimbabwe, the Royal Thai Government calls on the Pretoria régime immediately to cease all illegal and hostile acts against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of its neighbouring States.

"The Pretoria régime must bear full responsibility for the consequences."

(Mr. Kasemsri, Thailand)

The root cause of all the problems in southern Africa remains the repressive policies and practices of apartheid of the Pretoria régime. As long as the apartheid system is maintained, its victims will continue to flee South Africa and to seek refuge in neighbouring countries, whose humanitarian role in accepting these refugees then incurs armed attacks by South African forces or Pretoria's insidious measures to destabilize their Governments. We must not only continue to affirm the right of these countries to give sanctuary to refugees fleeing from apartheid but also help to bring about the dismantling of the apartheid system, thus eliminating the root cause itself.

Only last February the Security Council adopted resolution 581 (1986), in which it

"Strongly condemns racist South Africa for its recent threats to perpetrate acts of aggression against the front-line States and other States in southern Africa;

"Strongly warns the racist régime of South Africa against committing any acts of aggression, terrorism and destabilization against independent African States and its use of mercenaries;

"... calls upon South Africa to respect fully the sanctity of international borders;

and

"Demands the immediate eradication of apartheid as the necessary step towards the establishment of a non-racial democratic society based on self-determination and majority rule through the full and free exercise of universal adult suffrage by all the people in a united and non-fragmented South Africa...".

Moreover, the United Nations has for four decades been seized of this problem, and the situation has further deteriorated. The Pretoria régime has persisted in

(Mr. Kasemsri, Thailand)

its flagrant violations of the Charter and the norms of international law. Its latest actions have demonstrated its mounting aggressiveness and arrogance; it has further segregated itself from the community of decent and civilized nations. The time has come for the international community to take strong concerted measures against such a régime, since any other effort has proven illusory and ineffectual.

My delegation's position in this regard is clear and consistent. Thailand has consistently and in the strongest possible terms opposed and resolutely condemned South Africa's acts of aggression as well as any foreign occupation and violation by one country of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of another country. In this connection my delegation demands that the racist régime of South Africa desist from such lawless acts and immediately compensate the respective Governments for all damages incurred, as well as cease all violations against its neighbouring countries. Moreover, my delegation demands that South Africa end its policies and practices of apartheid and comply with all relevant United Nations decisions without further delay, in order to eliminate the apartheid system and establish a non-racial democratic society in South Africa and Namibia based on self-determination and majority rule.

For the foregoing reasons, therefore, my delegation will vote in support of the draft resolution as contained in document S/18087 now before the Council.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Thailand for the very 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. TREIKI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (interpretation from Arabic): I should like at the very outset, on behalf of my delegation, to express our congratulations to you, Sir, upon your accession to the presidency of the Security Council for the month of May. Your country's historical role under the leadership of the late Kwame Nkrumah and its present important role under the revolutionary guidance of Major Rawlings stress the importance of the struggle of the peoples of Africa. Your well-known personal and diplomatic skills will surely play an important role in the success of the Council's deliberations.

I also wish to thank your predecessor, last month's President, Mr. Claude de Kémoullaria, the representative of France, for the rare wisdom and skill with which he presided over the Council.

My delegation did not intend to speak today after having agreed in the African Group that the delegation of Tanzania would represent us in its capacity as this month's Chairman of the Group. Indeed, I have little to add to the statements made by our brothers from Zambia and Tanzania and by the Chairman of the Committee against Apartheid. However, the defamatory remarks made at yesterday's meeting of the Council by the representative of the United States, compel me to speak today.

My delegation strongly condemns the dastardly, barbaric, terrorist attack perpetrated by the white racist South African settler régime against the sanctity, integrity and sovereignty of three sister African States - Botswana, Zambia and Zimbabwe. That act of aggression constitutes a flagrant breach of all norms of international law and is a clear example of State terrorism in its most blatant form. What we predicted in this Council last month has come true. At that time, when it was my country that had been subjected to a dastardly terrorist attack perpetrated against our peaceful cities by the strongest imperialist Power in the



(Mr. Treiki, Libyan Arab  
Jamahiriya)

world, the United States of America, we warned that what had happened to the Jamahiriya might well happen to any country - indeed to any country that prides itself on its dignity, independence and non-alignment and cherishes the principles of freedom and independence.

The enemies of the people and of freedom play the same broken record, the record called "anti-terrorism". They fraudulently invoke Article 51 of the Charter with respect to self-defence. The United States Administration has fraudulently used the United Nations Charter as an excuse, and today the racist Government of South Africa uses that same excuse. That distorted logic adopted by the terrorist United States has become a precedent in the contemporary world, and is now echoed by its two illegitimate offspring, the racist reactionary régimes in South Africa and in occupied Palestine.

The methods used by the United States are the same methods to which the racist régime in occupied Palestine has resorted and are identical to those pursued by racist South Africa. Even the logic and the words they use are the same. Botha, the President of the racist régime, expressing himself with sarcasm and disrespect, stated that the United States and the United Kingdom had condemned terrorism. He compared what his forces had done with United States actions against Libya and with the actions of the racist entity against Tunisia. He took arrogance a step further when he said:

"We shall fight terrorism with precisely the same means used by certain Western and other States despite the clamour and complaints that may be made at the United Nations, the sponsor of the international terrorist movement."

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan Arab  
Jamahiriya)

Botha added that he "would bear full responsibility for the actions undertaken by his security forces". He congratulated those forces just as President Reagan had congratulated his own forces. He used the very same words that President Reagan used. He said that he was prepared to repeat that action. Botha's role model and the one whose principles he holds dear is the President of the terrorist United States Administration. President Reagan invoked those very same pretexts against the Jamahiriya. His other role model is the leadership of the Zionist racist entity in occupied Palestine and the pretexts they have used in their repeated attacks against the Arab States.

The logic and the pretexts of the aggressors are one and the same. There are no differences whatsoever. They shamelessly practise outright State terrorism against peace-loving peoples and States. They persist in accusing the oppressed and the peace-loving of terrorism. In their opinion, the United Nations is the sponsor of terrorism. Some of them accuse the United Nations overtly, while others impose financial pressure on the United Nations in order to destroy it. The white settlers consider it a legitimate act of self-defence to attack people's freedom and homes, to violate the sovereignty and sanctity of independent States and to carry out terrorist raids. They also justify the occupation of others' land under the pretext of "security requirements". Cases in point are the events that have taken place in Angola, the subversive raids into Mozambique, the occupation of southern Lebanon, Palestine and Golan, as well as the request made to the Government of Nicaragua to dissolve its army.

Libya seems to be a supporter of terrorism because it supports liberation movements in Palestine, South Africa and Latin America. Hence Libyan assets have

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan Arab  
Jamahiriya)

been confiscated, we have been placed under economic siege, and the sanctity of our land, waters and airspace have been attacked. Our children have been killed and our cities have been bombarded. We know what took place in Angola, Botswana, Lebanon, Mozambique, Tunisia, Zambia and Zimbabwe. Striking Libya is considered legitimate. However, arming Savimbi with missiles to attack the people of Angola in collaboration with South Africa is also considered legitimate.

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan Arab  
Jamahiriya)

Furthermore, this is not a terrorist act, according to American logic because Savimbi is a freedom fighter, just as the Contras in Nicaragua are freedom fighters.

My delegation reaffirms once more that these acts perpetrated in the past by the United States of America and perpetrated again by the racist Government in South Africa have indeed set a dangerous precedent. If the Security Council does not take practical and effective measures, there will be another act of aggression, followed by yet others. Indeed, there are threats today against Syria. These are merely indications that a new act of aggression is to be committed by the racist Government in occupied Palestine, supported by the United States Administration.

Moderation, common sense and wisdom, according to the colonialist Western logic, did not solve the problem. What did the Western contact group do? What of Security Council resolution 435 (1978)? What has the group of eminent persons which is mediating between the Pretoria régime and the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC) achieved?

Who is it that is refusing to abide by United Nations resolutions? Is it not the United States Administration and its allies? Who is it refusing to impose sanctions against South Africa? Who is continuing to support the South African régime? Is it not the United States Administration? We see that there is political hypocrisy at the highest level here. We see the United States Administration condemning acts of aggression by South Africa while at the same time itself committing aggression - the United States Administration and President Ronald Reagan, who applauded the Zionist entity when it made its strike against Tunisia.

If the United States Administration is serious, as some tried to tell us yesterday, it must agree to the draft resolution now submitted to the Security Council. It must stop providing weapons to South Africa. It must stop providing

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan Arab  
Jamahiriya)

money to South Africa. We will not swallow this political hypocrisy. We cannot put an end to these acts of aggression by the racist régime against small African peoples in the southern part of the continent while the natural ally of the Zionist entity in occupied Palestine is provided with the means of international terror by the United States of America. We cannot put an end to that alliance except through unity in the struggle in our two continents. We should indeed follow Viet Nam's example.

My delegation will not stop at condemnation; it will not be satisfied with denouncing acts of aggression by South Africa. We stress most forcefully, with the people of the Jamahiriya behind us, that we stand by the peoples of Africa. We stand by the people of Azania in its legitimate struggle to dismantle the régime of the white minority in South Africa. We must do something. We must act most seriously. We must shoulder our responsibility as an international community. It is our duty to put an end to this plague in Africa, the only continent in which the practices of apartheid continue to be practised.

We cannot be fooled by the statements of the United States Administration, because this is merely "doublespeak" and political hypocrisy that none of us can believe. This is the policy of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde, a policy which is an insult to the intelligence of peace-loving peoples. Those that bring pressure to bear on their allies to besiege Cuba, Nicaragua and Angola are not prepared to do the same, apparently against South Africa. Why? It is because the black people of South Africa are not a people, in its opinion; they are not human. The United States Administration and its President welcomed a Soviet emigrant with red-carpet treatment because he managed to take over Palestine and throw out the Palestinians. But we do not see the same enthusiasm - we see no enthusiasm - from

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan Arab  
Jamahiriya)

that Administration, when thousands of militants are killed in South Africa. We do not see the same enthusiasm from the United States Administration when it is a question of the imprisoned leaders in South Africa, or of the thousands of Palestinians in Zionist jails. It uses all possible pressure to protect the racist régimes in both Palestine and the African continent. At the same time, it resorts to political hypocrisy, a dual personality, to encourage the racists in their crimes. What does arming Savimbi mean? Is it not direct support for South Africa?

Statements by a foreign ministry or a White House spokesman cannot possibly make us believe that the United States of America and its allies are not collaborating in the crimes against Zambia, Botswana and Zimbabwe. In no way could South Africa carry out such an act of aggression without the agreement of the United States Administration and its allies.

We are facing another challenge by the racist régime. Despite dozens of resolutions, we have not succeeded in changing the policies of the racist apartheid régime in South Africa or the racist régime in Palestine. We are trying to strike the snake, but the head of the snake is the United States Administration. It is the leader of world imperialism and it is that Administration which encourages the racist régimes in occupied Palestine and in the southern part of the African continent.

We are convinced that our people in South Africa, Azania, and in Namibia will be victorious, just as the peoples of Angola, Mozambique, Zimbabwe, Nicaragua, Cuba and Viet Nam were victorious. We are convinced that, just as the Jamahiriya courageously faced up to American arrogance and its fascist instrument, Thatcher, the peoples will face up to aggression and be victorious, and imperialism and its instruments will fail.

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan Arab  
Jamahiriya)

We do not expect much from the Security Council because of the position of America and its allies. They will resort to their veto. Just as three of them exercised their right of veto against Libya to justify aggression, so that veto will be used to justify the aggression by South Africa. However, we must shoulder our responsibilities. We cannot be subjugated by blackmail. We cannot be subjugated by aggression. Our small peoples in the African continent must stand side by side with the peace-loving and socialist States of the world to put an end to the effects of these acts of aggression and to dismantle the apartheid régime for ever.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya for the kind words he addressed to me.

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. LEGWAILA (Botswana): We are very pleased indeed, Sir, to see you, an illustrious son of Ghana and Africa, in the Chair as the President of the Security Council for the month of May. I need not tell you how highly we regard you as a person, a diplomat, a colleague and a brother and how awed we are by your prodigious abilities. Our confidence in your leadership is far beyond the reach of doubt, I assure you.

We express similar sentiments to your predecessor, the Ambassador of France, whose inimitable leadership of the Council's deliberations last month will, we are sure, be remembered with enduring nostalgia.

Eleven months ago we appeared before the Council to complain about the invasion of our capital by South African commandos. The Council responded promptly and positively by adopting resolution 568 (1985) and dispatching a mission to Gaborone, the capital of my country, to assess the damage inflicted by those commandos.

Security Council resolution 568 (1985) condemned

"all acts of aggression, provocation and harassment, including murder, blackmail, kidnapping and destruction of property committed by the racist régime of South Africa against Botswana".

It demanded payment of

"full and adequate compensation by South Africa to Botswana for damage to life and property resulting from such acts of aggression".

That was barely a year ago. The racist régime in Pretoria has neither paid the compensation demanded in Security Council resolution 568 (1985) nor shown any



(Mr. Legwaila, Botswana)

inclination to desist from committing further acts of aggression against my country. On the contrary, in the early hours of Monday this week the commandos returned to our capital for a repeat performance, that is, to sow more death and destruction. Like a gang of space-age terrorist thugs, they descended in heavily armed helicopter gunships on a tiny, sleepy hamlet adjacent to our capital where they murdered in cold blood one Motswana and wounded three others. They destroyed the residential property of a Motswana, who may not even know what the initials ANC stand for.

The facts are very clear. The housing complex in the tiny village of Mogoditshane, alleged by the white minority régime in South Africa to have been used as a transit camp by "ANC gangsters", did not even have refugees as tenants, let alone ANC gangsters, which in the first place we have never had in Botswana. The complex was rented by our own nationals. In any case, ever since the brutal and murderous invasion of our capital on 14 June 1985, during which more than 10 refugee-rented houses, some of which were owned by private individuals, were destroyed, we have encountered a great many problems finding accommodation for South African refugees in our capital. Why have we encountered these problems? It is because not only are Batswana unwilling to rent their houses to refugees; they do not even want them as neighbours. Our people are in perpetual terror of the very real possibility of a repeat performance by the South Africans, a repetition of the trauma of 14 June 1985. They simply will not risk their residential properties by renting them to refugees. I am saying this in order to show that the place that was attacked on Monday could not have been rented by refugees, let alone used by what South Africa calls "ANC gangsters", because, as I have said, we have no ANC gangsters in Botswana. We have never had them.

(Mr. Legwaila, Botswana)

The South African commandos did not find anybody at that place other than the three Motswana, of whom one was killed and two wounded. That is why the South African Ambassador could not produce any evidence yesterday as to why the commandos went there, other than to kill our own people. All he could do in a futile attempt to mitigate his violent régime's shame was to treat the Council to a boring repetition of the old, worn-out, baseless accusations that we harbour "terrorists".

Anybody who knows my country and the way we do things must know that we have absolutely nothing to hide. We harbour refugees; we do not harbour terrorists. In her address in the Council on 21 June last year, our Minister for External Affairs, Dr. Chiepe, stated:

"The truth is that we have never allowed, can never allow and will never allow our vulnerable country to be used as a base for guerrilla operations against South Africa, for very obvious reasons." (S/PV.2598, p. 6)

This truth is known very well by the white minority régime in Pretoria. The régime knows the lengths to which we have gone in the pursuit of peaceful coexistence. In the 20 years that we have been independent we have never deviated from our self-preservation policy of not allowing even those whose struggle is our struggle and whose suffering we share so deeply to carry weapons of war in our country or to use our country to wage war against any of our neighbours.

Our disposition towards refugees is another matter. Our President, Dr. Quett Masire, has stated on several occasions that

"It is not possible, in spite of all the military power South Africa possesses and may unleash on us, to destroy our belief in the rule of law..." We will never turn our backs on victims of racial tyranny in South Africa, regardless of the consequences. We will never close our hearts to our suffering fellow men.

(Mr. Legwaila, Botswana)

We have never stopped talking to South Africa about the security of our common border. We have tenaciously endured its penchant for treachery and bad faith for the very sake of our survival. Indeed, to demonstrate our commitment to coexistence with South Africa, today, Friday, 23 May, our officials were to meet with those of the white minority régime to discuss the border problems. Yes, imagine the treachery. They invited us to a meeting today and we agreed, only to have our capital, territorial integrity and sovereignty violated four short days before the meeting was to take place. The pattern of bad faith is very clear indeed. We were attacked on 14 June last year, also on the eve of a similar meeting to discuss the same border problems.

Monday's attack is a treacherous act of bad faith for another reason: We had a series of meetings with South Africa in March of this year at which we were given reason to feel that our bona fides were appreciated. We have had to seek asylum abroad for refugees whom they threatened to murder and whose security we could not guarantee. And the world knows that the ANC residence and office destroyed in the 14 June raid have not been rebuilt and that the ANC officers who had been looking after the civilian affairs of their organization in our country have had to leave out of fear for their lives.

What is the problem? The problem is not that our country provides sanctuary for South Africa's enemies. It is simply that we are who we are - a democratic country which has never made bones about the fact that it fully shares the aspirations of the people of South Africa as they struggle for their liberation. We cannot do otherwise, because we love and value freedom. Our respect for the rule of law and our unshakeable commitment to a democratic way of life compel us to join hands with the people of South Africa as they struggle for the creation of a democratic society in their country.

(Mr. Legwaila, Botswana)

The problem is that we have continued to see no beneficial reason whatsoever why we should sign a non-aggression treaty with a country which has become so notorious for violating agreements concluded in good faith. That is the problem. It is not as if we have been discovered to have something to do with what is going on inside South Africa. It is simply because we refuse to be enslaved to a non-aggression pact which, in addition to turning our country into a servile buffer zone in the struggle for freedom in South Africa, would commit us to performing slave tasks for which we have neither the capacity nor the moral inclination.

We abhor violence because we are a peace-loving people. We abhor the violence represented by the inhuman policies of apartheid. We abhor the violence and the terrorism perpetrated by the authors of the apartheid policies against the black majority in South Africa. We abhor without fear or equivocation the racist terrorism that has so needlessly consumed and wasted the young and innocent lives of more than 1,600 black South Africans since the end of 1984. That is the violence we abhor. That is the terrorism we abhor.

We do not and will not abhor the counter-terrorism practised by the people of South Africa as they try to liberate themselves from the shackles of racism. We understand why they are fighting. We have no guns to give them to fight for their liberation, but we understand why they have resorted to violence as an instrument of change.

Botswana would have preferred peaceful change in South Africa rather than the kind of blood-letting we witness today in that tortured country. The blood-letting has nothing to do with us or with other neighbours of South Africa. Young black South Africans have had more than enough of the brutalities of apartheid and have decided to lay down their lives for their freedom. They have done so of their own volition - without any incitement from beyond the borders of their fatherland, South Africa.

(Mr. Legwaila, Botswana)

And so there is one solution to the problem of violence in South Africa. It is a very simple solution, because we are in no doubt as to the source of the violence. The source of that violence is apartheid. I think we all agree that that is the source of violence in South Africa. Even those who are quick to apologize for South Africa will agree that the source of violence in that country is apartheid from which emanates the terrorism by which the white minority régime in Pretoria seeks to perpetuate white privilege and black misery. It stands to reason, therefore, that peace in South Africa is absolutely incompatible with the existence in that country, in any form whatsoever, of the pestilence of apartheid and the pernicious ideology of white supremacy. Not even the so-called reforms can save that country, let alone the repeated attacks on innocent neighbours under the pretext that they support the aims and objectives of the ANC and others and that because of those aims and objectives we threaten the process of reform. Evil, the unmitigated evil which apartheid represents, can never be reformed; it must simply be destroyed.

The hour is late and, unfortunately, there is no indication whatsoever that the white rulers of South Africa are ready for peaceful change. Blinded by racism and intoxicated by their ability to inflict violence on the oppressed majority in South Africa and on their neighbours, they have misguidedly convinced themselves that they still have time to tinker with apartheid. Every time they open their mouths they boast of the lethal power at their disposal. They have clearly committed themselves to the imposition of a unilateral solution on South Africa, a solution which must leave them in a position of domination. That is why they spat on the Commonwealth eminent persons' initiative on Monday. They attacked three Commonwealth countries in the presence in Cape Town of the eminent persons. It is clear that they were not sincere in inviting the eminent persons to Cape Town for talks. How then, we ask, can anyone suggest that they want peace and that it

(Mr. Legwaila, Botswana)

is the ANC and thousands of young freedom fighters in South Africa who want to perpetuate violence? The white minority régime in South Africa does not want peace. What it wants is entrenchment of the status quo.

Those who believe in Commonwealth miracles - and I am not going to excuse my own country - had invested a great deal of hope in the eminent persons' initiative. Indeed, the eminent persons' first visit to South Africa and the report of their meeting with Nelson Mandela created the impression that reason was beginning to prevail in the land of apartheid and that a Lancaster House-type miracle was about to save the country from the tragedy of wasted opportunities. Unfortunately it was not to be. It turned out that the white rulers of South Africa could not be deflected from the suicidal course on which they had set themselves and their people. With the brazenness normally associated with armed robbers, aeroplane hijackers and pirates, they invaded three Commonwealth countries, two of which are in the group of six which is supposed to monitor the progress of the eminent persons.

If the eminent persons' initiative is not dead - killed by South Africa - it must be presumed to be so wounded, so deformed, that it is now good only for the wheel-chair - which means it is as good as dead alive. The eminent persons themselves were quoted the other day as saying that their initiative was not quite dead. That is an understandable observation by a group of eminent statesmen and women whose mission was doomed from its very birth in Nassau. It was doomed because it was to feed on hope, even against hope itself, in order for it to survive.

(Mr. Legwaila, Botswana)

That is the tragedy of South Africa, the tragedy of apartheid. The Security Council must without any equivocation call South Africa to order. South Africa's apologists, on the other hand, must realize that their permissive attitude towards that incorrigible disturber of peace is a clear encouragement to anarchy and bloodshed in our subcontinent. South Africa must be forced out of Angola, where, in collaboration with the bandits of Jonas Savimbi, it is turning the southern part of that front-line State into a wasteland. It must be forced out of the international Territory of Namibia, where its presence has long been declared illegal. It must leave all the countries of southern Africa to decide their future as they see fit, in freedom and peace.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Botswana for the very kind words he addressed to me.

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

Mr. RAJAIE-KHORASSANI (Islamic Republic of Iran): Mr. President and my dear brother, it is a great pleasure to see the Security Council presided over by a capable person with the admirable qualities that you possess. The Council must be proud of its present President as it was of its President last month, the representative of France, Ambassador de Rémoullat. My compliments go to both for the manner in which the Council was administered in the month of April and is being administered this month.

The issue under consideration is nothing new; it is the perennial problem of Zionism at work in South Africa under the patronage of Zionism's headquarters in the United States, with a veto power in its hand, relaxed in a permanent seat in

(Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani, Islamic  
Republic of Iran)

the Security Council. There are two spectacular instances of fraud by the two enemies of mankind - namely, South Africa and the United States Administration, dominated by Zionism - which no one's intelligence, no matter how naïve, can fail to grasp. The first case of fraud is the apartheid régime's arrogation of democracy to itself, and the second is the United States championing and guarding of human rights. The Pretoria régime is a racist, anti-human régime by every standard; yet it does not feel ashamed of joining the advocates of democracy, as the speech made by its representative yesterday, 22 May, demonstrates. The United States, on the other hand, is a staunch supporter of South Africa. The Security Council is just not able to pressure the apartheid régime into giving up its heinous policies and practices, because the United States is always on guard with a veto to undo all the good work the Council might have been doing for years.

The two enemies of mankind are so confident that they do not mind at all the television reports of the brutal police attacks or military attacks on countries neighbouring South Africa. After all, it is nice to play democracy by just tolerating a few snapshots of those criminal brutalities in order to pacify public opinion in the United States. The important thing is the safety and security of the Zionist racist Pretoria régime, which has the unreserved sanction of the United States. The same United States gets so agitated at the slightest violation of human rights that its President, President Reagan, just cannot sleep comfortably when he learns about such violations.

Libya must be bombarded and "missiled" just because it is - at least from the viewpoint of the United States - accused of supporting terrorism. A telephone conversation or the cracking of a coded message from the Libyan Embassy apparently



(Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani, Islamic  
Republic of Iran)

and allegedly has fully convinced His Excellency the President of the United States of the validity of those charges. He has therefore issued instructions to the United States forces - which are floating everywhere anyway - to take "appropriate action". Libya was "missiled" and then bombarded; innocent civilians, including a baby girl, were killed. But now the same American media claim that both in the blast at the discotheque in Germany and in the operation at the Rome airport it was Syria and not Libya that was not responsible. Very interesting.

First of all, what about those criminal State-launched terrorist attacks against Libya, then? And what about those innocent martyrs in Libya? They have apparently been offered as sacrifices to the insatiable volcano of United States aggression. Secondly, what about the validity of the allegations against Syria? That also is going to be known only after the necessary instructions are carried out against Syria - this time not by the United States naval forces, but by the Zionist base established in Palestine for precisely the same purposes. The United States, however, remains the unchallenged guardian of human rights and a strong enemy - paradoxically enough - of international terrorism. Here we have two fraudulent claims: one, the claim by South Africa to democracy; the other the claim by the United States to the guardianship of human rights and the combating of terrorism. If such parallel cases of fraud are not seen by the Council as being committed by the United States and South Africa, it will be surprising.

(Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani, Islamic  
Republic of Iran)

His Excellency Mr. P.W. Botha of the so-called democratic régime of South Africa maintains that his military attacks on the three neighbouring countries were of the same category as those by the United States on Libya and those by the sister Zionist base occupying Palestine on Tunisia. I believe he is right. All those acts of aggression are of exactly the same character. However, he fails to see that from the viewpoint of the Council that is not the issue. The issue is that it is the American and Zionist aggressions that abet the South African aggressors in their aggression against their neighbours. "If President Reagan can blatantly do it, why cannot President Botha do it?" the latter is telling us in this international forum.

The logical and operational similarities between the two acts of aggression well demonstrate the nature of the three malicious Satanic bases of our small globe, all equally democratic, each complementing the democratic values of the other two. The two Zionist bases - one in South Africa and the other, of course, occupying Palestine - are inferior to the mother base in the United States because the latter has the advantage of being the guardian of human rights as well. The other two are only supporters of democracy.

This Bermuda Triangle that swallows every sign of human values well explains the unreserved veto of the United States on any harsh decisions in the Security Council regarding the two Zionist bases. The last veto was cast on 15 November 1985.

The recent aggressions once again demonstrate the malicious connection between the constructive - or, to use a truer word, destructive - engagement with the acts of aggression of the two Zionist bases of South Africa and the régime occupying Palestine against their neighbours. It should not be forgotten that some neighbours of the United States are not any safer than are the neighbours of South

(Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani, Islamic  
Republic of Iran)

Africa or the neighbours of the Zionist régime occupying Palestine. It has once again become evident why the United States is always against comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa. Once again it becomes evident that military and militant resistance is the only solution against those two petty Satans, and freedom-loving nations should therefore support all liberation movements - the Pan Africanist Congress and the African National Congress, the South West Africa People's Organisation and the heroic military operations of the Lebanese and Palestinian Muslims - instead of dancing to the tune of United States imperialism and calling those operations and liberation movements names and accusing them of terrorism.

Once again, it is evident that the apartheid régime in South Africa, just like the Zionist base occupying Palestine, does not have any reformistic remedy. Both of them are cancers that are to be eradicated by the clean surgery of a military operation.

It becomes evident once again that the slogans of law and order are being exploited for the preservation of the status quo and the perpetuation of apartheid. The \$25 billion from private American banks and the \$1.1 billion-dollar loan by the International Monetary Fund (IMF), thanks to United States pressure, are quite understandable: they are only a modest contribution to the aggressive nature of the Pretoria régime.

Finally, once again it becomes quite evident who is the terrorist and who exercises State terrorism. Attacks on Zimbabwe, Botswana and Zambia at a time when eminent - so to speak - persons of the Commonwealth were in the capital of South Africa for mediation to find a negotiated settlement for the situation may even imply that all those mediations and negotiations may have been nothing more than delaying tactics in order to buy some more time for the Pretoria régime and to

(Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani, Islamic  
Republic of Iran)

postpone the inevitable final assault by all revolutionary freedom-fighters against the apartheid régime.

The attacks on the three neighbouring countries are terrorist attacks against independent States in order to terrorize and destabilize the region. Such tactics are neither new nor unknown to the Council. My Government and all revolutionary people in the Islamic Republic of Iran strongly condemn these acts of military aggression against Zimbabwe, Botswana and Zambia. They all offer their condolences to the good people of the victimized countries. To this effect, the Foreign Ministry of the Islamic Republic of Iran issued the following communiqué at Tehran on 21 May 1986, which I wish to read out to the Council:

(Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani,  
Islamic Republic of Iran)

"On the previous day, the racist régime of South Africa, in accordance with its aggressive nature, blatantly attacked the territories of three independent countries of South Africa. This régime, which is unable to counter the development of ever-increasing movements and protests by the people inside its borders, attacked the capital cities of Botswana, Zambia and Zimbabwe and announced that its aim was to suppress the so-called terrorist camps of the African National Congress.

"The recent aggression by the Pretoria régime against the three countries of southern Africa took place with the co-ordination and the support of United States imperialism at a time when world public opinion had not yet forgotten the savage aggression by the United States against innocent Libya and was still witnessing preparations by the régime occupying Palestine for another aggression against Syria.

"All these savage acts are carried out under the false pretext of combating terrorism, with the real purpose of extinguishing the voice of freedom and breaking down the fast-growing movement and resistance of the peoples of the world against such epitomes of injustice and oppression in today's world as the United States, Israel and South Africa.

"The Islamic Republic of Iran, while condemning this naked aggression against the territories of independent States, calls upon all progressive, peace-loving countries and humanitarian international organizations which support human rights and justice to condemn these acts of aggression and by taking the necessary and co-ordinated measures to simultaneously and decisively counter these crimes.

(Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani,  
Islamic Republic of Iran)

"The Islamic Republic of Iran once again declares its full support for the struggles of the front-line countries and the freedom movements of southern Africa. It declares its support for the struggle of the oppressed people of South Africa until the downfall and the total eradication of the racist régime of Pretoria, which is a dark stain and a source of degradation for humanity."

If my memory does not betray me, at some time towards the end of the 19th century the Boer people occupied the area now called South Africa. The Anglo-Saxons had no problem with that occupation, but when gold and diamonds were discovered they had to go and, so to speak, liberate that region from the Boer occupation.

Namibia is in trouble simply because, particularly after uranium was discovered, it became an obligation of the South African apartheid régime to maintain 100,000 members of its forces there. Oil was found in the Middle East, and now it is a very serious obligation of the United States to be there in order to defend the security of the region.

All those examples of strong defensive commitments by the United States and imperialism remind me of the following verse by Jallal-adin Rumi, the great Persian poet:

"The enemy of the peacock happened to be its own beauty.

"So many kings there are who have been martyred by their own majesty."

I believe that if those resources did not exist in the Arab world or in South Africa or its neighbouring areas the United States would not have so much incentive to support the occupying forces there or those in the Arab countries in the Middle East.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran for the very kind words he addressed to me.

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

Mr. AL-ATASSI (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic): We thank you, Sir, and, through you, the other members of the Council for giving my delegation this opportunity to take part in the deliberations on the problem before it - the South African aggression against Botswana, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

I wish also to take this opportunity to express to you, Sir, the eminent representative of a friendly country, Ghana, our congratulations on your assumption of the presidency for the month of May and on your acknowledged diplomatic skills. We are sure that you will be able to guide the Council's deliberations with great objectivity, thereby enabling it to perform the tasks entrusted to it.

I also wish to offer to Ambassador Claude de Rémoullard of France our thanks for the exemplary manner in which he conducted the Council's work last month.

It was with great consternation and indignation that we learned of the barbarous acts of aggression by the racist Pretoria régime on 19 May against Botswana, Zambia and Zimbabwe. The Council is again meeting, after only a short interval, to consider foreign aggression against those independent States carried out on patently false pretexts and in violation of international law. The world has condemned those acts of aggression, which are a violation of international law and of the sovereignty of three independent States, which are, moreover, Members of the United Nations and the Non-Aligned Movement and African front-line States.

The apartheid régime's armed forces brutally bombed civilians, in particular, refugees in camps established by international organizations.

(Mr. Al-Atassi, Syrian Arab Republic)

I shall not dwell further on these aspects, since preceding speakers have already described them in detail.

My country believes that this act of aggression is but a new episode in a long series of attacks perpetrated by the racist régime against independent sovereign States. Here, we must reaffirm that the South African régime could not continue its acts of aggression against independent States, using the big-stick policy under the pretext of pursuing freedom fighters of the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC) and other freedom fighters, were it not for the material, financial and political support and encouragement abundantly provided by the imperialist Powers with colonial ambitions, in particular the United States. For the United States itself has practised State terrorism against a brother country, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. We along with the international community have not forgotten that act of aggression. United States threats against sovereign States are now a daily occurrence against countries that have themselves become victims of aggression. Their collaborator and accomplice of the racist régime of South Africa, Tel Aviv, has been practising the same policy against the Arab people of Palestine, and, thanks to the lavish assistance of the United States, it has followed that example.

That is part of an expansionist aggressive policy designed to perpetuate the domination of the white minority. The racist régime having failed to stifle domestic opposition then turned to more violent means in an attempt to put down resistance once and for all. A few days ago it was announced that that criminal aggression was only the beginning and that South Africa fully intended to put an end to the freedom fighters.

As a non-aligned country, we fully support the declaration of the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Movement of Non-aligned Countries, which was read out by the representative of India yesterday.



(Mr. Al-Atassi, Syrian Arab Republic)

The Security Council has the duty to shoulder the full measure of its responsibility. The eyes of the world are focused on the Council, and the world expects it to impose sanctions against the South African régime, which has been systematically violating the Charter and seriously endangering international peace. The application of Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter providing for comprehensive mandatory sanctions is the only language the apartheid régime will understand. It would make it possible for the indigenous population to live in freedom and dignity on their ancestral land. The African liberation movements will continue their struggle until the apartheid régime has been dismantled.

We should like to express our solidarity with the African peoples in their just struggle to extirpate the scourge of apartheid.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic for the kind words he addressed to me.

Mr. AL-MOSFIR (United Arab Emirates) (interpretation from Arabic): My delegation and I are very pleased, Sir, to see you presiding over the Council. Your well-known diplomatic abilities and tact leads us to believe that our work will be crowned with success.

We wish to thank Ambassador de Kémoularia for the exemplary and able manner in which he guided the business of the Council last month.

The Council, along with all other organs of the United Nations, has for many long years been seized of the tense situation in southern Africa. That situation is the result of the policies and practices of the racist régime in South Africa. International public opinion is cognizant of that deteriorating situation.

The people of South Africa are daily faced with murder, displacement and the denial of their rights, and that is now also the lot of the front-line States. We are convinced that stability will not be installed in South Africa and peace restored to southern Africa until the apartheid régime is eliminated.

(Mr. Al-Mosfir, United Arab Emirates)

We believe that the Government of South Africa, which has embraced apartheid as its doctrine and way of life, will not abolish it by itself. We also believe that the racist régime was not born on African land, and hence its peaceful elimination will not take place on African land. Its eradication must take place where racism as a theory and a doctrine was born. It must first be eliminated in the culture in which the theory was unveiled. We believe that so long as racism is rooted well beyond the African continent in places that provide South Africa with the wherewithal to continue and survive, then talk about eliminating such a régime will be simply abstract talk devoid of any meaning.

Hence my country has always supported the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa. We believe that without such sanctions and a blockade apartheid cannot be eliminated and peace cannot be restored to southern Africa.

South Africa carried out an act of aggression against Zambia, Zimbabwe and Botswana as a means of consolidating the apartheid régime and undermining the dialogue aimed at a peaceful settlement of the question.

(Mr. Al-Mosfir, United Arab Emirates)

That Government justified those acts of aggression by saying that they were carried out for three reasons: to fight terrorism, for self-defence in accordance with Article 51 of the United Nations Charter and for the defence of civilized nations.

Although the last of those alleged justifications deserves more time and consideration than can be given to it now in this forum, all the South African pretexts to justify its acts of aggression have been used before and have been considered in this Council. Therefore, we need not discuss them again. Nevertheless, we believe that we shall hear more of them in the future and that many other States will be subjected to acts of aggression on those same pretexts. We believe that they will be used to justify any crime that may be perpetrated. The use of such pretexts is a clear indication of the links that exist between those who use them. Therefore, the Security Council must monitor this situation very closely and save whatever can be saved so that this pattern of acts of aggression is not repeated.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of the United Arab Emirates for the kind words he addressed to me.

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

Mr. MUDENGE (Zimbabwe): Because Ghana was the first sub-Saharan African State to defeat colonialism and attain freedom and for long remained a standard-bearer in the struggle against imperialism and a source of solace for the dispossessed of our continent, it occupies a very special place in the hearts of all Africans. And of course it is also the beloved land of that great son of Africa, Dr. Kwame Nkrumah. You, Sir, therefore, are the embodiment of those noble traditions of your country, and my delegation could not, with the subject at hand in mind, have wished for a better President of the Council for this month.

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

My delegation wishes to put on record its appreciation of the efficient way in which the representative of France guided the work of the Council during the month of April.

What took place in the small hours of Monday, 19 May 1986, is now a matter of public record. Agents of the racist Pretoria régime attacked the capitals of the republics of Botswana, Zambia and Zimbabwe. That same afternoon my Prime Minister, the Honourable Robert Mugabe, issued a statement outlining what happened and expressing Zimbabwe's position on those events. That statement reads as follows.

"The South African racist and apartheid régime carried out a midnight attack against the sovereign State of Zimbabwe on ANC targets located at two places in Harare.

"The barbarous acts were perpetrated at 16 Angwa Street in the city and at 19 Eve's Crescent in Ashdown Park. At 16 Angwa Street, the racists caused damage to a public building used partly as a restaurant and hairdressing salon and partly as executive offices. There was injury to a private security guard.

"At 19 Eve's Crescent no one was injured as the former ANC house was not occupied. At both places, the racists in panic left various equipment, including communication items, vehicles and explosives when security forces reacted to the attacks.

"In follow-up operations security forces have arrested three, and I believe the number now is four, suspects who are now helping police with investigations. More information will be released as soon as this investigation is completed.

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

"The two cowardly and unprovoked attacks are clearly aimed at Zimbabwe as one of the Front Line States. The racist South African régime has, by these acts of wanton aggression against the Front Line States, clearly become a terrorist organisation which unleashes without any moral restraint barbaric attacks against its neighbours in defence and justification of the evil and inhuman system it advocates.

"The barbaric racist régime in Pretoria has obviously failed to stem the tide of the revolution in South Africa or to satisfy the just demands of its oppressed majority and deliberately chooses to blame neighbouring independent States for its internal problems.

"We refuse to accept responsibility for the internal strife in South Africa. The racists blame and attack us as well as others for supporting the just struggle in South Africa and for giving shelter and assistance to refugees fleeing from the wrath of the racists.

"Zimbabwe will not be deterred from rendering assistance to the liberation movements of South Africa in the form of political, material and moral support in the context of the OAU Charter.

"Today's wanton military aggression underlines two related factors. One, that the South African régime has adopted State terrorism as a policy that is bound to lead to a dangerous security situation in the region because we who are the victims of such a policy will have to defend ourselves. Two, in order to guarantee peace and security in the region, the international community should take immediate steps to isolate the South African régime by imposing comprehensive mandatory economic sanctions."

Analysts and writers have been trying to fathom the rationale and timing of these events. There seems to be unanimity that the choice of targets was militarily dubious, the timing mind-boggling and the results paltry and pathetic, if only they were not so sadly tragic.

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

In Gaborone the airborne-raiders managed to destroy, as we are told, some housing estates and killed an innocent Botswana football player, as well as wounding two others, before being chased away by fire from the local security forces. In Zambia the screeching jet fighters and the group of commandos managed to kill a Namibian refugee and to wound 10 others, including two Angolan children - one two years old, the other five - in the bombing of a refugee camp near Lusaka. In Harare, a Zimbabwean night-watchman was injured by flying debris in downtown Harare. The intended targets were supposed to be a public building housing executive offices, a hair salon and a restaurant. I have here a picture of the "Go-Go" restaurant, which is underneath the little office that is supposed to be the "operational centre" of the ANC; next to this little restaurant is a hair salon. They are all public places, always full of people. The second target was a house in one of the suburbs of Harare which was used by ANC officials. This small house was supposed to be a "transit facility".

The Council is being asked to believe that an official United Nations refugee camp in Zambia, a housing estate in Botswana and a small public office and house in Zimbabwe were major "operational centres" and "transit facilities" threatening the security of South Africa.

Surely, if the racist régime wants to delude itself, it can go ahead, but it should not expect the world community to be so imbecilic as to believe such hogwash. The ANC has bigger and better offices and residences in London, in New York, in Paris, in Brussels, in Rome - well, I could go on - and elsewhere, than it ever had in Harare. Are these also guerrilla "operational centres" and "transit facilities"? And is Mr. Botha going to send his murder squads to London, New York and other places to destroy those facilities? If the United States, the United Kingdom and the rest of the international community accept their obligations to

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

allow such offices to exist in their countries, why must the same obligation be denied in the case of Zimbabwe? As a member of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), the Non-Aligned Movement and the United Nations, we have similar obligations and we cannot shirk those responsibilities. No, Pretoria's declared reasons for attacking its chosen targets are specious, illogical and nonsensical. As always, its arguments are deceptive: a farrago of lies, evasions and spurious drivel.

The racists attacked the three countries primarily because they represent the antithesis of their own policies. They are good examples of successful non-racial societies and implacable opponents of the evil system of apartheid existing in South Africa. Secondly, the régime is trying to divert attention from its internal upheavals and discords by creating fictitious outside enemies, a classic ploy employed by most fascist régimes. Thirdly, the racists want to tarnish the image of its neighbours, in particular that of Zimbabwe, which is soon to host the Eighth Summit Conference of the Non-Aligned Movement. And, finally, the three countries are a danger to the racist régime because they believe and practice what, to the apartheid régime, are subversive ideas, such as democracy, equality of man, brotherhood of man, non-racism, and so forth. Botha foolishly believes that he can insulate the majority of his countrymen from these ideas. How pathetic! Like a latter day king Canute, he stands vain-gloriously at the Limpopo with his arms outstretched in a futile attempt to stop the rising tidal wave of freedom buffeting his land. And like the earlier Canute, his own failure is equally guaranteed.

Botha's arguments for attacking his neighbours have neither moral nor legal validity and are basically dishonest. He quotes article 51 of the United Nations Charter to justify his actions as self-defense and refers to the United States attack on Libya as if it were a precedent already accepted in international law.

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

My Government's view on this has previously been expressed and is on record. I have heard of the devil quoting the scriptures, but I never thought I would witness such an obvious example.

Apartheid, according to the United Nations, is a crime against humanity. The Botha régime is guilty of this crime. Genocide, states the United Nations Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, is a crime against humanity. The apartheid régime stand accused of genocide. The daily slaughter of black babies, school children, men, women and children has now reached genocidal proportions. It is the duty and obligation of every man, woman and child - nay, of every civilized nation - to stand up and resist these crimes against humanity being perpetrated by the apartheid régime. That régime is bereft of any moral or legal right to exist. It is beyond the pale. It cannot invoke for its protection the higher principles that govern civilized man in his international relations.

We say to Botha: "The United Nations, whose international instruments you have deigned to quote in vain in your defence, anathematize you and deny you any right to exist as a government. It condemns you to damnation. It calls for the liquidation of your system of government."

Yesterday in the Council the representative of the racist régime asked South Africa's neighbours to accept the socio-political system existing in his country as a condition for establishing good-neighbourly relations. But we ask: how can we accept an evil system and a crime against humanity? Furthermore, he asked us to come to an agreement with him and his country for peace in our region. We say: "how strange that you can dare to ask us to enter into agreements with you when your treachery was amply demonstrated in the Nkomati Accord." We say to South Africa, "first show us that you can honour your word by fulfilling your obligations under the Nkomati Accord."



JSM/gmr

S/PV.2686  
89-90

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

Not only are Botha's raids bereft of any moral or legal justification, but their very timing has caused great dismay, because they took place at the very moment when a Commonwealth group of eminent persons was in South Africa trying to find a solution to that country's problems. How crazy can one be?

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

I am reminded of your country, Mr. President, where two market women were boasting to each other about the wonders of modern technology. The first woman said, "You know, my cousin came back from London with a wooden leg, and every day he runs for five miles." The second woman said, "Ah, but mine came from the United States. He has two wooden legs and one wooden arm, and he takes part in the 30-mile marathon every year". Next to them was a young South African female student. She said, "Well, where I come from there is a man with a wooden head, and he runs the country."

That being said, it is important that we should not lose sight of the fact that the recent raids are not isolated aberrations. No. They are part and parcel of a well-laid policy of sanctions against the front-line and neighbouring States. Yes, Pretoria has been systematically implementing its own policy of sanctions against its neighbours. The policy involves the use of economic, military and political sanctions against each one of us. These sanctions are applied regularly and remorselessly. What happened on Monday is in this context largely symbolic in its significance, valued by Pretoria for its high visibility rather than for its actual material damage to the three countries. In the case of Zimbabwe, it would appear, Pretoria genuinely thought it was doing it to please some of its big friends which, so it believed, wanted to see Zimbabwe's wings clipped. However, the more insidious and pervasive sanctions are imposed largely unannounced.

Pretoria's policy of sanctions against its neighbours is well articulated in a paper produced in 1981 at the specific request of the racist régime by one Professor Deon Geldenhuys, a South African foreign policy consultant. The paper, entitled "Some strategic implications of regional economic relationships for South Africa", has now been published and is there to be read. It is no longer a secret. The paper shows how South Africa could, to summarize: first, use its railways and harbours to squeeze, pressure or strangle any of its land-locked

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

neighbours, that is, by manipulating the availability of rail trucks and berthing facilities and imposing surcharges or announcing restrictions on the amount of goods to be exported through South Africa; secondly, limit or ban the importation of labour from its neighbours; thirdly, use border posts to harass nationals of those States that use South Africa to reach the outside world; and fourthly, curb and regulate the amount of such goods as petroleum which may pass to neighbouring States. I will leave it at that. The paper stresses that South Africa must act in such a way that the outside world never sees that it is being done deliberately.

The measures cited have been and are being employed regularly. We recently saw what the manipulation of border posts can achieve. In the case of Lesotho, a Government collapsed as a result. The limiting or banning of labour importation has at one time or another been used against almost all South Africa's neighbours. It is calculated that Mozambique alone had lost about \$2.6 billion by 1984 as a result of labour-related reprisals by South Africa. In the case of Zimbabwe, South Africa has used armed bandits to destroy the major rail connection between Zimbabwe and Mozambique, with the result that the bulk of its goods are forced to go through the longer and more expensive South African harbours. This has resulted in Zimbabwe's having to pay \$500 more per tonne to export some of its goods than if it had been using the shorter routes through Mozambique. This is true also of Zambia. In the case of Angola, we all know what Stinger-missile-carrying UNITA criminal bandits have done to paralyse the Banguela line.

We could go on to give many more concrete examples of these sanctions, but I believe that we have made our point that South Africa has a policy of political and economic sanctions against its neighbours. We have previously pointed out that South African sanctions against the South African Development Co-ordination

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

Conference (SADCC) countries have cost the countries concerned at least \$10 billion in the last five years. South Africa is also known to have brought about the death of at least 100,000 people in neighbouring States through its destabilization activities. These are real and horrendous facts and figures.

This is the reality of our situation. Since South Africa is already using the sanctions weapon against us, and the weapon is demonstrably effective, we cannot understand why some of our Western friends try to argue that sanctions against South Africa (a) are morally wrong, (b) will hurt the wrong people, (c) will not be effective and (d) will hurt neighbouring States, and so on and so forth. We are already being hurt and we know that they are effective - indeed, even against South Africa itself. We know that the world banking community nearly brought South Africa to its knees when it unintentionally imposed limited sanctions against it.

What we are today asking from the Council is not much. We are not asking for the imposition of new sanctions by the Council. No. We are asking for the conversion of the present United Nations voluntary measures adopted by the Council - some of which have been endorsed by the Commonwealth, others by the European Economic Community (EEC), and some of which are already law in the United States of America - into mandatory and obligatory sanctions. We have not introduced anything that is not already in effect. All that we are asking from the Council is that it now send a stronger message to South Africa than the previous messages, which seem not to have impressed it up to now. We are asking for a demonstration of political will, for resolution and determination by the Council.

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

Let us therefore avoid clothing our self-interest in sanctimonious hypocrisy. We need to sit down as friends and declare our true interests to each other so that we may honestly see how we can achieve our common goal of saving South Africa from the brink of disaster. Let us abjure gimmickry and all manner of dissimulation. We say to our Western friends: we have a pretty good idea of your fears and interests in South Africa. We know you want to protect those interests. We are ready to discuss them with you. But this must be on the basis of honesty and frankness.

Before I conclude, let me appeal to my friends in the United States. It is time to abandon linkage, constructive engagement and the supply of Stinger missiles. Those are not policies but fantasies and delusions, and prescriptions for disaster in our region. They have blocked Namibian independence and have given respectability to racist South Africa. We therefore ask our American friends to think again.

Finally, we should like to speak to all our friends, for we know that in history there are times to talk and times to act. We admire the mystery of birth because we have seen much death. We hope that there is no one who deludes himself by believing that he or she can use the racist régime to deter us from our chosen course or to teach us lessons in obedience. As my Prime Minister has stated, for us it is clear that the

"South African régime has adopted State terrorism as a policy that is bound to lead to a dangerous security situation in the region, because we who are victims of such policy will have to defend ourselves."

Let us hope that no one is about to start a forest fire,

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Zimbabwe for the very kind words he addressed to my country and to me.

Mr. ALLEYNE (Trinidad and Tobago): It gives me very great pleasure indeed to extend to you, Sir, my sincere congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of May. I know that under your able stewardship the Council's work will be guided with competence and impartiality.

I wish also to pay a tribute to your predecessor, Ambassador de Kémoullaria, the Permanent Representative of France, for the energetic and responsible manner in which he led the Security Council's work during the month of April.

Racist South Africa's acts of aggression against Botswana, Zambia and Zimbabwe on 19 May 1986 constitute further conclusive evidence that the situation in South Africa is one which undoubtedly calls for the kind of action appropriate to cases of threats to or breaches of international peace under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter.

As recently as 13 February 1986 the Council, in its resolution 581 (1986), strongly condemned racist South Africa for its threats to continue acts of aggression against the front-line and other States in southern Africa. Moreover, the racist régime of South Africa was strongly warned against committing any acts of aggression, terrorism and destabilization against African States.

It was thus with incredulity and indignation that we learned that the racist régime of South Africa had launched once more wanton, unprovoked military raids into Botswana, Zambia and Zimbabwe, resulting in injury, loss of life and damage to property. On behalf of the Government and people of Trinidad and Tobago, I extend sincere condolences to the respective Governments and the bereaved families affected by those recent acts and reaffirm our solidarity with the Governments and peoples of those countries in their efforts to safeguard their sovereignty, independence and non-aligned positions.

The apartheid régime, by its actions, has ignored and stood in defiance of the will of the international community and continues to challenge the United Nations and the Charter.

(Mr. Alleyne, Trinidad and Tobago)

The Security Council, on which the Charter has bestowed responsibility for maintaining and restoring international peace and security, must now discharge its responsibility in the light of the racist régime's recent acts of aggression.

The Pretoria régime's assault on international peace and security, as manifested by its continued attacks on southern African States, has as its origin that régime's persistence in perpetuating the heinous system of apartheid in South Africa. Apartheid, characterized as a crime against humanity, has been unequivocally condemned by the international community in general and the Security Council in particular. Moreover, the immediate eradication of apartheid is generally regarded as a necessary step towards the attainment of peace and stability in southern Africa. However, despite the Council's condemnation of the apartheid system, the Pretoria régime has ignored numerous calls to effect peaceful change in South Africa through the complete abolition of apartheid. On the contrary, the apartheid régime persistently manufactures designs further to entrench apartheid. News of the wanton killings, continued violence and massive repression against the black people and all opponents of apartheid consistently evoke deep anxiety and the profound indignation of the international community.

My delegation is convinced that the violence and repression of the South African régime have greatly aggravated the situation in South Africa and will certainly lead to increasingly violent conflict, with serious international repercussions.

(Mr. Alleyne, Trinidad and Tobago)

Attempts by the international community and the Security Council to effect a peaceful solution to the question of South Africa have failed to produce the desired results. These latest attacks, coming as they did when the Eminent Persons Group of the Commonwealth was in southern Africa and in the very throes of efforts to bring solutions by peaceful means, must give us pause. It is now imperative that the Security Council act with unmistakable resolve by imposing sanctions against the South African régime, in accordance with Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter. This appears to be the most effective option for this body if it sincerely wishes successfully to combat the apartheid system and bring peace to southern Africa.

Is the Council in need of a precedent? Let us not forget resolution 388 (1976) in the case of another racist régime, that of Rhodesia, when the Council overcame all hesitation and acted in the interests of peace and security, imposing sanctions.

In the instant case, permit me to quote from the statement made, following these recent raids by South Africa, by the Minister of External Affairs of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago:

"Nothing short of economic sanctions or even stronger action appears capable of bringing about a solution to the problem".

Trinidad and Tobago regards attempts to cite Article 51 of the United Nations Charter as justification for the armed attacks across international boundaries as specious, spurious and intellectually insulting arguments which also constitute underhanded attempts to revise the United Nations Charter outside the very framework of the United Nations.



(Mr. Alleyne, Trinidad and Tobago)

This phenomenon is even more bewildering if we consider that this latest attempt at revising Article 51 of the Charter in order to sanction aggression is being manifested by a régime that sustains itself on repression and massive violence against the overwhelming majority of the people within its own borders.

My delegation wishes to conclude its statement on the matter before us by urging members of the Security Council to see that the imposition of comprehensive, mandatory sanctions against the racist Pretoria régime is the only peaceful means left to the Council to achieve its goal - that is, the establishment of a non-racial democratic society in South Africa, a society based on self-determination and majority rule through the full and free exercise of universal adult suffrage by all the people. It is only through the imposition of such sanctions that the peaceful eradication of the apartheid system can be achieved and peace and security restored to southern Africa.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Trinidad and Tobago for his kind words addressed to me.

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

I wish to begin by paying a richly deserved tribute to last month's President of the Security Council, Mr. Claude de Kémoullaria of France, for his leadership. I am glad that he is here in person to listen to my delegation's very sincere thanks and appreciation for the leadership which, with his sagacity and style, he afforded the Council.

The Ghana delegation joins the international community today in condemnation of the latest outrage perpetrated by the racist minority régime of South Africa

(The President)

against the sovereign States of Botswana, Zambia and Zimbabwe. My delegation finds the South African attacks to be - and here we use the words of the United States delegation - reprehensible, irresponsible and inexcusable. Our profound shock and dismay at these illegal and barbarous acts by the racist régime of South Africa can be tempered only by the hope that adequate lessons will be drawn by all of us from these events and a bold and clear signal sent to the apartheid régime at the end of our deliberations that the Council will no longer tolerate violations of the United Nations Charter with impunity.

Only a few months ago, in a debate prompted by similar circumstances - namely, the violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Angola by the Botha régime - the Secretary for Foreign Affairs of Ghana, Mr. Obed Asamoah, had occasion to forewarn the Security Council that racist South Africa - and I quote his words:

"in keeping with its character of bigotry and contempt for the black man, ... will most likely repeat the same barbarous acts in the future" (S/FV.2617, p.27).

Subsequent atrocities perpetrated by the racist régime against Lesotho, Botswana and Angola, coupled with the Monday, 19 May, air strikes against Botswana, Zambia and Zimbabwe provide painful and disturbing vindication of that premonition. To those who have been tempted in the past to give the racist régime the benefit of the doubt, we repeat today that South African State-organized terror, manifested in illegal and violent incursions into the territories of the front-line States, either directly or through proxies such as the bandit UNITA mercenaries, has been and will continue to be a central feature of its policies.

These policies have as their corner-stone a pernicious determination to destabilize the front-line States in support of the racist régime's dual aim of maintaining its illegal stranglehold over Namibia and pressuring the front-line

(The President)

States into denying support for the liberation movements. My delegation is only too aware that there is nothing new in these latest acts of aggression against the front-line States, which are yet another demonstration of South Africa's continued contempt for international law and public opinion. What is striking, however, is the extent to which the racist régime could go to escalate tension in the region and, by so doing, further endanger international peace and security. It is this threat to the peace and stability of southern Africa which must engage the serious concern of the Security Council.

It is a matter of deep regret to the Ghana delegation that the racist minority régime has been able to defy the international community for so long because of the political and diplomatic support accorded it and, principally, because of the attitude of some Member States. The consistent pleas, both direct and indirect, that the racist régime be given more time for a peaceful change have proved illusory. Be that as it may, we have seen, especially since last summer, by the cycle of violence and killings perpetrated by the racist régime that the South African authorities do not know and do not care for the language of peace. In that regard, we deem the continued opposition of some members of the international community to the imposition of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa to be indirect support, if even inadvertent, for the Botha régime.

(The President)

Indeed, the significance of the timing of Monday's raid cannot be lost on us. Those barbarous acts occurred at a time when the group of eminent persons set up by the summit meeting of Commonwealth Heads of State and Government were busy cutting out the path of peace towards a negotiated political settlement. The attacks also occurred at a time when talks to improve security in the area generally were in progress, and they occurred at a time when the deaths among black South Africans at the hands of the repressive apartheid régime had reached an all-time high of about five to six persons a day. What clearer demonstration do we require than those acts to show that Botha is a man of war and that the racist régime finds greater security in terror than in reason?

In the light of those events, my delegation urges a concerted and united effort in the deliberations of the Council to adopt concrete measures that leave no doubt as to our resolve to eradicate apartheid and remove the threat to international peace and security that it poses. In calling for concrete measures we are particularly mindful of the fact that the credibility of this body to follow through on its pronouncements is at stake. We cannot afford an image that casts our countless resolutions on South Africa as mere formulas for inaction. That would only benefit the enemies of peace in South Africa.

Members of the Council will have noticed that many representatives who have spoken before the Council, both yesterday and this morning, have posed the question of how many times the Council wanted South Africa to commit aggression against sovereign and independent countries before it acted. That question, posed again and again, is the veritable expression of the dwindling confidence in the Council. The Council should reflect seriously on this unhappy situation if anarchy is to be averted internationally.

Let me remind our colleagues in this body that we are the Security Council; we are endowed with the mandate to prevent the situation under discussion, and we

(The President)

are expected to use the powers vested in the Council to defend the Charter. Let us act with resolution and not give comfort to those who, by their actions, destroy the very basis of our Organization.

What is the nature and import of the recent actions of the South African Government against the front-line States? Those attacks are morally indefensible because they were violent; they constitute State terrorism by our common definition; they contravene the letter and spirit of the Charter; they are in pursuit of the preservation of a system universally condemned by the international community, especially by the Security Council, and they add to a long chain of similar and inexcusable acts of aggression in the past. For what reason then would this Council stay action under its mandate against this recalcitrant State? Yes, the present Government of South Africa is a minority régime and represents white interests, but there are also no saving graces for its present situation. In fact, were the Council to desist again from acting resolutely in this case, it would inadvertently be concurring in State terrorism, in illegality and in racism. The Council, in our view, should resist the temptation.

It is for those cogent reasons that the Ghana delegation has co-sponsored draft resolution S/18087 now before the Council. Members of the Council will note that it stops short of demanding the imposition of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa, even though that is the policy of the Ghana Government. That is to make it possible for the Council to adopt a decision in the current debate unanimously. The limited and selective actions proposed are not new, as has been explained. They are actions that legislative bodies and multilateral organizations, especially those of the West, have already instituted against the racist régime. The intention is therefore to bring those actions too under the umbrella of the United Nations. With slight adjustments of language in the draft resolution, we believe that a unanimous decision could be reached, and we

(The President)

urge all members of the Council to join in the solemn effort to achieve success this time round. To limit ourselves to a mere condemnation of the military raid - a course of action already taken several times over in the past - would be unwittingly to encourage South Africa to repeat its crime again and again. But, more than that, we appeal to our colleagues on the Council to join in sending an unambiguous message to the rulers of Pretoria that the Council does not and will not underwrite illegal aggression, apartheid and racism. In other words, the expression of the firm collective will of the Council against South Africa's bad faith and naked military aggression against other Member States is now even more important than South Africa's crime. Let the Council not fail in this moment of truth.

The Ghana delegation wishes to state at this point that Botswana, Zambia and Zimbabwe are entitled not only to assistance that would enable them better to defend their territories from the aggression of the South African Defence Forces and their proxies, but also to full and fair compensation for the damage to life and property occasioned by this criminal act.

In conclusion, I wish, on behalf of the people and the Government of Ghana, to convey sincere condolences to the peoples and Governments of Botswana, Zambia and Zimbabwe in this difficult time. Our support for the national liberation movements in their just struggle will continue undeterred. To our colleagues on the Council, we address our plea for justice and the unwavering defence of the Charter. We hope this plea will not be ignored.

I now resume my functions as President of the Council.

The representative of the United States of America has asked to make a statement in exercise of the right of reply, and I now call upon her.

Miss BYRNE (United States of America): We have listened today to yet another effort by the Soviet Union, Libya and Iran to stand truth on its head. As we well know, those three countries continue their established practice of the big lie - that is, the more frequently an untruth is repeated, the greater the chance it will be accepted. My delegation will not permit such lies to pass unchallenged.

(Miss Byrne, United States)

There is an old English proverb that fits the concoction of distortions, evasions and outright inventions we have heard today from those three delegations: "Birds of a feather flock together". I trust it will also not have escaped notice that the representative of Iran called for the elimination by military force of a sovereign Member in good standing of this Organization - Israel.

To catalogue this sorry list of insults would, however, take more of the Council's time than they merit. Suffice it to say that we reject them totally.

My delegation rejects the lie that there is a connection between the United States action against Libya and the South African raids against Botswana, Zambia and Zimbabwe. Libya is the world's principal proponent of State-sponsored terrorism. Iran is not far behind. Every week brings fresh reports of Libyan diplomats - I use the term warily - expelled from one or another country for "activities incompatible with their status".

On the other hand, the Governments of Botswana, Zambia and Zimbabwe have made serious efforts to end the vicious cycle of cross-border violence directed at South Africa. It should therefore be obvious to all that there is no similarity whatsoever between the terrorist-dominated foreign policy of Libya and the efforts to promote dialogue and co-operation made by the three front-line States.

We also reject as a perversion of the truth the allegation that the United States policy of constructive engagement - that is, the active promotion of dialogue and co-operation among the States of southern Africa - is responsible for the South African raids. The United States condemns the actions of the South African Government, and today took concrete measures to express our condemnation. The United States Government's expulsion of the South African military attaché in Washington and recall of our military attaché in Pretoria are evidence of our outrage over the violation by the South African military of the sovereignty of Botswana, Zambia and Zimbabwe.



(Miss Byrne, United States)

The constructive approach of the United States and the other industrialized democracies to the African continent will be evident next week during the special session of the General Assembly. It will be interesting to observe during the debate what, besides words and weapons, the Soviet Union and its allies offer the nations of Africa.

The meeting was suspended at 8.05 p.m. and resumed at 9.55 p.m.

The PRESIDENT: The representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya has asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. FARTAS (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (interpretation from Arabic): I apologize for asking to speak at such a late hour, after a long list of speakers. But what we heard this evening made it necessary for me to exercise the right of reply.

The proverb used by the United States representative, "birds of a feather flock together", is also an Arabic proverb. I am not concerned here with the origin of the proverb but I am interested in the fact that Botha, the leader of the South African régime, gave a good demonstration of it when he announced that the United States had provided him with a precedent when it launched an air strike against Libya. Botha made a general rule of that precedent, a rule he could invoke whenever he wanted to strike against one of South Africa's neighbouring countries.

His invoking of that rule on the basis of the American precedent is the embodiment of that proverb used by the United States representative. The leader of the racist régime would take it as a pretext to act in self-defence in order to eliminate "terrorism", as a justification for his aggression and for committing acts of aggression against neighbouring African countries. That is exactly what was done by the United States of America when it launched its barbaric and wanton aggression against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. The American precedent invoked by the leader of the racist régime in South Africa is in total contravention of Article 2 (4) of the Charter, which proscribes the threat or use of force in international relations, as it is also against Article 51.

(Mr. Fartas, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

The United States was not acting in self-defence. The Libyan fleet was not manoeuvring in American waters and had not launched any missiles against American targets. The opposite is correct. The United States has been constantly conducting military manoeuvres off the Libyan coast; it has sent aircraft to strike at targets on the Libyan coast as part . . . practising with live ammunition. The whole world was shocked by that American raid against the cities of Tripoli and Benghazi, whose victims were children and the elderly. That was the precedent to which the leader of the racist régime in South Africa referred.

The Council's failure to condemn that American raid has encouraged the leader of the racist régime to invoke that precedent. This is a very dangerous matter in international relations and in international conduct. The American raid against Libya has been linked to the aggression of the racist régime against Zimbabwe, Zambia and Botswana, and not against Iran or Syria. But it was launched by the strategic ally of the United States, which is South Africa.

A while ago we heard that three delegations would use the veto against the draft resolution submitted to the Council. Those three delegations are the same delegations that vetoed the condemnation of the American raid against Libya. If that rumour is correct, it will not be a coincidence. It will be an affirmation of the reply given by the leader of the racist régime in South Africa.

Mr. ALLEYNE (Trinidad and Tobago): After protracted negotiations on the text of the draft resolution (S/18087), the authors have asked me to introduce the following oral revisions.

In the second preambular paragraph, fourth line, delete the words "and from acting" and replace them by the word "or", so that the phrase would read "independence of any State or in any other manner".

In the seventh preambular paragraph, first line, delete the word "international" and insert after the word "security" the words "in southern Africa", so that the paragraph would read:

"Gravely concerned also at the threats to peace and security in southern Africa created by the acts of aggression by the racist régime of South Africa in Botswana, Zambia and Zimbabwe on 19 May 1986".

In the ninth preambular paragraph, delete the last word, "humanity", and replace it by the words "the conscience and dignity of mankind", so that it would read "a crime against the conscience and dignity of mankind".

In the eleventh preambular paragraph, third line, delete the penultimate word, "Western".

In the twelfth preambular paragraph, delete the words "completely failed" at the end of the paragraph and replace them by the words "not succeeded", so that the paragraph would read:

"Noting that the so-called policy of constructive engagement has not succeeded".

The next revision involves a formulation for a new eighteenth preambular paragraph, which would be inserted after the present seventeenth preambular paragraph and would read:

"Taking note also of the efforts of the eminent persons group in the search for a peaceful solution to the situation in southern Africa".

(Mr. Alleyne, Trinidad and  
Tobago)

The former eighteenth preambular paragraph, beginning with the words "Recalling further its resolution 569 (1985)" now becomes the nineteenth preambular paragraph.

There are no changes to operative paragraphs 1, 2, 3 or 4.

In operative paragraph 5, delete the words "and their national liberation movements", so that the paragraph would read:

"Expresses further its solidarity with the people of South Africa in their struggle for freedom and justice in the land of their birth".

In operative paragraph 6, delete "Chapter VII" and replace it with the words "the provisions" so that it would read:

"Acting in accordance with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations".

There are no further revisions to the text.

On behalf of the sponsors of the draft resolution, I request that the Council proceed to the vote on the draft resolution as revised. I hope that with these revisions the Council can proceed to adopt the draft resolution.

The PRESIDENT: I note that the representative of Trinidad and Tobago has requested a vote on the draft resolution contained in document S/18087, as orally revised by him on behalf of the sponsors.

Sir John THOMSON (United Kingdom): I am very grateful to the representative of Trinidad and Tobago for his oral amendments, which I think are indeed helpful, and I should like, in the light of that, therefore, to ask for a separate vote on the twelfth preambular paragraph and on operative paragraph 6.

Mr. ALLEYNE (Trinidad and Tobago): In accordance with rule 32, I should like to ask that we proceed to a vote on the draft resolution, as revised, as a whole.

The PRESIDENT: I should like to quote the relevant part of rule 32 of the provisional rules of procedure which states:

"Parts of a motion or of a draft resolution shall be voted on separately at the request of any representative, unless the original mover objects."

Since the sponsors of the draft resolution object to the proposal to vote on separate parts of the draft resolution, the Council will now consider the draft resolution in its entirety.

Sir John THOMSON (United Kingdom): Mr. President, I heard you say that the original movers of the draft resolution objected to the proposal I made. I did not actually hear the representative of Trinidad and Tobago say so and I was not clear that he was doing so. Could I have clarification on this point?

Mr. ALLEYNE (Trinidad and Tobago): I should have thought that, if someone asked that we vote on the draft resolution in separate parts and I, as the representative of the movers, asked instead that we vote on the draft resolution as a whole, that met the case. However, to remove all question of doubt, I wish to inform the Council, through you, Sir, that I have been authorized by the original movers of the draft resolution, as orally revised, to inform the Council that we

(Mr. Alleyne, Trinidad  
and Tobago)

object to the proposal and ask that we proceed to vote on the draft resolution in toto.

The PRESIDENT: It is my understanding that the Council is ready to proceed to the vote on the draft resolution submitted by the Congo, Ghana, Madagascar, Trinidad and Tobago and the United Arab Emirates, contained in document S/18087, as orally revised. Unless I hear any objection, I shall put the draft resolution to the vote now.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

Does any member of the Council wish to make a statement before the voting?

Mr. de KEMOULARIA (France) (interpretation from French): The delegation of France would have very much hoped that the unanimous condemnation of the international community of the raids of South Africa against Botswana, Zambia and Zimbabwe could have been expressed through a resolution clearly indicating the unequivocal reprobation of all members of the Security Council.

My delegation takes the view that, in the circumstances, there are no grounds for replacing national measures by mandatory sanctions. Hence we could not accept the original draft resolution. Furthermore, my delegation cannot accept certain formulations used in the present draft resolution now before us.

The French delegation made its position known to the sponsors of the draft resolution. Some of our proposals have been taken into account, but my delegation sincerely regrets the fact that the changes that have been made are not sufficient to enable us to vote in favour of the draft resolution. In these circumstances, my delegation will be compelled to abstain in the voting.

The PRESIDENT: Since there are no other delegations wishing to make a statement before the voting, I shall now put draft resolution S/18087, as orally revised, to the vote.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

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

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

Abstaining: France

The PRESIDENT: The result of the voting is as follows: 12 votes in favour, 2 against and 1 abstention. The revised draft resolution has not been adopted owing to the negative vote of a permanent member of the Council.

I shall now call on any member of the Council who may wish to make a statement following the voting.



Miss BYRNE (United States of America): On numerous occasions in the past, before this body and elsewhere, the United States has explained the reasons underlying our opposition to mandatory economic sanctions. We do not believe that the destruction of the South African economy serves anyone's interests, least of all those who suffer under apartheid. My Government further believes that a severance of economic ties would lead ineluctably to the severance of political ones, depriving us of any leverage over Pretoria, depriving the international community of any ability to work for the timely and complete dismantling of apartheid. The United States will not turn its back on the millions of blacks in South Africa and on a growing number of whites there who look to the West to lead the South African Government out of its crude and inhuman political system into one where the voice of the majority participates directly in the formulation of national and international policy.

For the aforementioned reasons, my Government cannot support language calling for the imposition of mandatory sanctions. We believe that all States should be able to decide for themselves what measures are most appropriate as we pursue our common goal of destroying apartheid.

Sir John THOMSON (United Kingdom): All members of the Council, I am sure, will regret that the Security Council cannot represent its united condemnation of South Africa's recent actions through the adoption of a unanimous resolution. Nevertheless, all members of the Council do condemn South Africa's recent actions against its neighbours. There should be no doubt about that. It is, unfortunately, the result of a tactical situation that this message is not coming out as loudly and clearly from this Council as my delegation had hoped.

The draft resolution as put to the vote has incorporated in it passages which we warned the sponsors were unacceptable to us and for reasons which we gave. Those reasons are well known. I need not repeat them because we have put them

(Sir John Thomson, United Kingdom)

forward repeatedly. I need only refer to my statement earlier today, to my statement in the Security Council on 15 November 1985 and to that in the General Assembly on 29 October 1985.

There are, however, one or two points that I think it useful to emphasize. First, despite this unfortunate outcome, the Council has demonstrated during the debate its strong and unanimous condemnation of South Africa's actions. My delegation would have voted in favour of all those operative paragraphs except operative paragraph 6. Secondly, we believe that nothing must be done that would undermine the chances of a successful outcome, however hard to achieve, to the Commonwealth initiative. This initiative, after all, deals with the main point: it deals with the peaceful abolition of apartheid, and this Council has said again and again that apartheid is at the root of the problems of South and southern Africa. That is so. Of all that is being done and that has been tried for many years, the Commonwealth initiative holds out the best prospects of there being, through negotiation with the right people, a peaceful solution to the problems of South Africa through the abolition of apartheid. We feel that that is the overriding objective. We are not prepared to take short-term steps which may endanger that long-term and fundamental goal. It is our goal and we would like the Government of South Africa to be in no doubt that its response to the proposals put to it by the eminent persons group of the Commonwealth is crucial. It is crucial to the attitude that the international community will take. That is important - and I will not attempt to say what actions will flow if the South African Government does not give a positive reply - but it is even more crucial to its own people, to both the white and the black populations of South Africa and the Coloureds.

My delegation regrets that the sponsors of the draft resolution were not prepared to accept my proposal for a paragraph-by-paragraph vote. I believe that

(Sir John Thomson, United Kingdom)

had they been we would have achieved a consensus resolution. This, I think, would have carried a convincing and potent signal to the Government of South Africa and to its people. As it is, the Council has sent a divided signal. We regret this. It is a pity. Nevertheless, the position of my Government remains unchanged: We condemn the South African actions which caused this Security Council to be summoned. We condemn apartheid. We support the eminent persons group and their effort and we warn the Government of South Africa that much - indeed, the whole future of its country - depends on the way in which it responds to that Commonwealth initiative.

Mr. BIERRING (Denmark): My delegation voted for the draft resolution because it gives expression to the policy of my Government, but we cannot help at the same time expressing our regret that it was not possible to adopt a resolution tonight in spite of efforts to that end. We participated in these efforts in the strong belief that a unanimous decision by the Security Council would have been the best way to convey to the Government of South Africa the views which I believe we all share with regard to its policies in southern Africa.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The representative of Senegal has asked to speak, and I now call on him.

Mr. SARRE (Senegal) (interpretation from French): During the two days of debate we have noted two basic elements: on the one hand, Africa's passion for peace, the eradication of apartheid and, above all, for the establishment of an egalitarian, democratic and just society in South Africa in which whites and blacks, Coloureds and other ethnic groups can live in peace and understanding, all leading to an era of co-operation between the South African Government and the neighbouring States.

We have also noted during the debate that all speakers have stressed the need for a solemn warning to South Africa not only to cease its repeated attacks against neighbouring States but also to heed the voice of reason, the voice of the international community, and put an end to the policy of apartheid.

It has also been emphasized that South Africa's acts of aggression against Botswana, Zambia and Zimbabwe were aimed essentially at undermining an attempt at rapprochement made by the Commonwealth eminent persons group. In this regard, ways and means must be found to make possible the continuance of that praiseworthy effort, which will be complementary, or even supplementary, to the efforts already made by the international community.

In the light of the fact that in the vote that has just taken place the draft resolution submitted by the non-aligned countries members of the Security Council has been rejected, Africa has the right to wonder whether there is still any chance through recourse to the international community of seeing the South African problem settled peacefully, as it so earnestly desires.

We have been told that neither mandatory nor selective sanctions against South Africa are likely to make it see reason and that sanctions might even endanger the neighbouring States and above all the black community in South Africa. But we cannot do good to people without their consent. Here, as elsewhere, more than once those who are directly interested in these measures - I am talking of both the

(Mr. Sarré, Senegal)

blacks who live in South Africa and the States neighbouring South Africa - have made it clearly understood to the international community that whatever the suffering they are ready to accept and bear it. The essential thing is that through the suffering justice and equality should prevail in South Africa.

No matter how great our bitterness - and it is great; we cannot hide that - Africa will continue, as in the past, to mobilize all its energies and use all its creative imagination so that this crime against humanity may one day be eradicated from that region, so that the blacks who are suffering so deeply and have no other means of expressing themselves than through persuasion, not only of their brothers, but also of those who can help them, will listen to them and will come to their assistance.

We respect, of course, the position taken in voting by each member; it is a sovereign right and we do not dispute that. But at least let Africa's suffering be understood. May the legitimate aspirations of Africans to a democratic society based on equality one day prevail in Africa.

Mr. SHUSTOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): We wish to express our profound regret that the Security Council did not succeed in adopting the draft resolution, owing to the negative votes of two permanent members of the Security Council.

We wish also to draw the attention of members of the Council to the fact that the vote of the representative of the United States against the draft resolution fully confirms what we said in our statement about that Government's position on the question of South Africa's aggressive policy towards other countries in that part of the African continent. The vote of the representative of the United States also shows that its attempts to refute what we have said were groundless.

(Mr. Shustov, USSR)

In that statement there were attacks on several delegations, including my own, which were unworthy of our serious discussions, and we strongly reject them. We do not feel it necessary to respond to them.

In conclusion, although the draft resolution was not adopted, all those that supported it can be sure that the Soviet Union will continue to act in accordance with the spirit of the draft resolution and, indeed, go further in its policy of support for the just cause for which the peoples and Governments of the States victims of those barbarous attacks by South Africa are fighting.

Mr. GARVALOV (Bulgaria): Bulgaria was among the 12 members of the Security Council which tonight voted in favour of the draft resolution submitted to the Council by the delegations of Congo, Ghana, Madagascar, Trinidad and Tobago and the United Arab Emirates.

Bulgaria was of the opinion that the original text of the draft resolution was commensurate with and reflected the situation as well as the discussion in the Council. We were prepared to vote in favour of the original text, without any revisions. When the amendments were introduced by the Permanent Representative of Trinidad and Tobago, for one reason or another my delegation was under the impression that a kind of general agreement had been reached on them; we had in mind a specific appeal to that effect made to the Council this morning.

Of course, we regret the fact that the draft resolution was not adopted. So far as our delegation is concerned, "regret" is probably the mildest of the words that we could use. We shall have some more official comments to that effect.

We as a Council were not able to assure the States and peoples of Botswana, Zambia and Zimbabwe that we understood the position they are in following the aggressive acts by South Africa. However, during our discussions we did - most of us, not all of us - condemn those aggressive acts by South Africa. The failure of the Council to adopt a resolution because of the vetoes cast by two permanent members leaves the responsibility upon the shoulders of those two members and not of the Council. Incidentally, what I have just said is taken from the statement by the Bulgarian representative this morning.

(Mr. Garvalov, Bulgaria)

Even a very cursory glance at the Council's activities last year and this year gives us a very clear picture. In 1985 the Council was seized five times of situations in which South Africa had committed aggression against neighbouring States and there were specific complaints in that regard. Under each complaint the Council was seized of a draft resolution leaving aside the question of sanctions. It was high time today in this debate, taking into account all the pertinent elements, for the Council to agree on a minimum of sanctions against South Africa. That is the message that the Council should have sent to the international community in general and to the African States in particular.

I should like to assure the Council that the text of the draft resolution which was not adopted because of the vetoes of two permanent members will be sent, in its revised form, to the Bulgarian Government. I am sure that my Government will abide by its provisions, as it has done in the case of similar provisions in the past, and will be taking even more steps in this respect.

The PRESIDENT: There are no further names on the list of speakers. The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on the agenda.

The meeting rose at 10.45 p.m.

