



Security Council

UN LIBRARY

FEB 20 1987

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.2734
18 February 1987

ENGLISH

UN/SC COLLECTION

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND
SEVEN HUNDRED AND THIRTY-FOURTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Wednesday, 18 February 1987 at 3.30 p.m.

President: Mr. ZUZE

(Zambia)

Members:

Argentina
Bulgaria
China
Congo
France
Germany, Federal Republic of
Ghana
Italy
Japan
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
United Arab Emirates
United Kingdom of Great Britain and
Northern Ireland
United States of America
Venezuela

Mr. DELPECH
Mr. GARVALOV
Mr. LI Luye
Mr. ADOUKI
Mr. BROCHAND
Mr. LAUTENSCHLAGER
Mr. DUMEVI
Mr. BUCCI
Mr. KIKUCHI
Mr. TIMERBAEV
Mr. AL-SHAALI

Sir John THOMSON
Mr. WALTERS
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 QUESTION OF SOUTH AFRICA

LETTER DATED 10 FEBRUARY 1987 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF EGYPT TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/18688)

The PRESIDENT: In accordance with decisions taken at the previous meetings on this item, I invite the representatives of Algeria, Angola, Egypt, the German Democratic Republic, India, Kenya, Morocco, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Senegal, South Africa, the Sudan, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the United Republic of Tanzania, Yugoslavia and Zimbabwe to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Djoudi (Algeria), Mr. de Figueiredo (Angola), Mr. Badawi (Egypt), Mr. Ott (German Democratic Republic), Mr. Dasgupta (India), Mr. Kiilu (Kenya), Mr. Bennouna (Morocco), Mr. Icaza Gallard (Nicaragua), Mr. Ahmed (Pakistan), Mr. Sarré (Senegal), Mr. Manley (South Africa), Mr. Adam (Sudan), Mr. Oudovenko (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic), Mr. Chagula (United Republic of Tanzania), Mr. Djokic (Yugoslavia) and Mr. Mudenge (Zimbabwe) 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 Guyana and Uganda in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Karran (Guyana) and Mr. Kibedi (Uganda) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

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

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

Mr. DASGUPTA (India): It is for my delegation a particular privilege to greet you, Mr. President, in this important office for the current month. It is fitting that this series of Security Council meetings addressing one of the most critical problems the United Nations confronts should be presided over by the representative of a front-line State. You bring to your office a profound appreciation of the full dimensions of this problem, many of whose facets you have dealt with also in your capacity as President of the United Nations Council for Namibia.

May I also pay tribute to Ambassador Andres Aguilar of Venezuela, who guided the Council's work last month with such distinction.

My country was privileged to be the first to draw the attention of the United Nations to the problem of racism in South Africa by bringing a complaint to the United Nations General Assembly in 1946. That very year we imposed sanctions against South Africa - the first nation to do so. We have never ceased to press for dismantling the odious system of apartheid.

The United Nations plays an important role in the world-wide struggle against the abhorrent system of apartheid. It has helped steadily to turn the balance of forces against the racist régime and in favour of the movement for freedom. It has helped to secure for the liberation movement the widest possible measure of international support from Governments and organizations. The United Nations has

(Mr. Dasgupta, India)

helped to sensitize world opinion and has reflected the mounting international repugnance against the evil of apartheid. The Organization has helped achieve unanimity on condemnation of apartheid, on the arms embargo against South Africa, and on humanitarian assistance to the victims of apartheid. It has reflected the overwhelming support of the international community for the principle of sanctions against the apartheid régime and assistance to liberation movements. These are no mean achievements, but the prevailing situation in South Africa calls for further measures.

Our meeting today takes place at a crucial moment in the history of South Africa. The people of South Africa are astir. The tide of mass resistance against apartheid is rising inexorably and gathering strength every day. Apartheid stands with its back to the wall. The indiscriminate killings, maimings, torture and detentions without trial, which have followed the imposition of the state of emergency by the racist régime, are the paroxysms of a system struggling to escape inevitable extinction. The countdown to the collapse of apartheid has started.

The apartheid régime has hardened its position towards its opponents inside and outside the country. Arguing that the State was confronting a "revolutionary onslaught", the régime extended the powers granted under the emergency imposed in June last by proclaiming new and more severe restrictions on the local and foreign media. The adoption of these measures against the media, establishing censorship of news on any form of protest, as well as police and army action, constitutes Pretoria's admission that the political situation in the country has indeed moved beyond its control. The régime's stand clearly indicates that Botha has abandoned any pretence of "reform".

The rapidly growing mass upsurge against the evil of apartheid and the simultaneous hardening of the terror and repression of the racist régime will inevitably lead to a violent confrontation. This is inevitable - that is to say,

(Mr. Dasgupta, India)

unless the international community intervenes by applying effective pressure on the Pretoria régime to mend its ways. Such pressure could be applied through comprehensive mandatory sanctions. The apartheid economy, already weak and stagnant, is clearly susceptible to the pressure of sanctions. It is therefore incumbent on the international community immediately to institute such measures with a view to bringing about a peaceful dismantling of the obnoxious system of apartheid. It is in this context that the Prime Minister of India, Mr. Rajiv Gandhi, stated recently that "sanctions are the only non-violent means left to counter the violence of apartheid". Sanctions provide the only alternative to a violent upheaval.

The argument has been advanced - as an excuse for avoiding sanctions - that they would adversely affect the front-line States as also the oppressed masses in South Africa. We have noted the threats held out by the Pretoria régime in this connection. But we must heed the voices of the representatives of the masses in South Africa and in the front-line States who have called for sanctions, notwithstanding the adverse effects of Pretoria's retaliation. Retaliatory measures which might be taken by the racists cannot therefore provide a pretext for avoiding sanctions. The correct conclusion to draw is that international action is necessary to strengthen the economic and financial capability of the front-line States to fight apartheid and support the liberation movements in South Africa and Namibia in their struggle against racist and colonialist oppression, and also to assist the front-line States to enforce sanctions against South Africa and to cope with any retaliatory economic action by the racist régime. It was with those objectives in view that the Non-Aligned Movement took the initiative to establish the Africa Fund.

(Mr. Dasgupta, India)

In conclusion, India has always supported the imposition of sanctions against the racist Pretoria régime. The deepening crisis in South Africa demands immediate action by the Council. It must not fail the victims of racist repression who are struggling to free themselves.

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

Mr. KIKUCHI (Japan): I wish to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of February. I am confident that, with the benefit of your well known skills of diplomacy and leadership, our deliberations will be conducted in a fruitful manner. Let me assure you that my delegation is fully prepared to assist you as you carry out your important responsibilities.

I wish also to express our heartfelt gratitude to His Excellency Mr. Andres Aguilar for the excellent manner in which he guided the work of this Council as its President during the month of January.

Since the Security Council last met on this agenda item the situation in South Africa has regrettably continued to deteriorate. The Government's policies of apartheid still pervade every aspect of the social, economic and political life of the country, causing uprisings among the oppressed majority and inviting the rancour of the neighbouring African States and indeed of the international community as a whole.

It is deplorable that the Government of South Africa refuses to confront the crux of its domestic troubles, namely the abhorrent and dehumanizing system of apartheid. Instead Pretoria continues to try to suppress popular discontent by brute force - a futile strategy that has resulted in the loss of more than 2,000 lives, most of them black African lives. Since reimposing a state of emergency in June 1986, it has arbitrarily arrested and detained countless thousands of its citizens, including many children and young people. Moreover it has recently stepped up its restrictions on the press in a vain attempt to conceal from the rest of the world the atrocities committed by its authorities and the public's protests.

South Africa's recent announcement that it would hold general elections for its "white" Parliament must not be construed as part of a democratic process, for

(Mr. Kikuchi, Japan)

the black citizens, who constitute the overwhelming majority of the population, continue to be deprived of their political and civic rights.

Pretoria must realize that, as the Dutch Reformed Church has recently concurred, peace and stability will not be restored to that troubled land unless and until its policies of apartheid are completely abolished.

South Africa continues to turn a deaf ear to the outrage expressed by the international community at its military interventions and incursions into neighbouring States. We have heard what the representative of South Africa said when he addressed this very Council yesterday. While its blatant military attacks of last May against Botswana, Zambia and Zimbabwe were still fresh in our memory, in January it again launched several military attacks against Angola. Its economic harassment and threats of "counter sanctions" against its neighbours are both unwarranted and outrageous.

Japan demands that South Africa take concrete and fundamental measures to abolish apartheid and present to the international community a credible timetable for the achievement of that goal.

Japan demands that South Africa lift the state of emergency and release all detainees immediately. We demand the unconditional release of Nelson Mandela and all other political prisoners.

We demand that Pretoria forthwith lift the ban on anti-apartheid organizations such as the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC) and the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania (PAC) and enter into serious dialogue with those and other liberation movements representing the majority of the population. It should do so with a view to seeking ways and means to achieve the abolition of apartheid in a peaceful and expeditious manner.

We demand the dismantlement of the so-called Bantustan system.

(Mr. Kikuchi, Japan)

Japan demands that South Africa refrain from military incursions into neighbouring territories and that it cease its economic harassment of its neighbours.

Finally, Japan demands that South Africa grant Namibia its rightful and long overdue independence.

Japan's record in opposing apartheid is second to none. Indeed we were among the first to take concrete steps to induce South Africa to abandon its policies of institutionalized racial discrimination.

As early as in 1951, when Japan joined the international community following the conclusion of the San Francisco Treaty of Peace, it refused to establish full diplomatic relations with South Africa. We still maintain relations with Pretoria only at the consular level.

At present the international community is beginning so-called disinvestment in South Africa; Japan banned all direct investment in South Africa way back in the mid-1960s. Thus Japan has no investments to disinvest.

Japan has also applied pressure against South Africa through the following measures: the restriction of commercial loans; the restriction of sports, cultural and educational exchanges; a prohibition on arms exports - I might add that not a single weapon has ever been imported from South Africa; a prohibition on the export of computers to South African institutions that enforce apartheid; the halting of imports of krugerrands and other gold coins; a prohibition on iron and steel imports; no issuance of tourist visas to South African nationals; no promotion of tourism to South Africa; no air-transportation links with South Africa; and a prohibition on the use of international flights of South African Airways by Japanese Government officials.

(Mr. Kikuchi, Japan)

In addition, of course, we have no military or nuclear relationship with South Africa.

While some of those measures date back years, even decades, I wish here to stress that in addition to those measures a new series of steps was taken in 1985 and 1986 in concert with other, Western, countries in order to convey a concerted message of global outrage at Pretoria's intransigence and the deterioration of the situation in South Africa.

Fully recognizing the need for concerted action, we have instituted domestic regulations to ensure that our private and commercial activities will not in any way undermine or weaken the effectiveness of sanctions and other measures taken by other countries.

We must be relentless in exerting political and economic pressure on South Africa until it realizes that apartheid is totally inadmissible and unacceptable to the world community. Japan recognizes that it must explore all possible avenues towards the eradication of apartheid.

To that end, Japan wishes first to promote political dialogue with regional leaders, including the black leaders in South Africa. Last year Japan welcomed the late President Samora Machel of Mozambique and a delegation of the Foreign Ministers of non-aligned States, who engaged in in-depth exchanges of views with Prime Minister Nakasone and other top leaders of the Japanese Government. Mr. Oliver Tambo, President of the ANC, is scheduled to visit my country in April in order to have talks with the Japanese leaders.

Second, Japan is extending training and educational assistance to help prepare young black citizens of South Africa and Namibia for the day when they assume positions of leadership in their respective countries.

(Mr. Kikuchi, Japan)

Third, in sympathetic concern for the neighbouring African States, especially the front-line States, which are suffering economic difficulties due to the deteriorating situation inside South Africa as well as to Pretoria's harassment, Japan is stepping up its efforts to assist them in their endeavour to strengthen their economic resiliency. Last month we dispatched a high-level economic co-operation mission to the front-line States, and at the Southern African Development Co-ordination Conference (SADCC) held recently at Gaborone, our representative confirmed Japan's intention to assist the countries in that region as they strive to overcome their present difficulties.

I realize that the intractable situation now prevailing in southern Africa is so frustrating that we are tempted to succumb to despair. However, let us stop for a moment and look beyond apartheid and consider what we would lose were we to allow ourselves to give up in defeat and turn our back on the problem.

The region is inhabited by courageous and hardworking peoples - not only native Africans, but also peoples of European and Asian extraction. South Africa is abundantly blessed with natural resources. Let us look beyond the South Africa of today and imagine these people united in peace under democratic and majority rule coming together in partnership as equal, sovereign citizens. If - or, rather, when - that happens, a new horizon will open up before them and the countries to which they belong, bringing with it infinite possibilities for prosperity and development. That new wave of development can, I believe, eventually extend throughout all of Africa and involve the entire international community in the process. Post-apartheid South Africa will surely play a pivotal role. Pretoria, Johannesburg and other centres will cease to be symbols of oppression, aggression and divisiveness. They will become, instead, centres for co-operation, consultation and constructive work for all of southern Africa and, indeed, for the entire African continent.

(Mr. Kikuchi, Japan)

I am not here suggesting that such a process of development will be achieved without trials and tribulations. Indeed, the recent SADCC meeting identified a number of obstacles that its members must overcome if they are to accomplish their objectives. However, is there any goal more worthy of effort and more worthy of great dignity than the economic and social development of a democratic South Africa, where human rights are respected and friendly relations with the rest of human society enjoyed?

Thus, with our sights fixed firmly on that, our ultimate goal, let us with renewed energy and undimmed hope continue our efforts for the prompt and total dismantling of apartheid. Indeed, Japan at this time begins its term as a non-permanent member of the Security Council with the fervent hope that in the next two years it will witness and, indeed, contribute to genuine and meaningful progress towards the solution of this tragic problem.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Japan for his kind words 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): On behalf of the Zimbabwe delegation and on my own behalf I would like to express warmest congratulations to you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of February. Zambia and Zimbabwe are like Siamese twins joined together by the mighty Zambezi umbilical cord and united in their determination to bring freedom, development and human dignity to southern Africa and to the world. Zambia, as Chairman of the front-line States, brings unique perspectives and insights to the presidency of the Council as it addresses the item on its agenda. Your responsibilities are difficult, but the skill and wisdom - as well as the experience - you bring to the

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

presidency will serve to assure you of our support and that of the Council in dealing with the important matter before us.

I would also like to take this opportunity to express the appreciation of my delegation to Ambassador Andres Aguilar of friendly Venezuela for the skilful manner in which he handled the affairs of the Council during the past month.

Since this is the first time I have spoken in this Chamber this year, allow me to take this opportunity to congratulate the new members of the Security Council upon their election to their high office and to wish them and the other members of the Council a fruitful and prosperous 1987.

The assertion yesterday by Pretoria's spokesman that

"Power in South Africa resides in the hands of the moderate majority [which includes] blacks, whites, Asians and coloureds" (S/PV.2732, p. 23)

must surely take the prize as the quintessence of that uniquely South African political lexicon known as "Bothaspeak". Surely, if we took the statements literally, we would be forced, with Congreve, to say to the gentleman who uttered those words: "Thou liar of the first magnitude!" But, of course, "Bothaspeak" is meant to be decoded and not to be taken literally. When Pretoria's spokesman says that "Far-reaching reforms have already been introduced" or that "much discriminatory legislation has disappeared" (S/PV.2732, p. 21), he does not use those words to mean the same thing as the rest of us understand them to mean. His is a land of delusions, a land of a mere phantasmagoria of changing shapes and illusions, a land that has lost touch with reality.

Let us hope that for the good of South Africa Pretoria's new spokesman will soon realize the tragedy of his country as did his predecessor at the United Nations, Mr. Kurt von Schirnding, and, of course, as did Dr. Dennis Worrall, who has also resigned his post at London in despair over Botha's failure to carry out meaningful reforms.

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

Sadly, the truth is that apartheid is still very much alive in South Africa. It continues to dehumanize both its victims and its perpetrators and to kill its opponents and victims. And, as opposition to it increases, it has become more vicious - including to little children, whom it incarcerates, tortures and brutalizes. And Botha is at his wit's end. He has run out of ideas and now has neither the courage nor the intention to address the fundamental challenges facing his country.

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

But, like a wounded buffalo, he stands bleeding and menacing, ready to charge anything that seems to threaten the apartheid edifice. Such is his state of confusion and fear that even such innocuous proposals as the so-called Buthelezi-Natal Indaba frighten him and threaten him. Nobody in this Chamber considers the Natal Indaba as a "far-reaching reform", and yet a South African Government Minister has rejected it as revolutionary in its consequences.

Botha has lost touch with reality; his only response to the crisis facing his country is to resort to violence and repression. Hence, we have seen him declaring a state of emergency which has resulted in over 2,500 people being killed and about 30,000 detained without trial. A report published on 3 December 1986 by the Detainees Parents Support Committee, which recently launched a free the children campaign in South Africa, states that about 40 per cent of the estimated 30,000 held under the current state of emergency are children between the ages of 10 and 18. The Committee further reports that those children are being held in filthy and cramped cells and that many of them have had to be hospitalized because of physical and mental torture during their incarceration.

In the International Herald Tribune of 14 September 1986, the Federal Party's Unrest Monitoring Committee reported on children being coerced into signing documents admitting themselves to Pretoria's re-education camps for brainwashing and indoctrination. Anyone doubting Pretoria's sadism against these children should watch the movie "Witness to Apartheid", produced by the United States journalist Ms. Sharon Sopher. Dr. Fabian Ribeiro, who treated some of the tortured children shown in that movie and who provided medical evidence to Ms. Sopher, has since been assassinated by Pretoria's agents. So has his wife.

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

It is those brutal, shameful acts of inhumanity that Pretoria's recent Draconian edicts against the news media are meant to hide, as behind a fig leaf. Under the emergency regulations of 12 June 1986, the press is banned from reporting Pretoria's military actions against the opponents of apartheid. On 11 December 1986, further measures prohibiting reports on police and military intimidation in pursuit of political goals were introduced, virtually silencing the press and leaving Pretoria answerable not even to its white electorate - and still less to the majority population of the country - but only to the inner contortions of its sick mind.

In spite of all such efforts, Pretoria can never completely hide its shame, because so long as the pillars of apartheid - such as the Group Areas Act, the Bantu Authorities Act and the Population Registration Act - continue to contaminate the South African statute book, violence and force will be necessary to suppress the resistance of its victims.

Those evil pieces of legislation bring great misery and pain to millions of South African citizens. The Bantu Authorities Act condemns millions to a condition of statelessness, and the Population Registration Act forces thousands to become chameleons, able to change colour year in and year out. For example, during 1985, the last year for which we have a report, under the Population Registration Act over 1,000 people changed colour: 702 Coloureds became white; 19 whites became Coloured; one Indian turned white; 50 Indians became Coloured; 43 Coloureds became Indians; three Chinese became white; 21 Indians turned Malay; 30 Malays turned Indian; two blacks became "other Asians"; 249 blacks turned Coloured; 20 Coloureds turned black; three blacks became Malay; three Coloureds turned Malay; eight Malays turned Coloured; 11 Coloureds became Chinese; one Chinese became Coloured. No blacks became white, and no whites became black.

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

To us this may sound like some Shakespearian comedy, but to the victims of this macabre drama the consequences can be most devastating. It can rend families asunder or lead to suicide. Some people spend days bleaching their faces and straightening their hair or hiding from the sun like cold-blooded reptiles to qualify for reclassification to the next, more privileged, class. That is a sick society, led by narrow-minded bigots and moral dwarfs.

Pretoria's State terrorism is directed not only against its citizens but also against the front-line and other neighbouring States. Here too the effect has been equally devastating. While starvation and malnutrition in many parts of the world are products of natural disasters, in southern Africa these ills are largely Pretoria-engineered. A recently released report of the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), entitled Children on the Front Line, which has been distributed to all of us, says that infant and child mortality rates in the countries of southern Africa, particularly in Angola and Mozambique, are estimated to be the highest in the world as a result of Pretoria's acts of aggression and destabilization. UNICEF reports that in 1986 alone the number of Angolan and Mozambican children under the age of five whose lives were lost as a consequence of war and destabilization by Pretoria reached an estimated 140,000. The report states that "Every four minutes a small child who would have lived is dying in Angola and Mozambique" as a result of the war and economic destabilization sponsored by South Africa. Today alone the lives of more than 360 little innocent Angolans and Mozambicans will be snatched by the talons of the apartheid monster. Since 1980, according to the same UNICEF report, the beast called apartheid has killed over half a million little Angolans and Mozambicans under the age of five: the exact figure is 535,000, who need not have died had South Africa not been carrying out acts of destabilization in those countries.

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

As we sit here, according to the same report,

"The state of the 15 million children under the age of five who live in countries bordering the Republic of South Africa is grave, and getting worse."

(Mr. Mudge, Zimbabwe)

Those horrendous statistics do not begin to tell even half the story, for hundreds of thousands over the age of five have been killed in the apartheid-sponsored wars, tens of thousands have been mutilated and millions are now facing starvation mainly as a result of the destruction of food crops and transport capacity and the loss of export earnings to pay for replacement food imports as a result of actions engineered by Pretoria. The other day, Mr. Christopher Patten, Britain's Minister for Overseas Development, said that 4 million people in Central Mozambique were facing starvation and were homeless as a result of the activities of the Mozambique National Resistance (MNR), which is sponsored, financed and trained by South Africa.

The economic cost of Pretoria's destabilization to the bordering States is reckoned in billions of dollars - over \$25 billion, to be precise. The wanton destruction of schools, clinics and other social services has inflicted a shattering blow on the development prospects of the region. For example, in Mozambique alone 718 health posts and centres have been destroyed since 1981, depriving over 2 million people of basic health care. As a result of Pretoria's acts of sabotage, millions of dollars are now being wasted on security expenditures instead of being channeled into development. And yet Pretoria's spokesman has the temerity to state here that if sanctions are imposed against his country, then its neighbours will "be hit hardest" (S/PV.2732, p. 19-20). For goodness' sake, South Africa not only has hit us "hardest" by its own sanctions against us but has killed close to 1 million of our people in five years, according to the UNICEF report. How hard can we be hit?

We could go on recounting the manifold heinous acts of the apartheid régime in southern Africa. But that is not our primary objective today. We are here to seek concerted international action to put an end to the evils of apartheid. We are here to appeal to the conscience of civilized man to rise above narrow

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

nationalistic interests. We come to ask the council of nations to stop the genocidal infanticide in southern Africa. We seek united action by the world community. We appeal to all nations to desist from actions that give succour to the apartheid régime - actions such as the sending of Israeli weapon system designs like the Saar-class missile boats, the Gabriel sea-to-sea missiles or avionics electronic counter-measures for Pretoria's Cheetar fighter bombers, or the development of KC-135-type surveillance aircraft and air-to-air refuelling capabilities or nuclear weapons technology, or West Germany's sale of submarine blueprints in violation of Security Council resolution 418 (1977) on the arms embargo against Pretoria. Pretoria cannot be persuaded of the seriousness of purpose of the international community when Hitachi or Olivetti swiftly moves into South Africa to fill the gap created by the disinvestment of International Business Machines (IBM), and when Britain's Lonrho, vulture-like, snatches shares of disinvesting rivals. Certainly, the régime can only gain comfort when attempts by the European Economic Community (EEC) and the Commonwealth to impose wider measures against the racist régime are resisted and blocked. Vetoes in the Security Council which shield the régime can only embolden the Pretoria racists. And the gun-running in the African night by a "certain colonel" to supply the UNITA bandits via Windhoek and other bases not only violates Security Council resolutions but amounts to collaboration with the apartheid régime. Those who train Pretoria's MNR bandit surrogates in Mozambique are as guilty as their paymasters and share guilt for the fiendish acts perpetrated by Pretoria against the little babies butchered in Mozambique or their mothers whose ears and noses have been severed by MNR bandits.

We are here today to seek to put an end to these policies of collaboration and the practice of sending conflicting signals to Pretoria. Many individual countries

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

as well as regional groupings have adopted a number of positive measures in order to send signals to the Pretoria racists. We want to unify these efforts so that the racists can get one clear, unambiguous message. We aim to bring all the different initiatives taken in this regard under one umbrella, to give them a global context and to cleanse them of some of their ambiguities. Although the leaders of the non-aligned countries, during the Eighth Summit Conference in Harare, sincerely believed that the only effective non-violent option left to persuade South Africa to change its apartheid policy was the immediate imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter, we have been persuaded by many of our friends that we should first seek to establish a baseline for further international action - a line that encompasses all the major initiatives so far taken. In this regard we have also been prevailed upon to accept that the measures already adopted by the United States Congress form a good basis to start on this path.

Furthermore we note, with satisfaction, that even the blue-ribbon commission on South Africa appointed by Secretary of State George Shultz has emphasized the importance of co-ordinating efforts in the sanctions movement against South Africa. The adoption of the United States congressional measures by other nations has been recommended by that commission. We endorse that considered recommendation. It is a recommendation made by seasoned men, well-versed in the practical affairs of the world. The report calls on the United States President to consult with a number of countries

"especially Britain, Canada, West Germany, France, Japan and Israel, to enlist their support for a multilateral programme of sanctions".

We applaud this call for concerted international action to impose sanctions and isolate South Africa economically. We stand ready to join hands with the

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

representative of the United States to give effect to this recommendation through a Security Council resolution, a resolution which will not allow Hitachi or Olivetti to profit from IBM's sacrifice or Lonrho from that of its rivals - in short a mandatory resolution.

The sanctions movement against South Africa is an act of solidarity with the victims and opponents of apartheid. It is they who ultimately will destroy the apartheid citadel. Ours is a supportive role. Let us therefore increase material, diplomatic and moral support to their movements, the African National Congress (ANC), the Pan Africanist Council of Azania (PAC) and the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO). In this connection, we welcome recent tentative gestures of recognition extended to the liberation movements of South Africa by some of the members of the Security Council. But they must go beyond these hesitant first steps to full support of the opponents and victims of apartheid. This they must do because it is the correct thing to do. It is a moral obligation we all owe to our fellowmen.

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

Finally, the South African spokesman made a number of spurious arguments which we have had occasion previously to discuss elsewhere. The question of the suffering in the neighbouring States in case of sanctions is a non-starter because those countries have made it clear that they do not want anyone to use their vulnerability as an excuse not to impose sanctions. Those countries are already suffering, and it would make their suffering tolerable if they knew that there was light at the end of the tunnel. The question of the blacks in South Africa, for whose cause half a million Mozambican and Angolan babies lost their lives in the last five years, was put clearly by the Nobel Prize winner, the late Chief Albert Luthuli, over a quarter of a century ago. That famous man said:

"The economic boycott of South Africa will entail undoubted suffering for Africans. We do not doubt that. But if it is a method that shortens the day of bloodshed, the suffering to us will be a price we are willing to pay."

As a representative of a small country, Zimbabwe, whose people endured United Nations comprehensive mandatory sanctions for nearly 15 years, as championed by the United Kingdom, I can assure the members of this Council that the black Zimbabweans accepted the deprivations of sanctions as a small price to pay in order to achieve their liberation. I have no doubt the Africans in South Africa will feel the same way.

Pretoria's representative is quite mistaken if he believes his countrymen do not respond to pressure and sanctions. All he has to do is to read about the recent panic of the cinema theatres in his country when faced by a firm threat of sanctions by the United States distributing company "Cinema International Corporation". That company told the South African cinemas to open up to all races by the end of this month, February, or they would be denied films. Within days the

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

apartheid signboards saying "Right of admission reserved" started falling and were replaced by new ones proclaiming "All welcome". I understand that as of last week, except for Pretoria and two other bastions of right-wing extremism, namely, Krugersdorp and Pietersburg, where the battle is still raging, the rest of the towns have now desegregated their cinemas. True this is only "petty apartheid", but it shows us that South Africans, like all other human beings, will respond to pressure and sanctions. Indeed, to argue otherwise as South Africa's representative tried to do yesterday, is to be a racist against the people of South Africa. Of course nobody here is so naive as to believe that United Nations sanctions alone will "bring about the imminent downfall of the South African Government". No. Sanctions are only an element of the pressures the international community intends to bring to bear on the South African régime in order to help it to concentrate its mind on the necessity to dismantle apartheid. For our part, we have no doubt that in the end apartheid will be destroyed, one way or another.

Let me conclude my statement by recalling that the Security Council has already sent a number of its own symbolic smoke signals to Pretoria by the adoption of voluntary measures under resolutions 566 (1985) and 569 (1985). And a number of countries and regional groups have repeated similar signals. But, alas, the apartheid wind has proved too strong and all those smoke signals have been dissipated and so the Pretorian guards in Pretoria have failed to decode the message. We must now send a messenger with strong legs with a written message to be read to the gods in Pretoria. Let it be a united message; a message of determination; one without equivocation. Let it not be another symbolic and ineffectual list of voluntary measures. Pretoria should not be left to guess. It should see, know and be told that the mandatory sanctions train is on the rails and cannot be stopped until it reaches its ultimate destination - the total destruction of apartheid.

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

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

Mr. OTT (German Democratic Republic): I should like at the very outset to extend to you, Sir, my cordial congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of February. We regard it as symbolic and encouraging that a representative of free Africa should be presiding over this important debate on the situation in South Africa. Your country, the Republic of Zambia, with which the German Democratic Republic maintains friendly relations, enjoys worldwide respect for its firm and determined position in the struggle against apartheid.

This fact, and your great diplomatic skills as well as your personal commitment to the rights of the oppressed South African and Namibian peoples, to the restoration of peace and security in the region, give us the assurance of the successful guidance of this body.

Our appreciation also goes to the Permanent Representative of Venezuela, His Excellency Ambassador Aguilar, for the discharge of his duties as President of the Council in the month of January.

Since this is the first time this year that my delegation has spoken in the Council, I should like to congratulate all the new non-permanent members of the Council on their election. It is our hope that they will render their contribution to making the Security Council effectively live up to its responsibility for securing world peace, solving conflicts and promoting international co-operation.

(Mr. Ott, German Democratic
Republic)

The delegation of the German Democratic Republic is speaking on this item under consideration because the policy of the apartheid régime not only endangers peace and stability in the region of southern Africa but also constitutes a permanent threat to peace and security in the world at large.

(Mr. Ott, German Democratic Republic)

The position of the German Democratic Republic with regard to the situation in South Africa, a position which is demonstrated by the people and Government of my country by their daily practice, is unambiguous and in conformity with that of the overwhelming majority of States. If the people of South Africa are to achieve the ability to live freely in a united, non-racial and democratic society; if Namibia is at long last to achieve its independence, on the basis of Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978) and without any pre-conditions; and if all the States of the region are to be able to follow their development path in peace and security, without aggression and acts of destabilization by Pretoria; then resolute measures are required against the apartheid régime.

The times when hopes for reforms were feigned by well-known circles are definitely over. The world is agreed that apartheid cannot be reformed; it must be eradicated once and for all.

It is incumbent upon the Security Council to prevent the continuation of bloodshed in South Africa, or even its probable escalation. It will be able to do so only if it heeds the world-wide call for the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions on Pretoria under Chapter VII of the Charter. Unity by all members of the Security Council on this question is the message which would be best understood by the racists, a message which could force them to abandon apartheid.

If it is not possible at present to reach that unity, we are well aware of the underlying reasons. There is still resistance from some Western members of the Council to comprehensive mandatory sanctions - for transparent reasons. They have been repeatedly and convincingly refuted by competent representatives of the peoples of South Africa, Namibia and the front-line States themselves.

(Mr. Ott, German Democratic Republic)

Everything that falls short of comprehensive mandatory sanctions is in our view only a beginning, or perhaps even represents a loss of time. It can hardly avert the danger of causing ever more victims among the oppressed population of South Africa, which is waging a courageous and united struggle.

In the course of the debate so far State representatives have impressively furnished proof of the fact that blackmail, force and terror form the foundations of apartheid. Their examples are legion, and with each passing day Pretoria is adding new links to the chain of its crimes. The German Democratic Republic resolutely condemns the arrest and detention of activists of the democratic movement in South Africa. We call for the immediate release of the political prisoners and detainees, and for the termination of all political trials without delay.

For how long is the state of emergency and the intensification and brutal utilization of the oppressive apparatus to continue? How many have still to be killed, arbitrarily arrested and prosecuted, so that the allies of the racists, too, draw the conclusions of their alleged intentions, which they have preached so often - namely, consequences serving the interests of the oppressed population of South Africa as well as the improvement of the entire situation in the region and beyond it?

As I mentioned earlier, there can be no doubt that the explosive situation in southern Africa, which is caused by apartheid, is jeopardizing peace and security, not only on the sub-continent, but also in the world at large. This fact fills us with great concern.

Only recently the Head of State of the German Democratic Republic, Erich Honecker, again commented on that fact and drew attention to the dangers to

(Mr. Ott, German Democratic
Republic)

world peace emanating from the imperialist policy of threat, interference, the use of force and the fanning of conflicts. He stressed that the German Democratic Republic welcomed all initiatives conducive to the peaceful settlement of existing conflicts. In addition to the Middle East, Central America and other regions, he explicitly mentioned southern Africa.

The decade-long national liberation struggle in South Africa, led by the African National Congress of South Africa, whose seventy-fifth anniversary we marked a few weeks ago, the numerous mass actions against apartheid and the support for the struggle given by the front-line States, the non-aligned countries and socialist States have shaken the system of apartheid to its very foundations. It is in a deep crisis, but it is still powerful and extremely dangerous. That is all the more reason why any collaboration by certain imperialist countries with the apartheid régime must be condemned, irrespective of its form - be it the ostracized, so-called constructive engagement or any other form of overt or covert support.

Those who back Botha and his vassals today support a policy of State terrorism inside and outside the country and oppose the process of national and social liberation in Africa, oppose independence, democracy and progress. We therefore demand the immediate termination of political, economic and military collaboration with the apartheid State.

What is required is the complete isolation of the racists, and the Security Council can contribute to that end. At the same time, it is imperative to increase support for the peoples of South Africa and Namibia, as well as for the front-line States, which are in the forefront of the struggle against the apartheid system. Along these lines, the German Democratic Republic will continue to strengthen its

(Mr. Ott, German Democratic Republic)

firm solidarity with those forces and with all those others that have devoted themselves to the fast and final liquidation of apartheid, that crime against humanity.

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

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

Mr. ADAM (Sudan) (interpretation from Arabic): We congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for this month. We are confident that with your wisdom and wide experience you will guide to the desired conclusion the Council's current deliberations on one of the most important questions of the age - guaranteeing the legitimate rights of all peoples, wherever they are, including their right to liberty, dignity and self-determination.

(Mr. Adam, Sudan)

Our confidence that you will lead these deliberations to the desired objective is reinforced by the fact that you come from an African country which has consistently taken principled positions towards the practices of the racist South African policy, the resulting daily loss of the dignity of man in southern Africa, the conspiracies, invasions and continuous sabotage throughout the valiant front-line African States.

This is not the first time that this important body has been convened to deliberate on the deteriorating and very grave situation in South Africa. As representatives know, the Council held a record number of meetings last year on this same question, yet the racist Government of South Africa still persists in its perfidy. For a long time, and with complete freedom, it has been detaining and imprisoning honourable citizens, foremost amongst them the African fighter Nelson Mandela, who has spent the greater part of his life in prison.

That Government imposes indiscriminate mass punishment that makes no distinction among men, women, the elderly and children. Every day that Government displaces large numbers of workers, students and other social groups for the most insignificant and strangest reasons. In addition to the aforementioned, it has imposed a state of emergency throughout the country, thus placing most cities and other populated areas under this oppressive tyrannical law.

As a result of those practices, the total number of detainees last year alone amounted to 25,000, including 10,000 women and 3,000 children. Those terrifying figures affirm beyond doubt that today, under the Pretoria Government, non-white citizens are living inside a large prison.

The unjust practices of the racist Government of South Africa have not been confined to the coloured and black citizens who are an absolute majority; they have been extended to the neighbouring countries of Angola, Mozambique, Botswana, Zambia

(Mr. Adam, Sudan)

and Swaziland. Air raids, assassinations, and kidnapping of revolutionaries and refugees have become the hallmark of that aggressive, racist State policy towards its neighbours, in addition to its assistance to the puppet secessionist movements hostile to the legitimate Governments of those States. Those policies pursued by the Government of the racist entity of South Africa not only jeopardize regional peace and security but also actually create a hotbed of tension in southern Africa, fuelled by international strife and confrontation among major interests and Powers.

The racist régime of South Africa with all its blatantly negative policies could not have continued to defy the entire international community if developed Western countries and Israel had not provided it with modern technology to the point where it possesses a nuclear capability with which it blackmails the sons of the African continent and threatens international peace and security. That régime could not have grown like weeds if the door to monetary, commercial and economic co-operation had not been thrown open to it. Some Western European countries have given precedence to their selfish interests over principles which they hold sacred - principles such as the liberty of man, the preservation of his dignity and providing him with security and safety.

Numerous and reliable statistics confirm that 43 per cent of the total imports of the racist régime during 1985 came from four Western States and 26 per cent of its exports went to those countries. Those statistics indicate in particular that 60 per cent of the racist Pretoria régime's gross national product is derived from revenues from foreign trade and that its industrial sector is based on imports to an extent ranging between 60 per cent in respect of chemical industries and 62 per cent in respect of inputs into the primary products industry. Moreover, the racist régime's total exports in 1986 amounted to \$35 billion, compared with \$29.6 billion for 1985.

(Mr. Adam, Sudan)

Hence it is clear that we are still confronted with a problem for one of two reasons: either political dissembling or the lack of a genuine will and desire to eliminate this entrenched evil. Both reasons are equally sinister. It is inconceivable that a question of such gravity should be dealt with by accommodating contradictory desires and convictions and allowing them to come into play simultaneously: while on the one hand some condemn the policies of apartheid, on the other hand they continue to co-operate with the racist régime on all levels, thus enabling it to grow, prosper and become a clear and present danger to the peoples and the countries of Africa and to international peace and security.

At this juncture we need a principled, open stand based on actual faithful application of the provisions of Chapter VII of this Organization's Charter on the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the racist régime of South Africa. Those who publicly reject the policy of apartheid and consider it a crime against humanity must put an end to any overt and covert co-operation with the régime, a régime that basically rests on this erroneous and immoral philosophy of apartheid. There is no room for a middle-of-the-road position. Should the international community fall short of that stand, its credibility on this extremely grave question will remain suspect.

Despite this bleak picture and despite the tragic situation of the overwhelming majority of the sons of South Africa and Namibia, we have noted the positive trends that have emerged recently in world public opinion and the Western political community. Some legislative bodies in the West have taken strong decisions against the racist Government of South Africa. In this connection, we refer to the decision of the United States Congress to impose partial economic sanctions against the racist Pretoria régime and the call addressed to the Western countries to follow suit.

(Mr. Adam, Sudan)

We also refer to the recent attitude of the United States Administration in listening directly to some of the leaders of the liberation movement in South Africa. It is a beginning, and we hope it will continue and grow to include vital monetary, technical and economic sectors and end in the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter to force racist South Africa to renounce its racist policies and open the way to genuine democratic practices that would guarantee full Namibian independence and the establishment of a democratic Namibian State, which would include all the sons of that unfortunate country and guarantee them all an equal right to liberty and human dignity.

The pretext of linking Namibian independence to preconditions is worn out and can convince no one. Moreover, the claims of the Government of South Africa that it is combating terrorism and so-called international communism are mere distortions. The Pretoria Government is the greatest practitioner of State terrorism, and it uses it against the overwhelming majority of its population, the black and Coloured citizens, and against neighbouring States. Its record is well known, and nothing more need be said in that regard.

It has never produced a single piece of evidence that might give it some credibility in the eyes of the international community. It is an entity that has opted to stand outside the framework of international legitimacy, an entity that must be terminated by all available means, including recognition of the liberation movements fighting against it, moral and material support for them, and the imposition of an economic boycott against it until it crumbles completely, opening the way for a genuine democracy in which the rights of all are guaranteed.

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

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

Mr. BENNOUNA (Morocco) (interpretation from French): Permit me at the outset to address to you, Sir, the warmest congratulations of the Moroccan delegation on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council. Your competence and diplomatic experience and your dedication to African causes are the best guarantee that the Council will accomplish its task. We hope that our debates will be marked by a sense of responsibility and a willingness to be effective, especially since they are being held under the presidency of an African country that is particularly affected by the dramatic situation in southern Africa.

I also wish to pay tribute to your predecessor, Ambassador Andres Aguilar of Venezuela, who with talent and efficiency led the proceedings of the Council last month.

The Council is meeting once again to discuss the odious system of apartheid, which has repeatedly and unanimously been condemned in all international forums. Could it be otherwise? Apartheid is a policy of racial discrimination that has become a system of government that challenges the most sacred human values and the most significant achievements of universal ethics since the defeat of the Fascist régimes in the last war.

When the founders of our Organization declared their determination "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war", they stressed the link between that goal and respect for the human person by immediately thereafter proclaiming their

"faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small".

(Mr. Bennouna, Morocco)

Indeed, respect for the rights of the human person without distinction as to colour, race or religion is the sine qua non for the establishment of peaceful and harmonious relations among States and the elimination of sources of conflict and confrontation that may jeopardize world peace.

That essential link between human rights and international peace is one that our Organization has embodied throughout its more than 40 years of life. Much progress has been made through the adoption of legal instruments of universal scope and the creation of institutions that have been called upon to express the conscience of mankind every time the fundamental rights of a person have been violated anywhere in the world.

Certainly much remains to be done. Violations of human rights are commonplace everywhere. However, the situation in South Africa has specific characteristics that call for specific and sustained action on the part of the international community. It is a case of State violence organized by a minority of the population that claims the white race is superior, a minority that is bent on making the black majority second-class citizens by denying them the essential freedom to express their views on their political future, to choose their representatives, to enjoy freedom of movement, to be employed in accordance with their skills, not to mention housing and education for their children, and so forth.

In order to impose this anachronistic and intolerable system, the racist South African authorities have become entrenched in an infernal wheel of repression, imposing a state of emergency and conferring unlimited and arbitrary powers on the police and the military, which has led to increasingly serious abuses ranging from detention to torture and the murder of those who cannot accept injustice and indignity as their daily lot.

(Mr. Bennouna, Morocco)

Thus over the last two years the Special Committee against Apartheid has listed several hundred murders in South Africa and thousands of persons who have been arrested and detained, many of them under the age of 18 - children. Racial laws have reserved 87 per cent of the land for the white minority, forcing the black population to live in reservations outside the cities or in "homelands" whose alleged "independence" our Organization has declared null and void.

In addition, the inherent violence of the South Africa régime inevitably leads to adventurism beyond its borders. Thus it maintains colonial and racist domination in Namibia, despite all the decisions of the General Assembly and the Security Council on the illegality of its presence there and the need to allow the Namibian people to accede to independence in accordance with the plan contained in Security Council resolution 435 (1978). The régime continually engages in armed intervention and naked aggression against all its neighbours without distinction, be it Botswana, Swaziland, Lesotho, Zambia, Angola or Mozambique.

(Mr. Bennouna, Morocco)

Violence begets violence, and apartheid, which is based on aggression, secretes it by nature and cannot, therefore, be reformed or rehabilitated. It must simply be outlawed. In addition, the Council has never been misled by the so-called reforms introduced by the South African régime; in resolution 554 (1984), it declared that the new constitution and the so-called elections organized under it were contrary to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and that they further aggravated the already explosive situation prevailing inside South Africa.

The black South Africans are waging a heroic and painful struggle against the inhuman policy of Pretoria and, quite simply, to defend their right to live in dignity. In that struggle they are supported by international public opinion on every continent. The Kingdom of Morocco, which has always supported the oppressed people of South Africa, welcomes the concrete measures adopted by national institutions - parliaments, municipalities, businesses or universities - to divest themselves of their interests in South Africa and to halt all co-operation in areas that are strategic to the South African economy.

It is indeed high time that an end be put to the tragedy in which the majority of the South Africans live and to halt the ongoing cycle of oppression and violence by implementing the whole spectrum of peaceful means available to the international community under the provisions of our Organization's Charter.

Need we recall that since the mandatory embargo on arms shipments to South Africa decreed in Security Council resolution 418 (1977) no further mandatory sanctions have been adopted. We may well wonder whether the time has not now come to enter into a new phase and to adopt new selective and mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter. In so doing, we would be issuing a further warning to the South African régime to bring it totally to abolish the apartheid system and to embark upon the only policy that can lead to a prosperous future for all new

(Mr. Bennouna, Morocco)

generations of South Africans. That course would also lead to the building of a democratic, united and tolerant society in which the rights and characteristics of all would be respected without discrimination and in which all its members would be called upon to contribute to the progress of that society as a whole. As everyone knows, a model already exists for this course in Africa, and in southern Africa in particular.

We must once again put the political will of Pretoria to the test, but we must also preserve intact the right of the Council to resort ultimately to broad mandatory sanctions in order to implement the whole panoply of peaceful means available and thereby to re-establish permanently the international legality that South Africa has flouted.

The Kingdom of Morocco, which has always worked in support of our Organization's preventive action, and in particular of the action of the Security Council and the Secretary-General, can only welcome any initiative designed to improve the climate and prevent the situation in South Africa from ultimately engulfing all of southern Africa. It is in that context that we feel that the recent meeting between Mr. Oliver Tambo, President of the African National Congress of South Africa, and the United States Secretary of State, Mr. Schultz, can be regarded as a step in the right direction.

The Kingdom of Morocco, which recognizes the sacrifices being made by the innocent victims of apartheid, calls for increased humanitarian actions to alleviate their suffering and to free all the detainees.

As history has taught us, there is no point in prolonging the process, for the restoration of peace in South Africa requires first the full participation of the black majority in the building of a democratic and egalitarian society, to the development of which each and every person will be able to contribute his own genius, ability and talent.

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

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

Mr. SARRE (Senegal) (interpretation from French): I should like at the outset to pay tribute to that son of the third world His Excellency Mr. Andres Aguilar, Permanent Representative of Venezuela, for the able and lucid manner in which he guided the work of the Council last month.

I should also like, through you, Mr. President, to thank the members of the Council for allowing me to participate in this very important debate. It is significant and symbolic that the Security Council should be considering the question of South Africa under the presidency of a distinguished son of Africa and one who comes from a front-line country. You will therefore understand with what great respect and deep feelings I congratulate you, on my own behalf and on behalf of Senegal, and wish you every success.

I should also like to congratulate the new members of the Security Council and to wish them every success in their noble task.

The inhuman and degrading practices of the apartheid régime, that odious and shameful system of racial segregation that is the most inhuman institutionalized form of racial discrimination, have led us once again to turn to the Security Council for a consideration of the apartheid policy of the South African Government.

Over the past year, the racist minority South African régime, which once again on 12 June 1986 decreed a state of emergency throughout the territory of South Africa, has increased its arsenal of repression against the black South African majority. Indeed, Pretoria, continuing to defy the United Nations, and particularly the Security Council, the principal organ responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security, has established a panoply of laws,

(Mr. Sarré, Senegal)

measures and arbitrary amendments enabling it to intensify and improve upon its brutal and blind repression of the legitimate aspirations of the South African people.

The South African Government, which has clearly demonstrated - if there were any need for further demonstration - its slight regard for any offer of a negotiated solution by its offhand dismissal of the démarche taken by the Commonwealth Group of Eminent Persons and of the initiative of the European Economic Community and Great Britain, has thus stepped up its mass arbitrary repression, highlighted by deliberate arrests and assassinations of anti-apartheid forces, as well as its muzzling of the national and international press.

(Mr. Sarré, Senegal)

Members of the Council are aware that the international community has responded by condemning this escalation of arbitrary action and this exacerbation of the already disturbing and explosive situation in southern Africa because of the actions of Pretoria, which already has to its dark and unenviable credit the Soweto and Sharpeville massacres, among so many others. Reflecting that general condemnation, the Security Council itself, in a statement issued on 13 June 1986, condemned the imposition of a state of emergency and held the South African Government responsible for the escalation of violence in that country of blood and sweat.

Yet there is no doubt that the racist régime of Pretoria, which refuses to listen to reason, is waging a war that is desperate because it is lost in advance: the victorious outcome of the struggle and the glorious resistance of political, trade union, religious, student and other forces within South Africa is certain and indeed imminent, as history has shown clearly in similar situations.

Outside South Africa, the apartheid régime's policy of forcing itself forward has been manifested in occupied Namibia by the installation of a so-called interim government and by its blockage of Namibian independence despite the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. Pretoria has made aggression and invasion the principles of its dealings with neighbouring African countries, trampling underfoot the principle of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States, which is sacrosanct under the United Nations Charter and objective international law. Aggression against Angola, Botswana, Zambia, Zimbabwe and other countries show Pretoria's determination to continue defying the entire world and the universal conscience by attempting to impose a "pax Sudafricana" upon the southern African region and to impose régimes to its liking on the region's proud, independent peoples - which is the height of irony for that land of apartheid.

(Mr. Sarré, Senegal)

That internal and external situation is the framework of the South African régime's policy of stubbornness and rejection of reason. This undoubtedly makes for an increasingly explosive situation in southern Africa, posing, moreover, a threat to international peace and security.

In 1985 the United Nations celebrated the fortieth anniversary of its founding Charter with the communion and renewal of commitment of its Members, and last year it commemorated the International Year of Peace; in the face of this present challenge the Organization must take control and demonstrate its ability to mobilize in favour of causes that are just and in keeping with its purposes and principles. For the racist policy of South Africa is a grave challenge to human rights, law and world peace - all fundamental purposes of the San Francisco Charter. If law and justice still have meaning, the world Organization must act to assist the black population of South Africa, which asks for nothing but respect for the fundamental human rights of dignity, freedom and life.

Any delay in dismantling the odious system of apartheid will have its effect in the loss of human life, including the lives of women and children; for those losses we shall bear the responsibility to present and future generations.

Yesterday, the Permanent Representative of South Africa spoke here of "reforms" that are under way. My delegation would have dearly liked to applaud those "reforms" had they been accompanied by practical action and by diminished suffering for the black population. Reading the press, we see that the facts do not conform with what that representative stated yesterday.

The state of emergency imposed on 12 June 1986 has borne fruit, as the South African Government has stated. According to the Government information office, it has enabled the authorities to reduce significantly agitation in the townships in

(Mr. Sarré, Senegal)

the second half of 1986. A journalist has examined that claim and wrote in Le Monde of 13 February 1987 that "that tangible decrease in the number of victims and incidents is a cover for unprecedented repression".

The same newspaper shows us the extent to which South Africa's apartheid policy is held in contempt by the international community. In a Le Monde article entitled "Petty Apartheid Remains a Fact", Michel Bole-Richard wrote the following:

"The refusal of a Pretoria school, the Menlo Park High School, to permit a black athlete to participate in a week-end sporting competition has given rise to a great debate. ...

"A spokesman for the Ministry of Education for whites stated that schools had the right to admit whomever they liked to such competitions. This has aroused considerable feeling in South Africa and has had political fallout at the beginning of the present electoral campaign.

"It proves that discrimination remains a deeply rooted reality, even though the Head of State, Mr. Pieter Botha, stated in January 1986 that the concept of apartheid was 'outdated'. Some recent instances prove the persistence of the legal barriers raised between the races; although these have been lowered in some spheres, they remain firm in people's minds.

"On 11 February an Indian family was barred from a Pretoria nature reserve because of the colour of their skin. Mr. Soobia Naidoo wanted to show one of his children a variety of tree he had studied in class. The humiliated Mr. Naidoo went to a nearby shop to buy his family ice cream and drinks. He was served ice cream, but not drinks, because the proprietor did not want 'us to drink from his glasses'.

"Also in the capital, a few days earlier, three soldiers on leave, one of them an Indian, wanted to board the same bus. Despite a discussion, the

(Mr. Sarré, Senegal)

19-year-old Indian youth, Nicolas Narayansamy, was not allowed to board the vehicle with his friends. A city spokesman supported the (white) driver, saying he had only enforced the law stipulating that municipal buses are reserved exclusively for whites. As the father of one of Nicolas' comrades, a white, said, 'They are good enough to fight at the borders, but they cannot use the same transport'.

"Very recently, seven Coloured instructors at the Saldanha Bay naval base were dumbfounded to be told by an officer that they could not train 'white recruits'. The previous month, five Indians from the Swans, a new multiracial unit at the Simonstown base, were forced to rejoin their original unit after a visit from Vice-Admiral Syndercombe.

"Those are but a few recent examples of the daily humiliation suffered by those who have committed the sin of being 'non-white'.

(Mr. Sarré, Senegal)

"On 5 February, the Minister for Education and Co-operation, Mr. Gerrit Viljoen, stated in Parliament that 'the National Party in power was not interested in reforms if they were to lead to the application of the ridiculous dogma of a non-racial society'. He added that this was 'a completely misleading ideal'."

Those were the few points - and I apologize to the members of the Council - that I wished to bring to the Council's attention in the light of the statements we heard yesterday from the South African representative in regard to reforms now under way in South Africa.

Of course, as I said at the beginning of my statement, my delegation would be only too happy to be proved wrong, as it would be only too happy if all these explanations given by the South African representative could be translated into reality.

In any event, that demonstrates that apartheid, by definition, by its very essence, cannot be reformed. As the President of Senegal has said, "Apartheid must be blown up at its very roots".

In its resolution of 13 February 1986 on the overall situation in southern Africa, the Security Council again recalled this when, in paragraph 7, it demanded "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".

(resolution 581 (1986), para. 7)

It also demanded, in paragraph 8, that

(Mr. Sarré, Senegal)

"the racist régime of South Africa put an end to the violence against and repression of the black people and other opponents of apartheid". (resolution 581 (1986), para. 8)

Apartheid is in fact the source of all southern Africa's ills, and it is the duty of all the Members of the United Nations and all peace- and justice-loving men and women of the world to ensure that this inhuman, heinous system of apartheid is completely and immediately dismantled.

The only peaceful response to the situation in southern Africa and the bloodshed, devastation and upheavals that the black African people are suffering is the imposition of collective, comprehensive, mandatory, binding sanctions against South Africa. Only such sanctions can bring the leaders in Pretoria to listen to reason before it is too late.

I am happy to say that the debate on sanctions has taken a qualitative leap forward since the World Conference on Sanctions against Racist South Africa, held in Paris from 16 to 20 June 1986. That Conference adopted a comprehensive programme of action, the central element of which was mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter.

That is why we welcome the economic-sanctions measures taken by, among others, the European Economic Community, some members of the Commonwealth and the Nordic and other countries, and also the measures recently taken by the United States Congress, as well as some private United States organizations. Those are in our opinion a real factor of encouragement of the international community's efforts and the objectives of the Non-Aligned Movement and the Organization of African Unity. That is also why my delegation welcomed the talks recently held between Mr. Olivier Tambo and the United States Secretary of State, Mr. George Shultz.

As I have said, these economic sanctions must be fuller, more complete and mandatory if they are to be effective. So it is a question of keeping up, and

(Mr. Sarré, Senegal)

indeed accelerating, this irreversible general trend toward sanctions against South Africa. That is the only path of reason, wisdom and history today.

Realism and the crusade for peace and justice in South Africa - which are identical with human rights, peace, law and morality: all values for which every one of us calls - require that we continue to work together and, above all, that we step up our efforts to put an end at last to this shame of the modern age, the abominable policy of apartheid. In this connection, the Western Powers and the other major Powers - particularly those that are members of the Security Council - have an important role to play, and we call upon them to play that role in the Council.

The Security Council is indeed best placed for this, since the United Nations Charter has given it a principal and historic responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. The Council can find in that fundamental Charter all the necessary means of action in order to take up this serious challenge to the conscience of mankind.

At this point, as a first stage, we are simply asking for selective mandatory sanctions - some that have indeed already been voluntarily imposed by certain Member States, which we commend for doing that.

The only way to ensure a viable future in southern Africa is to institute a régime of equality, democracy and fraternity for all. It is thus for the Security Council to ensure that this approach triumphs, by speeding up the concerted and consistent efforts of the international community to eradicate this scourge called apartheid.

I take this opportunity to pay a tribute to the United Nations Secretary-General, Mr. Javier Pérez de Cuéllar, who, in constant consultation with

(Mr. Sarré, Senegal)

the Security Council and the General Assembly, is making every effort to ensure that everything possible is done, under the Charter, to ensure that apartheid is eradicated from southern Africa.

So we must continue to mobilize world public opinion in support of the complete isolation and boycott of South Africa and disinvestment in it. In concrete terms, the international community must do its duty by way of solidarity with the freedom fighters of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the African National Congress (ANC) and the Pan Africanist Congress (PAC), and the front-line countries in southern Africa that are victims of the South African racist régime's policy of aggression, destabilization and retaliation for the economic sanctions.

The international community must finally shoulder its responsibilities and demand that South Africa unconditionally release Nelson Mandela and all the other political prisoners, including women and children; that it immediately lift the state of emergency and repeal the legislation for racial discrimination and repression against political and social anti-apartheid organizations; and that it enter into serious negotiations, in good faith, with the legitimate representatives of the liberation movements and the South African patriotic forces, with a view to the transfer of power to the majority.

In truth, that is the only way in which it will be possible to put an end peacefully to this anachronism whereby the people of South Africa - who are only claiming the elementary right to dignity, life and freedom - continue to live under this ruthless apartheid régime.

I now come to the conclusion of my statement.

We all, together, nourish the noble hope that the struggle being waged by the African continent for development - a struggle to which the international

(Mr. Sarré, Senegal)

community, in an unprecedented outburst of generosity and in a spirit of new "partnership", has agreed to contribute by supporting the United Nations Programme of Action for African Economic Recovery and Development 1986-1990, adopted by the thirteenth special session of the General Assembly, on the critical economic situation in Africa - will not be jeopardized by the continuing existence of apartheid and its heinous and inhuman manifestations.

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

There are no further speakers for this meeting. The next meeting of the Security Council to continue the consideration of the item on the agenda will take place tomorrow morning at 10.30.

I would appeal to representatives to be punctual, as there is a long list of speakers for tomorrow.

The meeting rose at 6.20 p.m.