

- ³¹ 2268th mtg., paras. 21-55.
³² *Ibid.*, paras. 57-78.
³³ For the consideration of the invitation to Mr. Peter Kalangula and the others associated with his request, see chap. 111, case I.
³⁴ 2268th mtg., paras. 81-110.
³⁵ 2269th mtg., paras. 5-33.
³⁶ *Ibid.*, paras. 36-52.
³⁷ For similar viewpoints, see also statements by the representatives of Zaire and Zimbabwe, 2269th mtg., paras. 95-137 and 140-148.
³⁸ 2269th mtg., paras. 56-79.
³⁹ *Ibid.*, paras. 82-90.
⁴⁰ 2270th mtg., paras. 7-26.
⁴¹ *Ibid.*, paras. 46-67.
⁴² *Ibid.*, paras. 70-122.
⁴³ 2271st mtg., paras. 6-22.
⁴⁴ For the consideration of the Namibian question by the Security Council during its meetings at Addis Ababa in 1972, see *Repertoire of the Practice of the Security Council. Supplement 1972-1974*, pp. 92-101.
⁴⁵ 2271st mtg., paras. 44-66.
⁴⁶ S/14457, OR, 36th yr., *Suppl. for April-June 1981*.
⁴⁷ 2271st mtg., paras. 87-94.
⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, paras. 124-131.
⁴⁹ 2273rd mtg., paras. 93-103.
⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, paras. 116-142.
⁵¹ 2274th mtg., paras. 9-16.
⁵² *Ibid.*, paras. 71-80.
⁵³ 2275th mtg., paras. 31-37.
⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, paras. 39-52.
⁵⁵ 2275th mtg., paras. 66-112.
⁵⁶ 2276th mtg., paras. 6-26.
⁵⁷ S/14459, S/14460, S/14461, S/14462 and S/14463, OR, 36th yr., *Suppl. for April-June 1981*.
⁵⁸ 2277th mtg., para. 5.
⁵⁹ S/14460/Rev. 1, OR, 36th yr., *Suppl. for April-June 1981*.
⁶⁰ 2277th mtg., para. 6.
⁶¹ *Ibid.*, para. 24.
⁶² *Ibid.*, para. 25.
⁶³ *Ibid.*, para. 26.
⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, para. 27.
⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, para. 28.
⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, paras. 32-38.
⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, paras. 39-45.
⁶⁸ S/14457, OR, 36th yr., *Suppl. for April-June 1981*.
⁶⁹ 2277th mtg., paras. 53-59.
⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, paras. 66-92.
⁷¹ *Ibid.*, paras. 94-104.
⁷² S/15760, OR, 38th yr., *Suppl. for April-June 1983*.
⁷³ S/15761, *ibid.*
⁷⁴ S/15776, *ibid.*
⁷⁵ 2439th mtg.
⁷⁶ S/15287, OR, 37th yr., *Suppl. for July-Sept. 1982*.
⁷⁷ 2440th mtg.
⁷⁸ 2443rd mtg.
⁷⁹ 2447th mtg.
⁸⁰ 2449th mtg.
⁸¹ S/15943, OR, 38th yr., *Suppl. for July-Sept. 1983*.
⁸² S/16048, *ibid.*, *Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1983*.
⁸³ S/16051, *ibid.*
⁸⁴ 2481st mtg.
⁸⁵ GAOR, 38th sess., *Suppl. No. 1 (A/38/1)*, p. 1.
⁸⁶ 2481st mtg.
⁸⁷ 2482nd mtg.
⁸⁸ 2484th mtg.
⁸⁹ 2485th mtg.
⁹⁰ S/16085, adopted as amended in writing (S/16085/Rev. 1) and orally at the 2492nd meeting by the representative of Zimbabwe. See resolution 539 (1983). The changes involved minor textual changes as well as the deletion of an explicit reference to Chapter VII of the Charter from operative paragraph 10 of the draft resolution.

⁹¹ 2490th mtg.

⁹² 2492nd mtg. Revised draft resolution S/16085/Rev.1 was adopted as amended orally (subsequently issued as S/16085/Rev.2) at the same meeting. See resolution 539 (1983).

⁹³ 2492nd mtg.

2. THE QUESTION OF SOUTH AFRICA

Decision of 5 February 1981 (2264th meeting): statement of the President

In a letter dated 28 November 1980,¹ the representative of Senegal, in his capacity as Chairman of the Group of African States at the United Nations for the month of November, forwarded for necessary action the copy of a letter of the same date addressed to him from the representative of the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC) in respect of death sentences passed by the South African Supreme Court on three members of ANC. The representative of ANC had specifically requested that the Council, as in a similar case on an earlier occasion, hold consultations and mandate the President to use his good offices to alert world opinion and to save the lives of the three ANC members.²

At its 2264th meeting, on 5 February 1981, the Council included the letter dated 28 November 1980 from the representative of Senegal in its agenda.

As a result of consultations among members of the Council, the President then made the following statement on behalf of the Council:

The members of the Security Council have entrusted me to express, on their behalf, their grave concern over the death sentences recently passed by the Transvaal Division of the Supreme Court at Pretoria on Ncimbithi Johnson Lubisi (28), Petrus Tsepo Mashigo (20) and Naphtali Manana (24), and which may be considered shortly by the Appellate Division of the Supreme Court at Bloemfontein.

Having this in mind, I strongly urge that the Government of South Africa, in order to avert further aggravating the situation in South Africa, should take into account the concerns expressed for the lives of these three young men.

Decision of 27 August 1981 (2295th meeting): invitation extended to Mr. Johnstone Makatini

By letter dated 27 August 1981,⁴ the representative of Niger, on behalf of the countries members of the Council belonging to the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, requested a meeting of the Council at the earliest possible opportunity to consider the wish expressed by Mr. Johnstone Makatini, representative of ANC at the United Nations, in his letter dated 24 August addressed to the President of the Council, that, in accordance with the position taken by the Council in previous similar cases, the President issue a statement on behalf of the Council in connection with the death sentences passed by the Pretoria Supreme Court on three members of ANC—Anthony Tsotsobe, 25, Johannes Shabangu, 26, and David Moise, 25—on 19 August 1981, in order to save their lives.

At its 2295th meeting, on 27 August 1981, the Council included the letter from the representative of Niger on its agenda. Following the adoption of the agenda, the Council decided to extend an invitation to Mr. Makatini under rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure.⁵

The representative of Niger pointed out that the South African regime was ready to murder in the space of a few months another three ANC militants

for reasons directly linked to their everyday struggle against the *apartheid* regime. He added that the repressive and political nature of the trials against ANC members escaped no one, since the deception of the South African authorities had been unmasked already six months ago. The black majority in South Africa only demanded a just and democratic society where all *races* and social categories would be treated equally and with justice and dignity. His delegation **wished** to stress that it was the duty of the Council to help them to achieve that **aspiration**, in accordance with the Charter and the relevant resolutions of the Council, and appealed urgently to the Council to prevent the **execution** of the three **patriots**.⁶

Most members joined the appeal of the representative of Niger that the Council, through its President, call upon the Government of South Africa to **desist** from the execution of the three ANC members.⁷ The **representative** of the United Kingdom indicated that the judicial process in the case might not yet be complete, but **stated** his **delegation's** view that, on humanitarian grounds alone, the death sentences, if they were **confirmed**, should call for **clemency**.⁸ The representative of the United States recalled the **statement** issued in February and expressed his wish that the Council might finally come to a similar unanimous **expression of concern**.⁹ Several representatives **voiced** surprise and dismay that the members of the Council had failed to endorse unanimously an appeal by the Council President as proposed by the representative of ANC and pointed to the **well-known** features of the South African handling of the case in question which could not be described as a normal judicial **process**.¹⁰

Decision of 15 December 1981 (2315th meeting): statement by the President

By letter dated 7 December 1981,¹¹ the representative of Botswana, on behalf of the Group of African States at the United Nations, requested that the President of the Council undertake consultations among the members of the Council in order that, in keeping with precedent, appropriate action might be taken by the Council following the proclamation by South Africa of the independence of another **bantustan**.

At its 2315th meeting, on 15 December 1981, the Council included the letter dated 7 December from the representative of Botswana in its agenda. As a result of consultations held among members of the Council, the President made the following statement on behalf of the Council:¹²

The Security Council notes that on 4 December 1981, the South African régime proclaimed the Ciskei, an integral part of South African territory, a so-called "independent" State, in pursuance of its *apartheid* and bantustanization policy.

The Council recalls its resolution 417 (1977), in which it demanded that the racist régime of South Africa should abolish the policy of bantustanization. It also recalls its resolutions 402 (1976) and 407 (1977), in which it endorsed General Assembly resolution 31/6 A of 26 October 1976 on the matter. The Council further takes note of General Assembly resolution 32/105 N of 14 December 1977 on the question of bantustans.

The Council does not recognize the so-called "independent homelands" in South Africa: it condemns the purported proclamation of the "independence" of the Ciskei and declares it totally invalid. This action by the South African régime, following similar proclamations in the case of the Transkei, Bophuthatswana and Venda, denounced by the international community, is designed to divide and dispossess the African people and establish client States under its domination in order to perpetuate *apartheid*. It *seeks* to create a class of foreign people in their own country. It further

aggravates the situation in the region and hinders international efforts for just and lasting solutions.

The Council calls upon all Governments to deny any form of recognition to the so-called "independent" bantustans, to refrain from any dealings with them, to reject travel documents issued by them, and urges Governments of Member States to take effective measures within their constitutional framework to discourage all individuals, corporations and other institutions under their jurisdiction from having any dealings with the so-called "independent" bantustans.

Decision of 9 April 1982 (2351st meeting): resolution 503 (1982)

In a letter dated 8 April 1982,¹³ the representative of Uganda transmitted a letter from Mr. Makatini, representative of ANC, who informed the President of the Council that the South African Court of Appeal had confirmed the death sentences imposed on three members, Ncimbithi Johnson Lubisi, Naph-tali Manana and Petrus Tsepo Mashigo, in 1980 and requested an urgent meeting of the Council once more to take up the matter; Mr. Makatini further requested that the President use his good offices to urge the Council, pursuant to the call made by the Council on behalf of the three patriots on 5 February 1981 at the 2264th meeting, to demand that South Africa desist from carrying out those sentences and to release immediately and unconditionally those and other patriots.

By another letter of the same date,¹⁴ the representative of Uganda requested an urgent meeting of the Council to examine the situation in southern Africa, following the confirmation of the death sentences on ANC members.

At its 2351st meeting, on 9 April 1982, the Council included the letter from the representative of Uganda requesting the Council meeting" in its agenda.

At the beginning of the meeting, the President drew attention to a draft **resolution**¹⁵ submitted by Togo, Uganda and Zaire.

The representative of Uganda pointed out that an amendment had been proposed regarding the draft resolution and would be acceptable to the sponsors; he then read the text of the amendment, which replaced operative paragraph 2 of the original draft. He further stated that the meeting of the Council had been requested for purely humanitarian reasons, in order to enable the Council to help save the lives of three South African patriots. He recalled the statement of the President on 5 February 1981 expressing the Council's grave concern for the lives of the three patriots and briefly indicated the humanitarian quality of the draft resolution. Speaking on behalf of the African Group and the three sponsors, he commented to the Council the draft resolution which he hoped would be adopted unanimously.¹⁶

The President then put the draft resolution as amended to the vote; it received 15 votes in favour and was unanimously adopted as resolution 503 (1982).¹⁷ It reads as follows:

The Security Council,

Recalling its resolution 473 (1980) and its statement of 5 February 1981 regarding the death sentences passed by the Transvaal Division of the Supreme Court at Pretoria on Ncimbithi Johnson Lubisi, Petrus Tsepo Mashigo and Naph-tali Manana, three members of the African National Congress of South Africa,

Gravely concerned at the **confirmation** of the death sentences by the South African Court of Appeal on 7 April 1982,

Deeply concerned that the carrying out of the death sentences would further aggravate the situation in South Africa,

1. *Calls upon the South African authorities to commute the death sentences;*

2. Urges all States and organizations to use their influence and to take urgent measures in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations, the resolutions of the Security Council and relevant international instruments to save the lives of the three men.

Following the adoption of the resolution, the representative of the United States commended the sponsors for their agreement to accept the critically important amendment to paragraph 2 of the text.¹⁸

The representative of the Soviet Union criticized the delegation of the United States for insisting on language in paragraph 2 of the resolution, which changed the context of the Council's position concerning the lives of the three young patriots from the explicit condemnation of the policy of *apartheid* as a crime against the conscience and dignity of mankind, as found in resolution 473 (1980), paragraph 3, adopted unanimously on 13 June 1980. He deplored the insistence of the United States on considering the threat to the lives of the three young men in the context of the violation of human rights and not in the context of the policy of *apartheid*.¹⁹

Decision of 20 September 1982 (2397th meeting): invitation of the Chairman of the Security Council Committee established by resolution 42 I (1977)

Decision of 23 September 1982 (2398th meeting): other invitations

At its 2397th meeting, on 20 September 1982, the Council resumed consideration of the report of the Security Council Committee established by resolution 42 I (1977) concerning the question of South Africa²⁰ on ways and means of making the mandatory arms embargo against South Africa more effective, an item which had been included in its agenda at the 2261st meeting, on 19 December 1980.

The President stated that, in the course of consultations, the Council members had agreed to extend an invitation under rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure to the Chairman of the Security Council Committee established by resolution 42 I (1977).²¹

At the 2398th meeting, on 23 September 1982, the Council invited the representatives of Algeria, Cuba and Ghana, at their request, to participate in the discussion without the right to vote.²²

At the same meeting, the Council also decided to extend an invitation under rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure to the Chairman of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*.²³

At the 2397th meeting, the Chairman for 1981 of the Security Council Committee recalled the adoption of the mandatory arms embargo under Chapter VII of the Charter in resolution 418 (1977) and the establishment, organization and work of the Committee established under resolution 421 (1977) in order to study ways and means by which the embargo could be made more effective. The report dated 19 September 1980 of the Committee showed that the embargo was violated in that illicit transfers of arms continued to take place and loopholes encouraged violation of the embargo. The Committee had recommended that the loopholes be closed and had urged that additional measures be taken to tighten the application of the arms embargo. He warned that if those steps were not taken to strengthen the impact of the arms embargo, the very respectability of the Organization would be called into question.*

Chapter VIII. Maintenance of international peace and security

At the 2398th meeting, the representative of Ghana, speaking in his capacity as the Chairman of the Group of African States at the United Nations, stated that sanctions offered the last peaceful instrument to accomplish the abolition of *apartheid* and racial discrimination in South Africa. He reviewed the developments since the imposition of the mandatory arms embargo in 1977 and pointed to the deliberate violations of the arms embargo and the loopholes in the coverage of the arms embargo that had become apparent since then. He also urged that the international community ban co-operation with South Africa's nuclear programme, since that enhanced the racist régime's nuclear-weapon capability and enabled it to threaten peace and security in the region and to terrorize neighbouring countries. He called upon the Council Committee to prepare a list of all the products that would fall under the provisions of the arms embargo, suggested that the embargo be extended to so-called dual-purpose items that could be taken advantage of by the South African military authorities and urged that oil be recognized as an essential element in any arms embargo. He appealed strongly to the Council that everything be done to ensure the more effective implementation of the mandatory arms embargo against the *apartheid* régime in South Africa.²⁵

Decision of 4 October 1982: statement of the President

By a letter dated 16 September 1982²⁶ addressed to the Secretary-General, the Chairman of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* drew attention to the death sentences imposed by South Africa on 6 August 1982 on Thelle Simon Mogoerane, Jerry Semano Mosololi and Marcus Thabo Motaung, three ANC members, on the charge of high treason.

On 4 October 1982, following consultations with the Council members, the President issued the following statement²⁷ on behalf of the members of the Council:

The members of the Security Council have entrusted me to express, on their behalf, their grave concern at the death sentences passed on 6 August 1982 in South Africa on Mr. Thelle Simon Mogoerane, Mr. Jerry Semano Mosololi and Mr. Marcus Thabo Motaung, three members of the African National Congress of South Africa.

The members of the Security Council strongly urge the Government of South Africa, in order to avoid further aggravating the situation in South Africa, to commute the death sentences.

Decision of 2404th meeting (7 December 1982): resolution 525 (1982)

At its 2404th meeting, on 7 December 1982, the Council included the question of South Africa in its agenda.

The President stated that the meeting of the Council had been convened in accordance with a request by the representative of Uganda on behalf of the Group of African States at the United Nations and the non-aligned members of the Council. He drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution** submitted by Guyana, Jordan, Panama, Togo, Uganda and Zaire. The draft resolution was put to the vote, received 15 votes in favour and was adopted unanimously as resolution 525 (1982).²⁹ It reads as follows:

The Security Council,

Having considered the question of the death sentences passed on 19 August 1981 in South Africa on Mr. Anthony Tsotsobe, Mr. Johannes Shabangu and Mr. David Moise,

Recalling its statement of 4 October 1982 regarding the death sentences passed on 6 August 1982 in South Africa on Mr. Thelle Simon Mogoerane, Mr. Jerry Semano Mosololi and Mr. Marcus Thabo Motaung, members of the African National Congress of South Africa, and reiterating its urgent appeal for executive clemency in this case,

Gravely concerned at the confirmation by the Appellate Division of the Supreme Court of South Africa on 26 November 1982 of the death sentences imposed on Mr. Anthony Tsotsobe, Mr. Johannes Shabangu and Mr. David Moise.

Conscious that the carrying out of the death sentences will further aggravate the situation in South Africa.

1. Calls upon the South African authorities to commute the death sentences imposed on the six men;

2. Urges all States and organizations to use their influence and to take urgent measures, in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations, the resolutions of the Security Council and relevant international instruments, to save the lives of the six men.

Decision of 7 June 1983 (2452nd meeting): resolution 533 (1973)

By a letter dated 6 June 1983,³⁰ the representative of Morocco, in his capacity as Chairman of the Group of African States at the United Nations, informed the Council that South Africa had on that day confirmed the death sentences passed on Thelle Simon Mogoerane, Jerry Semano Mosololi and Marcus Thabo Motaung and requested the Council to take urgent and appropriate action.

At its 2452nd meeting, on 7 June 1983, the Council included the letter from the representative of Morocco in its agenda.

Following the adoption of the agenda, the President drew attention to a draft resolution³¹ that had been worked out in the course of consultations among the members of the Council. He then put the draft resolution to the vote; it received 15 votes in favour and was adopted unanimously as resolution 533 (1983).³² It reads as follows:

The Security Council,

Having considered the question of the death sentences passed on 6 August 1982 in South Africa on Mr. Thelle Simon Mogoerane, Mr. Jerry Semano Mosololi and Mr. Marcus Thabo Motaung, members of the African National Congress of South Africa,

Recalling its statement of 4 October 1982 as well as its resolution 525 (1982) appealing for executive clemency in this case,

Gravely concerned over the decision of the South African authorities on 6 June 1983 to refuse executive clemency in respect of the three men,

Conscious that the carrying out of the death sentences will aggravate the situation in South Africa,

1. Calls upon the South African authorities to commute the death sentences imposed on the three men;

2. Urges all States and organizations to use their influence and to take urgent measures, in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations, the resolutions of the Security Council and relevant international instruments, to save the lives of the three men.

Decision of 13 January 1984 (2512th meeting): resolution 547 (1984)

By letter dated 10 January 1984,³³ the representative of Togo, in his capacity as Chairman of the Group of African States at the United Nations for the month of January 1984, requested an urgent meeting of the Council to consider the question of the death sentence passed by the Supreme Court of South Africa against Mr. Malesela Benjamin Maloise, a member of ANC.³⁴

At its 2512th meeting, on 13 January 1984, the Council included the letter from the representative of Togo in its agenda.

Following the adoption of the agenda, the President drew attention to a draft resolution³⁵ that had been prepared in the course of the Council's consultations. He then put the draft to the vote; it received 15 votes in favour and was adopted unanimously as resolution 547 (1984).³⁶ It reads as follows:

The Security Council,

Having considered the question of the death sentence passed on 6 June 1983 in South Africa on Mr. Malesela Benjamin Maloise.

Recalling its resolutions 503 (1982), 525 (1982) and 533 (1983).

Gravely concerned over the current decision of the South African authorities to reject an appeal against the death sentence imposed upon Mr. Maloise,

Conscious that carrying out the death sentence will further aggravate the situation in South Africa,

1. Calls upon the South African authorities to commute the death sentence imposed upon Mr. Maloise;

2. Urges all States and organizations to use their influence and to take urgent measures, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, the resolutions of the Security Council and relevant international instruments, to save the life of Mr. Malesela Benjamin Maloise.

Decision of 17 August 1984 (2551st meeting): resolution 554 (1984)

By letter dated 8 August 1984,³⁷ the representative of Algeria, on behalf of the Group of African States at the United Nations, requested, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 38/1 I of 15 November 1983, an urgent meeting of the Council to consider the so-called constitutional reforms in South Africa.

At the 2548th meeting, on 16 August 1984, the Council included the letter dated 8 August from the representative of Algeria in its agenda. Following the adoption of the agenda, the Council decided to invite the following, at their request, to participate in the discussion without the right to vote: at the 2548th meeting, the representatives of Algeria, Argentina, Czechoslovakia, Nigeria, South Africa and Thailand; at the 2549th meeting, the representatives of Benin, Cuba, Mongolia, the Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago and Yugoslavia; at the 2550th meeting, the representatives of the Congo, Indonesia, Kuwait, Qatar and Sri Lanka; and at the 2551st meeting, the representatives of Afghanistan, Guyana, Kenya and Togo.³⁸ The Council also decided to extend invitations under rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedures, at the 2548th meeting, to the Acting Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid, to Mr. Mfanafuthi J. Makatini and to Mr. Ahmed Gora Ebrahim, at the 2549th meeting, to the Chairman of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and, at the 2551st meeting, to Mr. Lesaona Makhanda.³⁹ The Council considered the item during its 2548th to 2551st meetings, on 16 and 17 August 1984.

Speaking on behalf of the Group of African States at the United Nations at the 2548th meeting, the representative of Algeria pointed out that the so-called constitutional reforms imposed by the South African Government sought to entrench and perpetuate the apartheid system and completed the edifice that made the indigenous population non-persons and deprived them of their fundamental right to citizenship. He then described in detail the new constitution establishing the hierarchy of races and a so-called three-house Parliament for whites, for "coloureds" and for persons of Asian origin, respectively, while excluding blacks from any kind of representa-

tion altogether. He indicated that whereas the white chamber could take up any matter it wished, the other two chambers could discuss issues only after the approval of the white President of the State, thereby guaranteeing the parliamentary dominance of the white minority. Referring to the long chain of discriminatory legislation, he stressed that the new constitution was merely another link intended to strengthen the *apartheid* regime and to perpetuate white supremacy.

In view of the long history of the racist system, the representative of Algeria concluded that the *apartheid* system could not be reformed, but must be rooted out, and that pressure **must** be kept up against the South African régime in order to obtain the restitution of the legitimate rights of the South African people. The Group of African States at the United Nations therefore expected and demanded that the Council, like the General Assembly, would **reject** the so-called constitution, as well as the results of the 2 November 1983 referendum. The Council should clearly indicate that the implementation of the "constitution" would inevitably aggravate tension and conflict in South Africa and throughout the region. Only the eradication of *apartheid* and the establishment of a democratic non-racial society based on universal adult suffrage in a united and unfragmented South Africa could lead to a just and lasting solution of the explosive situation in southern Africa.³⁸

At the same meeting, the representative of South Africa protested sharply **against** what he called interference by the Council in an internal affair of the Republic of South Africa. That violation of the Charter by organs and members of the Organization was unacceptable as the subject of constitutional arrangements was beyond the **ambit** of the United Nations. He offered the **official** explanation for the new constitution and stressed that the black population had not been left out but had exercised **its** right to self-determination by opting for political independence. He presented a detailed description of the new constitutional set-up, which was supposed to advance the goals of self-determination, autonomy, **devolution** of power and **co-ordinated** economic development throughout the country. He denounced the United Nations as an ineffectual organization and indicated that his Government **rejected** in advance what the Council would decide.³⁹

At the 2549th meeting, on 16 August 1984, the President drew attention to a draft **resolution**⁴⁰ submitted by Burkina Faso, Egypt, India, Malta, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Peru and Zimbabwe.

At the 2551st meeting, on 17 August 1984, the representative of India, speaking on behalf of the eight non-aligned sponsors of the draft resolution, **informed** the Council that as a result of consultations with other Council members the sponsors had agreed to a few changes, including the deletion of the original second preambular paragraph, some editorial changes in the original **fifth** preambular paragraph and the deletion of some words in the last **preambular** paragraph. He expressed hope that the spirit of accommodation shown by the sponsors would enable the Council to adopt the draft resolution by an overwhelming majority, if not by unanimity.⁴¹

At the same meeting, the President put the **draft** resolution to the vote; it received 13 votes in favour,

none against, and 2 abstentions, and was adopted as resolution 554 (1984).⁴² It reads as follows:

The Security Council,

Recalling its resolution 473 (1980) and General Assembly resolution 38/11 of 15 November 1983, as well as other relevant United Nations resolutions calling upon the authorities in South Africa to abandon *apartheid*, end oppression and repression of the black majority and seek a peaceful, just and lasting solution in accordance with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights,

Convinced that the so-called "new constitution" endorsed on 2 November 1983 by the exclusively white electorate in South Africa would continue the process of denationalization of the indigenous African majority, depriving it of all fundamental rights, and further entrench *apartheid*, transforming South Africa into a country for "whites only",

Aware that the inclusion in the "new constitution" of the so-called "coloured" people and people of Asian origin is aimed at dividing the unity of the oppressed people of South Africa and fomenting internal conflict,

Noting with grave concern that one of the objectives of the so-called "constitution" of the racist régime is to make the "coloured" people and people of Asian origin in South Africa eligible for conscription into the armed forces of the *apartheid* régime for further internal repression and aggressive acts against independent African States,

Welcoming the massive united resistance of the oppressed people of South Africa against these "constitutional" manoeuvres,

Reaffirming the legitimacy of the struggle of the oppressed people of South Africa for the elimination of *apartheid* and for the establishment of a society in which all the people of South Africa as a whole, irrespective of race, colour, sex or creed, will enjoy equal and full political and other rights and participate freely in the determination of their destiny,

Firmly convinced that the so-called "elections" to be organized by the Pretoria régime in the current month of August for the "coloured" people and people of Asian origin and the implementation of this "new constitution" will inevitably aggravate tension in South Africa and in southern Africa as a whole,

1. **Declares** that the so-called "new constitution" is contrary to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, that the results of the referendum of 2 November 1983 are of no validity whatsoever and that the enforcement of the "new constitution" will further aggravate the already explosive situation prevailing inside *apartheid* South Africa;

2. **Strongly rejects and declares as null and void** the so-called "new constitution" and the "elections" to be organized in the current month of August for the "coloured" people and people of Asian origin as well as all insidious manoeuvres by the racist minority régime of South Africa further to entrench white minority rule and *apartheid*;

3. **Further rejects** any so-called "negotiated settlement" based on bantustan structures or on the so-called "new constitution";

4. **Solemnly declares** that only the total eradication of *apartheid* and the establishment of a non-racial democratic society based on majority rule, through the full and free exercise of universal adult suffrage by all the people in a united and unfragmented South Africa, can lead to a just and lasting solution of the explosive situation in South Africa;

5. **Urges all Governments and organizations not to accord recognition** to the results of the so-called "elections" and to take appropriate action, in cooperation with the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity and in accordance with the present resolution, to assist the oppressed people of South Africa in their legitimate struggle for a non-racial, democratic society;

6. **Requests the Secretary-General to report to the Security Council on the implementation of the present resolution;**

7. **Decides to remain seized of the matter.**

Following the adoption of the resolution, the representative of the United States suggested that the United Nations could discuss and condemn all forms of racial discrimination, deemed at one time an internal matter, as the Members of the United Nations had pledged themselves through the Charter to promote human rights and fundamental freedoms

for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion. He emphasized that his Government did not believe that Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter could be interpreted to render the Universal Declaration of Human Rights or other general principles a nullity. He added, however, that his delegation had abstained in the vote since the Council, whose mandate was clearly spelt out in Article 24, was not the appropriate forum for that resolution. He expressed the hope that the expansion of the franchise to persons of Asian and so-called **coloured** descent could eventually be further extended to include the majority of South Africans and declared that the United States would continue to encourage attainment of the ultimate goal of universal, non-discriminatory suffrage in South Africa.⁴³

The representative of the United Kingdom stated that his delegation shared the concern expressed in the resolution about the absence of any provision in the new constitution for the black majority. But he warned against making a final judgement at that point about the new arrangements. His Government had consistently declined to take a position on the new arrangements, which might endanger prospects for further change in South Africa. He further took exception with some of the language in the resolution and did not accept that the references to the legitimacy of the struggle related to armed struggle or extended to the use of force. Nor did his delegation believe that outsiders should prescribe solutions or determine the validity of internal **arrangements**.⁴³

Decision of 23 October 1984 (2560th meeting): resolution 556 (I 1984)

By letter dated 17 October 1984, the representative of Ethiopia, on behalf of the Group of African States at the United Nations, requested the President of the Council, in pursuance of General Assembly resolution 39/2 of 28 November 1984, to consider the serious situation in South Africa emanating from the imposition of the so-called new constitution and to take all necessary measures in accordance with the Charter, to avert the further **aggravation** of tension and conflict in South Africa and in southern Africa as a whole.

At its 2560th meeting, on 23 October 1984, the Council included the letter from the representative of Ethiopia in its agenda. Following the adoption of the agenda, the Council decided to invite the representatives of Ethiopia and South Africa, at their request, to participate in the discussion without the right to vote. The Council also decided to extend invitations under rule 39 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure to the Chairman of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* and to Bishop Desmond Tutu.⁴⁵ The Council considered the item at the same meeting.

The President opened the meeting and drew attention to a draft **resolution**⁴⁵ submitted by Burkina Faso, Egypt, India, Malta, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Peru and Zimbabwe.

The representative of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Group of African States at the United Nations, condemned once again the process of **bantustanization** whereby blacks were uprooted from their ancestral homes and forced to settle in barren wastelands. He also denounced the so-called referendums and elections as nothing other than attempts to entrench white supremacy. He recalled the recent adoption of Council resolution 554 (1984) and General Assembly

resolution 39/2 as expressions of the international community regarding the illegitimate and racist character of the regime and its policy. He warned that the situation could no longer continue and emphasized that the Council should finally agree to the imposition of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter; otherwise, the people of South Africa would be left with no other choice than the intensification of the ongoing armed struggle. He concluded by calling upon the Council members to endorse the draft resolution, which contained the minimum to defuse the current tension.&

The representative of South Africa charged again that the Council was interfering in the internal affairs of his country and rejected whatever decisions the Council might arrive at in **prescribing** to South Africa how it should run its own **affairs**.⁴⁷

Bishop Desmond Tutu commended President P. W. Botha for his courage in declaring that the future of South Africa could no longer be determined by **whites** only, but deplored that that opportunity to resolve the burgeoning crisis in his native land should have been vitiated by exclusion of the overwhelming majority in the land. From all indications it had become clear that the new constitution was intended to perpetuate the rule of a minority and to entrench racism and ethnicity. He expressed dismay over all forms of violence, presented his dream of a truly non-racial, **democratic** society and pledged to continue the work for justice, peace and **reconciliation**.⁴⁷

Prior to the vote, the representative of the Netherlands addressed the growing danger of an explosion leading to destruction and violence in South Africa and warned that decisive measures of basic reform were **urgently** required to forestall such a development. He recalled his Government's willingness to co-operate with other Council members in strengthening the arms embargo by a mandatory ban on the import of arms manufactured by South Africa. He announced his delegation's support for the draft resolution, but objected to some of the language employed in the draft and to the Council's passing **judgement** on the legal validity of a Member State's constitution or electoral **processes**.⁴⁷

At the same meeting, the draft resolution was put to the vote, received 14 votes in favour with 1 abstention, and was adopted as resolution 556 (1984).⁴⁸ It reads as follows:

The Security Council,

Recalling its resolution 554 (1984) and General Assembly resolutions 38/11 of 15 November 1983 and 39/2 of 28 September 1984, which declared the so-called "new constitution" contrary to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations,

Reaffirming the provisions of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, particularly article 21, paragraphs 1 and 3, which recognize, *inter alia*, the right of everyone to take part in the Government of his country, directly or through freely chosen representatives, and the will of the **people** as the basis of the authority of Government,

Alarmed by the aggravation of the situation in South Africa, in particular the wanton killing and the maiming of **defenceless** demonstrators and workers on strike as well as the imposition of virtual martial-law conditions intended to facilitate the brutal repression of the black population,

Gravely concerned at the continuing **arbitrary** arrests and detentions without trial of leaders and activists of **mass** organizations inside the country as well as the closure of several schools and universities,

Commending the massive united resistance of the oppressed people of South Africa, including the strike by hundreds of

thousands of black students, to the imposition of the so-called "new constitution",

Commending also the Asian and coloured communities in South Africa for their large-scale *boycott* of the recent "elections" which constituted a clear rejection of the so-called "new constitution",

Reaffirming the legitimacy of the struggle of the oppressed people of South Africa for the full exercise of the right to self-determination and the establishment of a non-racial democratic society in an unfragmented South Africa,

Convinced that racist South Africa's defiance of world public opinion and the imposition of the rejected so-called "new constitution" will inevitably lead to further escalation of the explosive situation and will have far-reaching consequences for southern Africa and the world,

1. *Reiterates* its condemnation of the *apartheid* policy of the South African régime and South Africa's continued defiance of the resolutions of the United Nations and designs further to entrench *apartheid*, a system characterized as a crime against humanity;

2. *Further condemns* the continued massacres of the oppressed people, as well as the arbitrary arrest and detention of leaders and activists of mass organizations;

3. *Demands* the immediate cessation of the massacres and the prompt and unconditional release of all political prisoners and detainees;

4. *Reaffirms* that only the total eradication of *apartheid* and the establishment of a non-racial, democratic society based on majority rule, through the full and free exercise of adult *suffrage* by all the people in a united and unfragmented South Africa, can lead to a just, equitable and lasting solution of the situation in South Africa;

5. *Urges* all Governments and organizations to take appropriate action, in co-operation with the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity and in accordance with the present resolution, to assist the oppressed people of South Africa in their legitimate struggle for the full exercise of the right to self-determination;

6. *Demands* the immediate eradication of *apartheid* as the necessary step towards the full exercise of the right to self-determination in an unfragmented South Africa, and to this end demands:

(a) The dismantling of the bantustan structures as well as the cessation of uprooting, relocation and denationalization of the indigenous African people;

(b) The abrogation of the bans and restrictions on political organizations, parties, individuals and news media opposed to *apartheid*;

(c) The unimpeded return of all the exiles;

7. *Requests* the Secretary-General to report to the Security Council on the implementation of the present resolution;

8. *Decides* to remain seized of the matter.

Following the vote, the representative of the United Kingdom stated that his Government had supported the resolution just adopted in order to provide another sign by the international community that the problems of South Africa neither could nor should be resolved by repression, by the denial of civil and political rights or by violence. He regretted the exaggerated language used in some parts of the resolution and explained that his delegation regarded the expression "crime against humanity" as one of abhorrence rather than a technical legal description and that it did not interpret any part of the resolution as falling within the terms of Chapter VII of the Charter.⁴⁹

Decision of 13 December 1984 (2564th meeting): resolution 558 (1984)

In a letter dated 13 December 1984,⁵⁰ the Chairman of the Security Council Committee established by resolution 421 (1977) concerning the question of South Africa transmitted to the President of the Council for the attention of its members the text of a recommendation adopted by consensus by the Committee at its 63rd meeting, held on the same day.

At the 2564th meeting, on 13 December 1984, the Council included the letter in its agenda. Following the adoption of the agenda, the Council invited the representative of South Africa, at his request, to participate in the discussion without the right to vote.⁵¹ The Council considered the item at its 2564th meeting.

The representative of the Netherlands stated that, a month earlier, his delegation had requested a meeting of the Security Council Committee established by resolution 421 (1977) in order to submit to its members a proposal to expand the arms embargo imposed in resolution 418 (1977) by a ban on arms imports from South Africa, a step that his Government had advocated over the last few years. That step seemed advisable because South Africa had responded to the arms embargo with a major effort to build up its capacity to manufacture arms and thus to circumvent the provisions of the embargo. Moreover, the South African Government had launched an export drive for its self-produced weapons. Under those circumstances, his delegation believed that the international community must keep up the pressure on South Africa so that a process of fundamental reforms would be initiated leading to the elimination of *apartheid*.

He then introduced the draft resolution,⁵¹ which was the result of extensive consultations with other members of the Council and had been recommended by consensus by the Security Council Committee established by resolution 421 (1977). He added that his delegation saw the proposed draft resolution, though of a non-mandatory character, as a concrete step forward, and urged the Council to endorse the text.⁵²

Then the President put the draft resolution to the vote; it received 15 votes in favour and was adopted unanimously as resolution 558 (1984).⁵³ It reads as follows:

The Security Council,

Recalling its resolution 418 (1977), in which it decided upon a mandatory arms embargo against South Africa,

Recalling its resolution 421 (1977), by which it entrusted a Committee consisting of all its members with the task of, among other things, studying ways and means by which the mandatory arms embargo could be made more effective against South Africa and to make recommendations to the Council,

Taking note of the Committee's report to the Security Council contained in document S/14179 of 19 September 1980,

Recognizing that South Africa's intensified efforts to build up its capacity to manufacture armaments undermines the effectiveness of the mandatory arms embargo against South Africa,

Considering that no State should contribute to South Africa's arms-production capability by purchasing arms manufactured in South Africa,

1. *Reaffirms* its resolution 418 (1977) and stresses the continuing need for the strict application of all its provisions;

2. *Requests* all States to refrain from importing arms, ammunition of all types and military vehicles produced in South Africa;

3. *Requests* all States, including States not Members of the United Nations, to act strictly in accordance with the provisions of the present resolution;

4. *Requests* the Secretary-General to report to the Security Council Committee established by resolution 421 (1977) concerning the question of South Africa on the progress of the implementation of the present resolution before 31 December 1985.

Following the vote, the representative of the United Kingdom pointed out that his Government was opposed to certain suggestions that would exacerbate the situation in South Africa and could cause grave damage to neighbouring States and therefore

warned against the Council's lightly entering into areas such as Chapter VII measures. His Government also objected to the use of trade sanctions, which were difficult to enforce and harmed the poorest and most vulnerable, whereas trade was a channel for widening mutual understanding and for exercising a moderating influence. He commended the Council for adopting a realistic course and expressed great appreciation to the representative of the Netherlands for preparing a text that would command unanimous support.⁵²

The representative of India underlined the primary importance of resolution 418 (1977) setting up the mandatory arms embargo and suggested that the new measure to ban also the import of South African arms was only an aspect of the total embargo. He also expressed regret that the text adopted did not contain all the improvements that had been proposed in the consultations.⁵²

The representative of the Soviet Union asked for concrete steps to close some of the loopholes in the embargo and to make it as comprehensive as possible. Beyond the new decision, which he warmly welcomed, he reiterated his Government's long-standing support for the application of sanctions provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter.⁵²

The representative of Pakistan called the decision of the Council a mandatory Council resolution and expressed hope that the Council would take up the recommendations for comprehensive measures submitted by the arms embargo committee four years ago.⁵²

The representative of South Africa protested that he had specifically requested to speak before the Council voted on the draft resolution and called the procedure adopted by the President most irregular. He also acknowledged that the buildup of the South African arms industry had begun after the adoption of resolution 418 (1977) and claimed that that development was inevitable as the arms embargo constituted an ill-conceived attempt to destroy South Africa's capacity to exercise its basic right to self-defence. He added that South Africa had become self-sufficient in a number of important armaments sectors and would continue to keep pace with the requirements of its defence.⁵²

NOTES

¹ S/14277, OR, 35th yr., Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1980.

² For similar expressions of concern, see also the letter dated 1 December 1980 from the Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid (S/14280, *ibid.*) and the note verbale dated 23 December 1980 from the Permanent Mission of Cuba to the United Nations transmitting the text of the communiqué adopted at the plenary meeting of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries held in New York on 23 December 1980 (S/14315, *ibid.*).

³ S/14361, incorporated in the record of the 2264th meeting. See also OR, 36th yr., Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council, 1981.

⁴ S/14648, OR, 36th yr., Suppl. for July-Sept. 1981.

⁵ For details, see chap. III of the present Supplement.

⁶ 2295th mtg., paras. 5-8.

See 2295th mtg., statements by the representatives of China, France, the German Democratic Republic, Ireland, Japan, Mexico, the Philippines, Spain, Tunisia, Uganda and the Soviet Union.

⁷ 2295th mtg., paras. 43-44.

⁸ *Ibid.*, paras. 65 and 66.

¹⁰ See 2295th mtg., statements by the representatives of Mexico (paras. 50-54), the Philippines (paras. 57-62) and, in particular, Uganda (paras. 70-75).

¹¹ S/14787, OR, 36th yr., Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1981.

¹² S/14794, incorporated in the record of the 2315th meeting. See also OR, 36th yr., Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council, 1981.

¹³ S/14958, *ibid.*, 37th yr., Suppl. for April-June 1982.

¹⁴ S/14959, *ibid.*

¹⁵ S/14960, adopted as orally amended as resolution 503 (I 1982).

¹⁶ 2351st mtg., paras. 3-8.

¹⁷ For the vote, see *ibid.*, para. 9.

¹⁸ 2351st mtg., paras. 16-18.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, paras. 19-24.

²⁰ The report (S/14179) was issued on 19 September 1980. See Supplement 1975-1980, chap. VIII, part II, for details regarding the submission and its first discussion at the 2261st meeting.

²¹ 2397th mtg., para. 3. For details, see chap. III of the present Supplement.

²² 2398th mtg., para. 2 (Algeria, Ghana), and para. 121 (Cuba). For details, see chapter III of the present Supplement.

²³ 2398th mtg., paras. 3 and 4. For details, see chap. III of the present Supplement.

²⁴ 2397th mtg., paras. 7-29.

²⁵ 2398th mtg., paras. 7-32. For similar statements see *ibid.*, paras. 36-45 (Togo), paras. 47-90 (Chairman, Special Committee against Apartheid) and paras. 112-120 (Algeria).

²⁶ S/15405, OR, 37th yr., Suppl. for July-Sept. 1982.

²⁷ S/15444, *ibid.*, Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council, 1982.

²⁸ S/15511, adopted without change as resolution 525 (1982).

²⁹ For the President's opening statement and the vote, see 2404th mtg., paras. 2-4. See also chap. IV of the present Supplement regarding the vote.

³⁰ S/15814, OR, 38th yr., Suppl. for April-June 1983.

³¹ S/15815, adopted without change as resolution 533 (1983).

³² For the President's opening statement and the vote, see 2452nd mtg. See also chap. IV of the present Supplement.

³³ S/16265, OR, 39th yr., Suppl. for Jan.-March 1984.

³⁴ In a letter dated 11 January 1984 (S/16271, *ibid.*), the representative of South Africa denounced the request by the African Group as interference in the internal affairs of South Africa and attached to the letter the text of the formal murder charges against the defendant.

³⁵ S/16275, adopted without change as resolution 547 (1984).

³⁶ For the vote see 2512th mtg. See also chap. IV of the present Supplement.

³⁷ S/16692, OR, 39th yr., Suppl. for July-Sept. 1984.

³⁸ 2548th mtg. Similar statements regarding the unacceptability of the South African constitution were made at the same meeting by: the representatives of Argentina, Egypt, India, Nigeria, Peru and Thailand and by the Acting Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid; at the 2549th mtg. by the representatives of China, Malta, Pakistan, the Syrian Arab Republic, the Soviet Union, Yugoslavia and Zimbabwe and by the Chairman of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and Mr. Makatini; at the 2550th mtg. by the representatives of Benin, the Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Kuwait, Mongolia, Nicaragua and Sri Lanka; and at the 2551st mtg. by the representatives of France, Guyana, Indonesia, the Netherlands, Qatar, Togo and Trinidad and Tobago, by the President, speaking in his capacity as representative of Burkina Faso, and by Mr. Makhanda.

³⁹ 2548th mtg.

⁴⁰ S/16700, adopted with small editorial changes as resolution 554 (1984).

⁴¹ 2551st mtg.

⁴² For the vote, see *ibid.* See also chap. IV of the present Supplement.

⁴³ 2551st mtg.

⁴⁴ S/16786, OR, 39th yr., Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1984.

⁴⁵ S/16791, adopted without change as resolution 556 (1984).

⁴⁶ 2560th mtg. See also the statements by India (*ibid.*) and by the Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid (*ibid.*).

⁴⁷ 2560th mrg.

⁴⁸ For the vote, see *ibid.* See also chap. IV of the present Supplement.

⁴⁹ 2560th mtg. See also the explanation of the vote by the United States (*ibid.*), which had abstained in view of some "excesses" of language in the text of the resolution.

⁵⁰ S/16860. OR. 39th yr., Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1984.

⁵¹ S/16860, adopted without change as resolution 558 (1984).

⁵² 2564th mtg.

⁵³ For the vote, see *ibid.* See also chap. IV of the present Supplement.

3. ITEMS RELATING TO THE MIDDLE EAST

A. THE SITUATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Decision of 19 March 1981 (2266th meeting): President's statement

In a letter⁷ dated 3 March 1981, the representative of Lebanon requested a meeting of the Council to address itself to the continuing problem of repeated Israeli aggression against Lebanon. In previous letters,⁸ he had informed the Council about particular acts of aggression against Lebanon which he charged had been committed by Israeli forces.

At its 2265th meeting, on 9 March 1981, the Council included the letter dated 3 March 1981 from Lebanon in the agenda. Following the adoption of the agenda, the President of the Council invited the representatives of Israel and Lebanon, at their request, to participate in the discussion without the right to vote.⁹ The Council considered the item at the 2265th and 2266th meetings, on 9 and 19 March 1981.

The representative of Lebanon stated that his Government was not waiting for the expiration of the mandate of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) to submit its grievances and ask for action, as a novel situation had developed in the south since the last Council debate on 17 December 1980, involving repeated acts of violence, which had become constant, and continued warfare, which comprised a threat to international peace and security as well as to the safety of UNIFIL. The results of the well-pondered policy of so-called pre-emptive strikes by Israel were: (a) an escalation of military and paramilitary operations to an ever-ascending level of intensity; (b) the disruption of the fabric of civilian life in south Lebanon; and (c) a general state of disintegration and terror beyond the Lebanese borders and in the whole Middle East. He deplored the danger of UNIFIL being destroyed as a credible deterrent and pointed to the stability of the operation of the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force (UNDOF).

He quoted extensively from a statement by President Sarkis to the third summit meeting of the Islamic Conference and, in view of the tremendous danger, appealed to the Council to initiate a mechanism for peace in Lebanon and on the internationally recognized border with Israel, because only such a step could create the conditions for the peace-keeping enterprise to succeed. He concluded in expressing his hope that the Council could reach that type of action-oriented resolution.⁴

The representative of the Soviet Union recalled how often the Council had been forced to meet in connection with incessant acts of aggression by Israel

against Lebanon. He rejected the Israeli attempts to justify those aggressive actions against Lebanon by means of assertions that they were carrying out so-called pre-emptive strikes against Palestinians as blatant defiance of international law and of numerous decisions of the Council and the General Assembly designed to protect the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon. The Israeli policy could only be described as international State terrorism, which relied on the support of those who were paying lip-service to opposition against such terrorism.

He called for a return to collective efforts, within the framework of an international conference, to find a just and comprehensive settlement. In view of Israel's continued banking on force, the Council should adopt a resolution condemning the acts of aggression by Israel and calling for an end to such aggression; the Council should also oblige the Israeli authorities to observe and respect strictly the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon and to cease all intervention in that State's internal affairs.⁵

During consultations among members of the Council on 16 March 1981, the Secretary-General made a statement that was issued on the same day as a special report.⁶ The Secretary-General reported that, even as the Council was considering the complaint brought by the Government of Lebanon on the violence of 2 and 3 March, further hostilities had broken out in southern Lebanon and had made the situation in the UNIFIL area extremely tense. On the morning of 16 March, the *de facto* forces located in the south had fired 24 tank rounds into the village of Al-Qantara, in the Nigerian battalion sector of UNIFIL, killing a Nigerian captain and a corporal and injuring 11 Nigerian soldiers. The *de facto* forces had threatened to resume shelling unless the platoon of Lebanese soldiers was withdrawn from Al-Qantara, and that threat had been carried out when 10 tank rounds were fired into a village in the Netherlands battalion area.

The Secretary-General also informed the Council that the Commander of UNIFIL had made it clear to the *de facto* forces that there was no question of withdrawing the Lebanese platoon, which had been located in Al-Qantara since April 1979 in implementation of the UNIFIL mandate as set out in resolution 425 (1978). He added that the United Nations had been in touch with the Israeli authorities, urging them to make all possible efforts to bring an end to the irresponsible behaviour of the *de facto* forces. He noted that in recent months UNIFIL had also had to contend with constant efforts by various factions of armed elements to the north and west to infiltrate its area of operation and had sustained casualties in the process.

The Secretary-General declared that one of the most important principles upon which UNIFIL was established was the full co-operation of all the parties concerned, but it had been all too clear throughout the history of UNIFIL, and was again underlined by the tragic events in question, that co-operation had not been forthcoming. Therefore, all possible efforts should be made to impress upon all armed groups in the area that provocation, harassment and military offensives against UNIFIL could not and would not be accepted.

At its 2266th meeting, on 19 March 1981, the Council included the special report of the Secretary-