



Security Council

UN LIBRARY

MAR 9 1988

UN'S COLLECTION

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.2796
8 March 1988

ENGLISH

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND
SEVEN HUNDRED AND NINETY-SIXTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Tuesday, 8 March 1988, at 11 a.m.

President: Mr. PEJIC

(Yugoslavia)

Members:

Algeria
Argentina
Brazil
China
France
Germany, Federal Republic of
Italy
Japan
Nepal
Senegal
Union of Soviet Socialist
Republics
United Kingdom of Great Britain
and Northern Ireland
United States of America
Zambia

Mr. DJOUDI
Mr. DELPECH
Mr. NOGUEIRA-BATISTA
Mr. LI Luye
Mr. BLANC
Count YORK von WARTENBURG
Mr. BUCCI
Mr. KAGAMI
Mr. RANA
Mr. SARRE

Mr. BELONOGOV

Sir Crispin TICKELL
Mr. OKUN
Mr. ZUZE

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

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

The meeting was called to order at 11.20 a.m.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

THE QUESTION OF SOUTH AFRICA

LETTER DATED 2 MARCH 1988 FROM THE CHARGE D'AFFAIRES A.I. OF THE PERMANENT MISSION OF SIERRA LEONE TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/19567)

LETTER DATED 2 MARCH 1988 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF ZAMBIA TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/19568)

The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decisions taken at the previous meetings on this item, I invite the representatives of Botswana, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Guyana, India, Kuwait, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Tunisia and Zimbabwe to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Legwaila (Botswana), Mr. Garvalov (Bulgaria), Mr. Zapotocky (Czechoslovakia), Mr. Insanally (Guyana), Mr. Dasgupta (India), Mr. Abulhasan (Kuwait), Mr. Kargbo (Sierra Leone), Mr. Manley (South Africa), Mr. Ghezal (Tunisia) and Mr. Mudenge (Zimbabwe) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Malaysia, Nigeria, Pakistan and Somalia 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. Yusof (Malaysia), Mr. Itheme (Nigeria), Mr. Shah Nawaz (Pakistan) and Mr. Osman (Somalia) 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. Members of the Council have before them document S/19585, which contains the text of a draft resolution submitted by Algeria, Argentina, Nepal, Senegal, Yugoslavia and Zambia.

I should like to draw the attention of members of the Council to document S/19588, which contains the text of a letter dated 7 March 1988 from the Permanent Representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General.

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

Mr. SHAH NAWAZ (Pakistan): May I begin by conveying to you, Sir, the sincere felicitations of my delegation on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of March. You represent a country with which Pakistan enjoys close and cordial relations and which has earned the admiration and respect of the people of Pakistan for its consistent adherence to the principles of the United Nations Charter and for its unflinching support for all the peoples struggling against foreign domination and repression. We are confident that under your wise and able leadership the Security Council will respond effectively to the latest incidence of repression in South Africa by the Pretoria régime.

Let me also take this opportunity to voice our admiration for Ambassador Vernon Walters, who presided over the Security Council last month and guided its deliberations with great distinction and characteristic skill.

The Security Council has been asked to meet in order to consider the latest phase of the repression which the Pretoria régime unleashed in South Africa long ago and which has escalated through the years even as that unrepentant régime has come under increasing pressure from the United Nations to abandon its policy of apartheid. That odious policy has rightly been condemned by the international

(Mr. Shah Nawaz, Pakistan)

community as a crime against humanity. The de facto ban on 17 peaceful anti-apartheid organizations imposed by the Pretoria régime on 23 February exemplifies the defiant continuation of that policy.

As the representative of the African National Congress (ANC), Mr. Mnumzana, stated on 3 March, those restrictions represent

"the third generation of bannings of people's organizations and individuals opposed to apartheid." (S/PV.2793, p. 17)

He traced the origins of those repressive measures to the banning of the African National Congress in 1960, which negated the possibility of peaceful struggle and encouraged violence by compelling the ANC to go underground. The second stage, as he pointed out, was the banning of 17 organizations of the people in 1977, which was condemned by the Security Council in resolution 418 (1977) of that year. Ironically, the number of organizations restricted on 23 February is the same as that of those banned in 1977. Among those placed under restriction are some of the most democratic and progressive organizations, such as the United Democratic Front, whose Treasurer has commented that "the Government has declared war against peaceful opposition to its policies". In the same strain Archbishop Desmond Tutu, who was arrested on 29 February along with many other clergymen, has warned that if they - that is, the white South Africans -

"do not stop this Government soon, and there is not much hope that they will, we are heading for war."

It has been repeatedly stated at numerous meetings of the Security Council in the past that apartheid is a vicious system that is not amenable to reform and that the only way to dismantle it is to destroy it. The present régime in South Africa must know that the march of civilization towards universal brotherhood and equality cannot be impeded by its foredoomed efforts to keep alive a despicable creature of

(Mr. Shah Nawaz, Pakistan)

a cruel colonial era, which is as good as dead. There is still time for the Pretoria régime to retrace its steps from the fatal course on which it is bent.

Throughout these debates in the past, and more conspicuously now, the South African régime has shown little respect for the Security Council. The statements of its representative have throughout been contemptuous and derogatory and clearly intended to erode the authority of the Council. In your statement of 4 March you yourself, Mr. President, took note of the arrogant accusations of the South African representative against the Security Council and the United Nations. You also said that you shared the views of the members of the Council who drew your attention to his statement, which only showed that South Africa was determined to continue its racist policy in disregard of the international community and decisions of the United Nations.

In those circumstances a simple condemnation of the South African régime or a mere repetition of the contents of previous resolutions, truncated by tolerance and emasculated by compromise, will not be sufficient. The time has come for the Security Council to adopt an effective formula to deter the Pretoria régime from recklessly pursuing a course which threatens the peace and security of the region and spells disaster for South Africa itself.

In his address to the forty-second session of the General Assembly the Prime Minister of Pakistan observed:

"Apartheid is a cruel and perverse creed, repugnant to the laws of God and a crime against the laws of nations. Many nations, including my own, maintain a stringent and comprehensive boycott of the racist régime in Pretoria. We appeal to the international community to agree to the imposition of mandatory sanctions against the perpetrators of apartheid." (A/42/PV.11, pp. 26 and 27)

(Mr. Shah Nawaz, Pakistan)

The Security Council is the guardian of international peace and security and cannot escape its responsibility to compel South Africa to streamline its policies in accordance with civilized norms and the wishes of the overwhelming majority of the people of South Africa. That can only be achieved by the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the Pretoria régime.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Pakistan for his very kind recognition of the policies of my country and his kind words addressed to me.

Mr. BLANC (France) (interpretation from French): I wish, Sir, to congratulate your country on its assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of March. I take this opportunity also to convey our gratitude to the representative of the United States, who served as President of our Council in February.

Mr. President, you have expressed your feelings, along with those of many of our colleagues, about the tone and substance of the statement made by the Permanent Representative of South Africa. My delegation shares those feelings.

The imposition of new restrictions affecting 17 South African political and trade union organizations is yet another stage of the policy of repression carried out by the South African Government against all those who oppose the apartheid system. The announcement of those measures, on 24 February 1988, was met with consternation by the entire international community, for it is clear that they can serve only to make the prospect of peaceful change in that country more remote.

In a Foreign Ministry communiqué dated 25 February 1988, France firmly condemned those measures, which were aimed at organizations whose goal is the elimination of apartheid by peaceful means. We consider that this attack on freedoms raises a new obstacle to the dialogue which is indispensable for the establishment in South Africa of a democratic society where the legitimate rights of all communities would be respected, and France has called upon the South African authorities to rescind their decision immediately.

While they have been portrayed as mere restrictions, the South African Government measures amount in fact to banning the groups concerned. Their true purpose is to silence the non-violent opposition in South Africa by denying it the exercise of any democratic activity.

(Mr. Blanc, France)

In a country already under a state of emergency, these special measures are of particular gravity. With them, indeed, the South African Government is taking a large step in the direction opposite that in which it should be headed to settle the crisis afflicting the country. There is no path other than dialogue aimed at the dismantling of the apartheid system.

The French Government advocates such dialogue with all elements of South African society. As we know, necessary conditions for this dialogue are the unconditional release of Nelson Mandela and other political prisoners, the lifting of the ban on the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC) and the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania (PAC), and the abolition of restrictions on the anti-apartheid movement.

The 24 February measures run counter to that desirable objective. The South African Government has since demonstrated its obstinacy by imposing further restrictions on the freedom of movement and expression of individuals opposed to apartheid and by suppressing protest demonstrations, including that organized by the South African Council of Churches.

It was during the latter demonstration that the South African authorities unhesitatingly arrested Archbishop Desmond Tutu and other high religious officials, who were merely exercising their right to peaceful protest. Since then, additional plans to limit the opposition's political activities through eroding the sources of financing for anti-apartheid movements have been announced.

The South African Government has remained deaf to calls for realism and good sense. Its obstinacy is disturbing in all respects. The increased repression it is carrying out will lead only to ruling out any form of dialogue and exacerbating even further the political crisis in South Africa. The measures it has just taken,

(Mr. Blanc, France)

indeed, accentuate the polarization of South African political society into antagonistic blocs which, deadlocked, will inevitably lead them to take the path of confrontation and violence.

The international community is duty-bound to react strongly to this prospect; these meetings of the Security Council provide a good opportunity to issue a solemn warning to the South African Government about the risks of its irresponsible attitude.

I wish in conclusion to reiterate France's appeal to the South African authorities, and call on them to rescind their measures and embark on the only realistic course: the course of dialogue aimed at the complete dismantling of apartheid.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of France for his words of congratulation addressed to me.

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

Mr. OSMAN (Somalia): On behalf of my delegation and on my own behalf I should like, Sir, to extend to you our warm congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month. This is not only a well-deserved recognition of your wide experience, diplomatic skill and outstanding qualities, but also an honour for your great country, Yugoslavia, with which my country enjoys close ties of friendship and co-operation. We are confident that, under your able guidance, the deliberations of the Council will come to a successful conclusion.

Let me also take this opportunity to express my delegation's appreciation to your predecessor, Ambassador Vernon Walters of the United States, for the successful manner in which he guided the work of the Council last month.

(Mr. Osman, Somalia)

I thank you, Sir, and the other members of the Security Council for giving me the opportunity to take part in this debate on recent developments in South Africa.

My delegation wishes to add its voice to those which have strongly condemned South Africa's latest display of contempt for justice and human rights. We also wish to express our sense of outrage over the insolence shown by the representative of South Africa towards this Council and towards the United Nations. We believe that all Member States have been challenged, individually and collectively, to react strongly to the current wave of repression in South Africa and to the obvious determination of the Pretoria régime to continue on its criminal and intransigent course.

(Mr. Osman, Somalia)

Expressions of indignation over South Africa's actions and attitudes have of course come from a wide spectrum of international public opinion, but it will be more to the point for the Security Council to show a greater resolve for concerted action to end apartheid and to end the long agony and pain of the people of South Africa.

Twenty-five years ago it was established in this Council that apartheid was sui generis, that its unprecedented assault on human rights made it a proper subject for international concern and international action. In the decades that followed, the world community saw the unfolding of the apartheid plan in all its racist inhumanity. We saw a crime against humanity perpetrated through the alienation, dispossession and deportation of Africans in their native homeland. We saw South Africa attempting to defend apartheid by carrying out acts of destabilization and naked military aggression against neighbouring States in gross violation of international law. We have seen South Africa intensify and accelerate its internal policies of repression and terror, policies applied with murderous force even against helpless women and children.

It should come as no surprise to anyone that South Africa has now attacked the major anti-apartheid organizations in South Africa which were engaged in peaceful protest, that it has attempted to muzzle the large and powerful Congress of South African Trade Unions and that it has cut off external humanitarian assistance to supporters of human rights in South Africa. This deliberate closing of the remaining avenues of peaceful change is yet another step in a process that started decades ago, a process that has been carried out in full view of the international community.

All these tragic developments have continued unchecked because South Africa has always understood that no effective deterrent would be imposed against it.

(Mr. Osman, Somalia)

Threats of enforcement action under Chapter VII of the Charter repeatedly went unimplemented. Highly supportive trading, diplomatic and social relations continued without interruption; and extensive military assistance, together with the supply of nuclear technology, enabled South Africa to become a militarily significant State. The Pretoria régime's brazen defiance of the United Nations is the bitter fruit of these opportunist policies.

The situation in South Africa clearly shows that those who counselled patience over the years were at best misguided in their insistence that, given time and encouragement, South Africa would redress the criminal injustice of apartheid. That argument has been steadily undermined by Pretoria's continued intransigence, and today it obviously has no validity whatsoever.

The Security Council must now consider the alternatives before the United Nations. My delegation hopes that it will squarely face the fact that selective and voluntary sanctions unevenly applied have been without effect. Somalia joins the vast majority of Member States and the majority of the oppressed people of South Africa in calling for the imposition of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa. This is the only peaceful and sufficiently forceful measure available to the United Nations. It would have been an appropriate course of action in 1963, when it was first proposed in the Security Council. Today, when the situation in and around South Africa is immeasurably worse, the case for comprehensive sanctions cannot reasonably be rejected. A clear international consensus has determined that without forceful international action the steady drift towards violence and bloodshed in South Africa will culminate in a prolonged racial conflict involving the whole of the southern African region and having serious international implications.

(Mr. Osman, Somalia)

My delegation recognizes that the imposition of effective sanctions is not a simple matter, but that it will entail certain difficulties for some States. We believe, however, that with a sense of determination and commitment these difficulties could be overcome. South Africa's main trading partners should take the necessary steps with courage to ensure an equitable and integrated approach in the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa. Furthermore, serious efforts will have to be made to strengthen the capacity of South Africa's front-line States to maintain economic independence and withstand any punitive action South Africa might take against them.

Whatever the difficulties, there is no alternative to these courses of action, which we firmly believe are consistent with the moral and political responsibility of the United Nations to end apartheid and bring about peace and justice in South Africa.

South Africa has once again told the world community openly and without shame that it intends to continue to endorse its virulently racist apartheid policies. What is at stake is not only the elimination of apartheid, a crime against humanity, and the removal of a grave threat to international peace and security, but also the credibility and authority of this world Organization. My delegation strongly hopes that the Security Council will not fail to respond effectively to the challenge posed by South Africa's racist minority régime.

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

Mr. BUCCI (Italy): As the representative of a country which shares a common border with Yugoslavia, it is a particular pleasure for me to extend to you, Sir, my delegation's warm congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month. We are certain that the Council and its work will derive great benefit from your expert guidance and from the influence which your country enjoys in the world.

A grateful thought also goes to the Permanent Representative of the United States, who led the Council's work during the month of February with his well known experience and usual skill.

The Security Council is once again dealing with the issue of apartheid. This time we are meeting about the banning of 24 February, which affected numerous anti-segregationist organizations in South Africa. Those organizations have not been suppressed, but they have been denied the ability to engage in political activities. Following that event, measures were taken by the South African police against leaders of the clergy who had participated in a peaceful protest against apartheid.

My delegation is addressing the Council on those two events because in our view they constitute a disturbing sign that the situation in South Africa is deteriorating. The message is that segregationist rule continues to be imposed through force inside the country and defended abroad through an aggressive policy which aims to export the South African difficulties and thus interferes in the autonomy and freedom of other countries. The new events tell us that now even peaceful opposition to apartheid is not allowed. In essence, South Africa has sent a further message of intolerance.

When dialogue is rejected to the extent of prohibiting even civil protest, that means that a decline in human and civic values affects the South African white community. In other words, the denial of rights to others leads to the

(Mr. Bucci, Italy)

impoverishment of the rights of those who practise apartheid. In addition - and this is the most troublesome aspect - to prohibit protest even when it does not lead to a disturbance of the peace is ultimately to encourage violence. After years of such experience, we must assume that not even South Africa can seriously believe that the problems that led to segregation will be solved by prohibiting political activity by representative organizations or manifestations of civil protest.

My Government has voiced its concerns over the recent developments both publicly and directly through bilateral channels. Our protest is official, and in this forum my delegation can only reiterate it. The Italian Government also joined in and fully supports the statement made on the recent events in South Africa by the 12 member States of the European Community, which firmly condemned yet another demonstration of intolerance, which prejudices dialogue, the method in which we believe.

I should like to conclude by expressing the hope that the international community's response to South Africa's latest actions will contribute at least to avert the implementation of those provisions which threaten the continuity of the economic support which many countries, and the European Community in particular, provide to alleviate the effects of apartheid.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Italy for his kind words addressed to my country and to me personally.

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): It gives my delegation particular pleasure to see you, Sir, a friend and a representative of friendly Yugoslavia, presiding over the affairs of the Council during the month of March. Your country and my country enjoy a unique and abiding bond of friendship forged during my people's struggle

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

for independence and nourished and strengthened over the years by our shared non-aligned world vision and commitment to peace, justice and human progress. We know that because of your wide diplomatic skills the affairs of the Council will prosper this month.

Allow me also to express my delegation's appreciation to your predecessor, Ambassador Vernon Walters of the United States, for the able manner in which he guided the business of the Council last month.

Last Thursday the Council was most unjustly berated and taunted by the representative of the Pretoria régime. My delegation regrets that the Council was subjected to such unbecoming language and indecorous and unseemly behaviour. It was not proper for the representative of the racist régime to vent Pretoria's frustrations by fulminating against the members of this august body. For the Council is not responsible for Botha's recent trouncing in the platteland by-elections by the Frankenstein-like mutants created by the apartheid ideology. And the Council is also not responsible for the world-wide revulsion against Botha's banning and restricting of 17 mass democratic organizations. It is Botha's policies, and his futile attempt to placate and feed the voracious appetite of the Transvaal political mutants and deviants that were created by his policies, that have brought about his woes, and no one else - not his neighbours, and certainly not the Security Council.

It is time the world woke up to what is happening in South Africa before it is too late. There is a real danger that the international community may be caught napping by the events in South Africa. There is a recrudescence of Nazism in South Africa. The abhorrent system of apartheid is flowering, as expected, into full-fledged fascism.

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

In the recent by-elections in South Africa latter-day "brown shirts" were on the march, only this time they wore khaki shirts. They demanded the creation of a white State in South Africa where blacks would be allowed in to the extent that their labour was needed. However, all the Jews would be expelled. What a sad commentary on the vaunted alliance of pariah States, that between South Africa and Israel. And as Eugene Terreblanche, the leader of AWB (Afrikaner Resistance Movement), declared to a thunderous ovation from the faithful, in the proposed white State "we will govern ourselves with our superior white genes". The Aryan race marches on.

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

Fascism and Nazi tactics are not restricted to the extreme products of apartheid, as seen in the Transvaal. Even the apartheid State itself has tended increasingly to adopt Nazi-like tactics against its opponents.

During the past year we have seen the rise of Hitlerite death squads, directed by Pretoria's security machinery and licensed to kill key opponents of the apartheid régime. All over South Africa one hears of a new category of Pretoria's victims, called the "disappeared ones". Workers in South Africa now live in constant fear that one day the death squads may strike on their way to or from work, and school children on their way to school are frightened that they may never return to the comfort of their homes. As a representative of Amnesty International put it at the recent Human Rights Commission meeting in Geneva:

"Another ominous development in South Africa has been the growing incidence of attacks on critics or opponents of the Government, and the failure of the authorities to identify and bring those responsible to justice. The killing in recent years of Victoria Mxenge, a Durban human rights lawyer, Mathew Goniwe and three other Cradock human rights activists and the fate of three Port Elizabeth black community leaders who vanished amid allegations that they were detained, remain unexplained. So does the murder of Dr. Fabian Ribeiro, who was killed with his wife after he appeared in a television film concerned with human rights violations under the state of emergency. Most recently Sicelo Dhlomo, an 18-year-old former political detainee, was found shot dead soon after he was interrogated by security police about a film interview he gave to an American television company in which he described how he had been ill-treated in detention in 1986 ... Many political activists and others believed that such killings were politically motivated and were carried out by groups with or comprising members of the

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

security forces - in other words, those who were killed were victims of extra-judicial executions."

The apartheid régime has gone on a hanging spree. In 1986 the Pretoria régime hanged more people than at any time since the Union of South Africa was created in 1910. We have here in the United States family members of the "Sharpeville Six", who, as the Council will recall, are awaiting to be executed, in spite of a world-wide outcry against their execution, including the appeals of the Council itself.

The Pretoria régime has gone berserk. In the last 24 months alone it has detained over 30,000 people, including women and little children, under the emergency regulations. Journalists, clergymen, trade unionists, students, and community leaders, among others, have been detained without any recourse to the courts of law for remedy or knowledge as to when they might be released.

When Pretoria eliminates or incarcerates such leaders of the majority of the people, how can anyone believe its protestations that it is willing to negotiate for a peaceful and just future for all South Africans? Its actions speak louder than its words. The clamp-down on 17 popular organizations on 24 February this year is a reality which all can understand. It is a closing and not an opening of the channels for dialogue. The whites in South Africa are so regimented for the defence of apartheid that the régime could today field an army of 400,000 men if a crisis arose, and the white population of South Africa is today the most heavily armed civilian population in the world, owning in excess of 2 million guns in private hands. This is not a country or a Government preparing itself for dialogue; it is preparing itself for a desperate war.

Pretoria has over 8,000 of its troops occupying southern Angola as we sit here. Its agents of the MNR are wreaking havoc in Mozambique, while the UNITA

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

bandits are destroying Angola. Is this evidence of a peaceful régime? Armed dissidents and political malcontents are being trained and armed by Pretoria to destabilize Zambia and Zimbabwe, and Namibia continues to be occupied. Expansionism, bellicosity and brutal repression are the true characteristics of the noxious racist régime. As a result of its acts of destabilization against Angola and Mozambique, over 140,000 children under the age of five die every year, children who need not die if the evil system of apartheid did not exist. This the First Lady of Zimbabwe and Chairperson of the Zimbabwe Committee on Child Survival and Development, Mrs. Sally Mugabe, has dramatically likened to the crash every day of a fully loaded jumbo jet in which everyone on board is killed.

Pretoria's representative is quite wrong when he says:

"Our sin is that we are removing discrimination and extending democracy."

(S/PV.2793, p. 15)

Pretoria's sin is apartheid. Instead of extending democracy and removing discrimination, Pretoria is intensifying hanging, banning, murder, oppression, occupation and aggression. Equally incorrect is the claim that "the conflict in South Africa is rooted in tribalism", as some have recently suggested. It is rooted in racism, fascism and militarism. Apartheid is the root cause of the crisis, not only in South Africa itself, but in the sub-continent as a whole. It is an aggressive and racist ideology which must be uprooted, removed lock, stock and barrel, if peace and progress are to return to southern Africa.

The worsening situation in southern Africa demands that the international community take immediate concerted measures to compel the Pretoria régime to abandon its immoral policies. Nothing short of the dismantlement of apartheid can lead to durable peace in southern Africa. The Security Council, a body entrusted with the important task of maintaining peace and security under the Charter, has

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

the responsibility to ensure that the already explosive situation in southern Africa does not deteriorate further.

We note that various organizations, including the Commonwealth and the European Economic Community (EEC), have in the past two years adopted measures aimed at compelling South Africa to mend its ways. Several Governments, including some members of the Council, have taken even stronger measures to this end. We are sincerely grateful, and welcome these principled developments by the international community. However, what we now seek is for the international community to co-ordinate the implementation of these packages of sanctions. We note that the EEC package to date forms the lowest common denominator of all the packages of measures adopted by any of the members of the Council.

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

But, for the measures to be effective and for the international community to send a qualitatively strong message to South Africa, it is important, as a first step, that these minimum measures be brought under the United Nations and that they be made mandatory. Such a package would be applied for a time-frame of one year, subject to renewal depending on the progress that the Pretoria régime had made in releasing all political prisoners, allowing the exiles to return home without fear of arrest, lifting the ban on political parties and initiating genuine dialogue with the leaders of the majority population in South Africa. That is not asking too much. It is not a revolutionary programme; it is a minimum programme. We are not asking Botha and his henchmen to surrender power immediately. We are not prescribing forms of government or time-scales. What we ask is evidence of good faith to begin serious negotiations - only good faith.

South Africa must know that the Council is dead serious. It is for that reason that we have put forward a draft resolution that we feel addresses some of the difficulties which arose the last time we tried to internationalize the measures that the Congress of the United States had passed.

First among these constructive innovations is the introduction of a time-frame of 12 months and the five requirements which are in this draft resolution but which were absent in the last one. What is the significance of these two elements? First of all, in this draft resolution we are saying to Pretoria that our opposition to apartheid and oppression does not mean that we wish to dictate to the people of South Africa the kind of political system they should have. That should emerge from a genuine dialogue among the people of South Africa. Secondly, we are saying to South Africa that if it wishes the world to remove the sanctions we shall impose, then it has it in its power to do so any time it so chooses. For those

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

reasons we hope the draft resolution will concentrate the minds of the people of South Africa as they debate whether or not the Security Council requirements are reasonable.

The second aspect addressed in this draft resolution is that of scope. By choosing the limited measures imposed by the European Economic Community (EEC), to begin with, we hope those members of the EEC that are not yet ready to extend the range of measures beyond those so far adopted by that body will thereby be accommodated. Since all the members of the Council have adopted either the EEC measures or similar ones, or even wider packages of sanctions, we hope there will be none who will argue that they are not prepared to go along because these sanctions will hurt the neighbouring States or the Africans in South Africa or their own economies. On paper all members of the Council have already bound themselves to most of these measures. Therefore no member should have any excuse to oppose them, since in theory at least they are already in effect.

Finally, we have introduced a time-frame of 12 months for these sanctions so that if the members, especially any of the five permanent members, determine that South Africa has met the five requirements set by the Council, then the measures may be lifted. In other words, no member can use its veto to force the rest of the Council to continue with these measures against the will of the majority of the Council. And, more significantly, any one of the five permanent members can use its veto to have the measures terminated if it determines that the requirements have been met.

Those who have formulated this draft resolution have thought long and seriously about the measures they have presented. Although they themselves are committed to comprehensive mandatory sanctions, they have very carefully taken into consideration the views and concerns previously articulated by some members of the

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

Council. It is now up to those members to demonstrate their goodwill by supporting this constructive, realistic and balanced draft resolution. Pretoria is going to be watching very carefully how the Council will vote on this occasion. It will be assessing the political will of its major trading partners, all of which, fortunately, are represented around the Council table. The draft resolution does not ask these members to take any new measures at this stage, but only to express what amounts to a qualitatively enhanced political will to fight apartheid. I hope the Council will seize this opportunity to express its condemnation of South Africa's banning/restriction of the 17 organizations and degrading treatment of Archbishop Tutu and his colleagues by adopting the draft resolution before it.

From press reports we know that the Security Council is at present consulting on the possibility of invoking Chapter VII of the Charter in relation to one of the conflict areas in the world. It would be most ironic if it were to emerge that the members of the Council that are vigorously campaigning for the invoking of Chapter VII in the latter conflict turned out to be the very same members that are opposed to the invoking of Chapter VII against the crime of apartheid. That would be sad indeed. It would cast a dark shadow on their motives and would also explain why Botha's man treated the Council with such disdain the other day.

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

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

Mr. IHEME (Nigeria): On behalf of the Nigerian delegation, may I extend warm congratulations to you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of this body for the month of March. We have no doubt that your rich diplomatic experience as well as your country's well-known commitment to international peace and justice

(Mr. Itheme, Nigeria)

will make your stewardship a success. My delegation would also like to extend warm thanks to Ambassador Vernon Walters of the United States for his successful tenure as President of the Council last month.

We have come yet again to the Security Council, to deliberate on the latest of the ongoing and ever-increasing acts of repression and oppression against the black majority in South Africa by the discredited white supremacist régime. The latest of these well-planned actions by the Botha régime to stifle even the most peaceful protest against the ever-growing list of inhuman and reckless laws of the Afrikaner régime is the blanket ban on 17 anti-apartheid democratic organizations announced on 24 February 1988. The régime has also placed unjustifiable restrictions on 18 prominent individuals whose only crime was raising their voices of dissent against the ferocious and reprehensible system of apartheid. Not only that: the régime has, since the promulgation of the repressive legislation banning the peaceful anti-apartheid organizations, instituted the most dogged and strict monitoring of all peaceful anti-apartheid protests - a situation that led to the unfortunate arrest and brief incarceration on 29 February 1988 of some clergymen, including the well-known Nobel Peace Prize laureate Archbishop Desmond Tutu and the Reverend Allan Boesak, leader of the United Democratic Front (UDF).

(Mr. Itheme, Nigeria)

By its action on 24 February 1988, the racist régime in Pretoria successfully removed the last pretensions of democracy in South Africa, thereby giving free reign to the Fascist tendency in Afrikaner national psyche as represented by the neo-Nazi conservative organization that goes by the pseudonym of Afrikaner National Resistance Movement. It is instructive that a régime which likes to portray itself as part of Western civilization should clamp such Draconian legislation on organizations "notorious" - in the eyes of the South African Government only - for their commitment to peaceful means for bringing about long-overdue changes in their divided society.

My country has repeatedly expressed the view that the road to a meaningful change in South Africa, the pathway to the creation of a just and non-racial, democratic society, does not lie in platitudinous declarations but in action. The only peaceful action left to combat racism and dismantle apartheid is the consistent application of comprehensive, universal, effective and mandatory sanctions against racist South Africa. The half-hearted and isolated application of a selective package of sanctions cannot and will not bring about the abandonment of the monstrous system. At best it will lead only to cosmetic changes.

On 3 March my delegation heard with horror and disbelief the disgraceful epithets that the racist régime used against this body. That racist South Africa has never taken this body seriously is well known. However we condemn in the strongest terms the indecent language of the racist entity's spokesman. It is the Nigerian delegation's hope that South Africa's affront to the Security Council will not go unpunished. We also hope that South Africa's insults have removed the self-inflicted smokescreen from the eyes of those countries and individuals who have aided and abetted South Africa's crimes in one way or another. They should now understand the true nature of apartheid.

(Mr. Iheme, Nigeria)

Let the desperate and intemperate outburst of its spokesman perhaps pass without comment. Our message is simple: that no terror, no villainy, no repression, ban or murder will stop the people from their fight for justice and freedom and their inalienable rights in their own land. We call on the international community to understand that apartheid is a threat to peace and that this inexorable march to folly and tragedy should be stopped. Africa needs peace to tackle its economic and social problems, but apartheid threatens that peace.

In spite of the disappointments in the past - disappointments that were not unconnected with the self-serving calculations of some members - the Government and the people of Nigeria continue to have faith in the Security Council. We believe that truth and justice will eventually prevail and that the Council will consequently assume its historic responsibility. Action against the Pretoria entity is long overdue. Even now, we urge this august body speedily to redeem its record and identify with the oppressed in southern Africa.

The impression should not continue to be created that the United Nations can do nothing about South Africa. South Africa is vulnerable, and in spite of the desperate bluster of its spokesmen the Botha régime worries about concerted action by the international community to force meaningful changes in that country. The latest blanket ban on organizations and individuals in South Africa - the last bastions of those committed to peaceful change in that unhappy society - serves to underline the urgent need for action by all countries which are in favour of bringing about fundamental changes.

It is my delegation's view that the time for caution and gradualism has long gone. The ever-worsening international situation dictates that the Council should display courage, imagination and, above all, unanimity in the face of the greatest

(Mr. Ithemé, Nigeria)

travesty of justice which mankind has ever known. We therefore urge the Security Council to impose without delay universal, comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against the discredited régime in apartheid South Africa.

My delegation must warn that action is not only needed but also imperative. The unfolding events in South Africa are an ill omen. The signs and warnings of danger and disaster are clear. Urgent action is needed, and we call on the Council to take that action. It is capable of doing so. South Africa's arrogance and defiance must be brought to an end, and the time to do so has come.

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

The next speaker is the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, Mr. Peter Zuze, to whom the Council has extended an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. ZUZE (Zambia), President of the United Nations Council for Namibia: On behalf of the United Nations Council for Namibia and on my own behalf, I should like to express to you, Sir, very sincere congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of March. I wish to thank you and the other members of the Security Council for acceding to the request of the African Group to consider the deteriorating situation inside South Africa as a result of the apartheid régime's most recent wave of repression against its people. The Council for Namibia wishes to express its appreciation for the kind invitation extended to it to participate in the important deliberations of the Security Council at this critical time.

I also take this opportunity to express appreciation and commend you, Mr. President, for your statement issued on 4 March 1988 regarding the arrogant

(Mr. Zuze, President, United Nations Council for Namibia)

accusations against this Council - and indeed against the United Nations - made in this Chamber by the representative of South Africa.

As a founding and leading member of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, Yugoslavia has of course played an important role in inspiring the struggle for independence and social justice in the world. Your country's consistent support for the struggle against apartheid in South Africa and independence in Namibia, as well as the struggle for self-determination, justice and peace in all of southern Africa, has been much appreciated by our leaders in the area.

We in the Council for Namibia are gratified that this debate is taking place under the committed leadership of the country which you represent, a torch-bearer of the Non-Aligned Movement from its very inception.

I should also like to take this opportunity to express the appreciation of the delegation of the United Nations Council for Namibia to Ambassador Vernon Walters of the United States for the skilful manner in which he handled the Council's affairs during the month of February.

It was just over a year ago, in February 1987, that the Security Council considered the situation inside South Africa. All delegations reiterated that the situation in South Africa had continued to deteriorate. They deplored and condemned the reimposition of the state of emergency and the increased persecution and harsher methods of repression by the régime. In this regard, delegations underlined the fact that almost 40 per cent of the political detainees in South Africa were minors or under the age of 18.

(Mr. Zuze, President, United Nations Council for Namibia)

They condemned South Africa's continued illegal occupation of Namibia and its aggression and destabilization of the front-line States. All reiterated that apartheid must be eliminated. The majority of Member States sought from the Security Council concerted and united international action, including mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter. However, once again certain Western countries permanent members of the Security Council explicitly stated that the imposition of sanctions by the Security Council would exacerbate the conflict and increase repression rather than reduce it.

Those powerful States and major trading partners of South Africa disagreed with the majority view, namely, that the imposition of sanctions was a peaceful way to end apartheid, and they rejected what they termed the "notion" that the international community could eliminate apartheid by provoking the collapse of the South African economy.

Here we are, 13 months later, once again sitting around this table, once again taking stock of the situation, taking once more an inventory of the incredible acts of brutality and repression of the Pretoria régime and also, of course, an inventory of the acts of determination, courage and fearlessness of the people of South Africa as they struggle to achieve justice, democracy and peace in their beleaguered land.

The Botha régime has used the breather provided it by the failure of the Council to adopt concrete and concerted measures to increase repression and to ensure the continued survival of apartheid. The latest measures announced by South Africa on 24 February 1988, by which the régime hopes to stem the growing anti-apartheid tide, were the effective banning of and restriction on 17 democratic mass organizations and 18 individuals opposed to the obnoxious system of apartheid. A peaceful protest march by the clergy against those measures was

(Mr. Zuze, President, United Nations Council for Namibia)

ruthlessly put down and suppressed, and the régime detained leaders for a period of time - leaders that included such big names as Nobel Peace Prize winner Archbishop Desmond Tutu and the Reverend Allan Boesak, all of whom were detained simply for engaging in a peaceful exercise.

The organizations attacked include the United Democratic Front, the Azanian People's Organization, local student and community groups and human rights organizations like the Detainees Parents Support Committee. Those organizations have, under the state of emergency of almost two years, seen many of their members detained, tortured, killed and, indeed, hanged. The régime has also imposed crippling restrictions on the Congress of South African Trade Unions.

Not one of the organizations recently outlawed has been charged with violence, even by the racist régime, a point that the United Democratic Front made in its statement in response to this latest crack-down, a statement in which it said: "The Government has declared war against peaceful opposition to apartheid." In this regard, Archbishop Tutu stated that the Government "has nothing to offer but violence and bloodshed" and called the act "a vicious and provocative act by a Government that has become a threat to southern Africa."

The apartheid régime is engaged in a hysterical and vindictive vendetta against its own people, its own children and its own religious and civic leaders. Apartheid is not only a South African problem; it extends to and permeates the daily life of the Namibian people, whose country South Africa illegally occupies and which it has turned into a military garrison. This despite the fact that 22 years ago the General Assembly terminated South Africa's Mandate to administer the Territory. Numerous resolutions of the world Organization asking South Africa to withdraw from Namibia have gone unanswered by the Pretoria régime. This year will see the tenth year of the adoption of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which

(Mr. Zuze, President, United Nations Council for Namibia)

was formulated by the five Western members of the Security Council at that time. Even as we meet today, 10 years after adopting resolution 435 (1978), there seems to be no solution whatsoever in sight to the question of Namibia, the only Territory for which the United Nations has assumed direct responsibility and from which it has apparently failed to remove South Africa.

The racist Pretoria régime is also engaged in continuous and unremitting military aggression against and invasion of the front-line States, in particular Angola, where South Africa's most recent occupation, involving over 9,000 South African troops, is currently causing hundreds of casualties through the bombing of civilian centres. Those and other attacks are carried out from Namibian territory.

The destinies of South Africa and Namibia are in the hands of the oppressed people of those countries. No matter what it takes, the oppressed people of South Africa will defeat apartheid and their brothers and sisters in Namibia will gain their freedom. The racist régime will not succeed in its vain attempt to crush the oppressed peoples' quest for freedom through the brutal use of its military might.

It is now up to the influential Western members and business partners of South Africa to decide whether to continue hiding behind their threadbare, unconvincing and often patronizing arguments or to be part of the process of change that is under way by joining the campaign for the imposition of mandatory sanctions by this Council. Not only is that the only effective option left for the international community, it is also the surest way of speeding up the process of change and thereby minimizing the destructiveness that otherwise would accompany the process.

The crack-down in South Africa has declared "criminal" all non-violent avenues of opposition to apartheid. The people of South Africa have no access whatsoever to any political process. The States Members of the United Nations must take advantage of the machinery available to the Council under Chapter VII, Article 41,

(Mr. Zuze, President, United
Nations Council for Namibia)

of the Charter of the United Nations and adopt effective and comprehensive economic sanctions against the Pretoria régime. Anything less will amount to a betrayal of the people of South Africa and, indeed, of all of southern Africa, for by imposing the latest measures on the oppressed people, the South African régime has once again sent a clear message that it has no intention of ever peacefully negotiating the abolition of apartheid.

The racist Pretoria régime has also openly challenged the world body. We heard and we witnessed what was said by its representative only Thursday of last week. The Council was abused, and the Council cannot remain silent. The Council cannot remain numb to such unwelcome behaviour. If the Council fails to adopt decisive measures it will lose its credibility and respect not only with the oppressed people of South Africa but also with the millions of people the world over who look to it for inspiration and hope in their struggles for justice.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia for the very kind words of recognition he addressed to my country and to me personally.

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

Mr. YUSOF (Malaysia): Allow me, Sir, to extend my warmest congratulations to you on your assumption of the duties of President of the Security Council for this month. Your country has the best of relations with my country. The deep sense of internationalism which has been displayed by the leaders of Yugoslavia has inspired not only the Movement of non-alignment, but also international peace and development. Your leaders richly deserve our admiration. Your own renowned qualities and the broad experience you bring to your office ensure that the Council will be able to address effectively the many difficult issues it is confronted with.

I should like also to convey my appreciation to Ambassador Vernon Walters of the United States of America for the high stature he brought to the presidency during his tenure last month.

I have asked to speak in order to support the call for the firm and clear imposition of mandatory sanctions against the Pretoria régime in accordance with Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter. My Government believes strongly that in South Africa this Council is faced not only with an international problem, but a problem of humanity as well. I therefore feel compelled to join in this debate; I shall state as briefly as possible the case we have in mind.

Pretoria has deepened and broadened the system of racial discrimination and suppression. Draconian measures have institutionalized discrimination according to race and colour and the subjugation of an entire people, all to increase the

(Mr. Yusof, Malaysia)

wealth and prosperity of the white minority. After decades of apartheid the Pretoria régime has found itself beleaguered in a vast hinterland of the indigenous peoples of Africa. In a renewed act of desperation, it has once again resorted to the extreme measure of reinforcing the state of emergency and extending it throughout the entire country. At the close of last month, a blanket of censorship was cast over the media; freedom of expression and assembly in the country have been denied to organizations and individuals; wanton political arrests have been made. These are acts of repression, which have aggravated the situation in South Africa today. They are bound to lead to violent conflict and racial conflagration. We have no doubt that these conflicts will have very serious international repercussions.

My Government has been following events in South Africa closely for decades, since the time when South Africa was still a member of the Commonwealth. We have seen no let-up in Pretoria's determination to perpetuate its system of racial discrimination. We have been compelled therefore to condemn it again and again as its measures have unfolded. We do so again today, not only for what it is doing to the majority in South Africa but also for the arrogance and utter contempt it has shown towards this Council and the international community during this debate.

That show of contempt is an unacceptable characteristic of the Pretoria régime, one that separates it from the rest of the world community. It has condemned itself before humanity. In the light of its recent conduct and behaviour, we are convinced that Pretoria has no desire whatever to co-operate in any way with international efforts to search for a peaceful solution to the conflict in South Africa. It is bent on deception and on insulting the few friends it still has in this Chamber.

(Mr. Yusof, Malaysia)

The Security Council cannot but feel compelled to impose mandatory sanctions. My Government urges that it do so urgently and unequivocally.

I began by stressing that my statement was prompted by considerations of humanity. The problems created by Pretoria are not African problems alone. We strongly believe in universal human rights and the fundamental freedoms of the individual in a structure of democracy and peace. They constitute a measurement of progress in the development of universal morality. We shall continue to safeguard these rights and freedoms. We see in South Africa a desperate attempt by the minority to quell such human progress and to push mankind back through a time warp to the Dark Ages.

Hence, the question before this Council is not only directed towards Pretoria. It is, first and foremost, directed towards the international community and the Council itself. Human rights and fundamental freedoms have been and are being systematically violated in South Africa. The régime is persistently undermining international peace and stability. Pretoria has defied this Council to do its "damnedest" (S/PV.2793, p. 16). Is the Council willing and able to discharge its responsibility clearly and urgently? The answer must surely be obvious: It is one not only of courage but of wisdom.

We urge that the Security Council take the first steps towards comprehensive sanctions. We urge that to begin with the Council acknowledge and endorse the current denial by many countries of investments and financial flows to South Africa. It could act to ban all forms of co-operation extended by Member States to Pretoria. All forms of trade and exchanges should also cease. South Africa should be treated as an international pariah until apartheid is completely dismantled and freedom and democracy return to the people of that country. Further

(Mr. Yusof, Malaysia)

procrastination by important members of this Council can only encourage the racist régime to prolong the human suffering and ignominy in South Africa. We feel that no nation or institution has any right to condone or encourage these acts against humanity.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Malaysia for the very generous words of recognition he addressed to my country and to me personally.

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

Mr. LEGWAILA (Botswana): Mr. President, allow me to congratulate you on your timely assumption of the leadership of the Security Council. You represent a great country, Yugoslavia, whose credentials for fair play, objectivity and courage are far beyond reproach. In your presidency, in particular on this occasion, we repose without any equivocation our confidence that this debate will end fruitfully. The Council was also well served by the dynamic presidency of your predecessor, whom we congratulate.

The crimes of apartheid and the outrageous monotony and abandon with which they are perpetrated against so many in South Africa by the Pretoria régime have become so commonplace, so routine that the world has now grown to take them for granted. These crimes have come to be accepted as normal and their routinized occurrence or perpetration as an inexhaustible source of boredom to some.

And now more than ever before, when the state of emergency in that country has transformed apartheid South Africa into a veritable secret concentration camp in which the brutalization of apartheid's victims is carried out in private, any occurrence like the proscription of 17 peaceful organizations and 18 individuals and the denial of the right to march for freedom, dramatized by the arrest the other day of the bishops, has nothing more than a nuisance value for some people in a world that has accepted South Africa and its murderous racist tyranny as a normal and understandable aberration of human civilization.

In the world outside southern Africa, of great interest is not so much the unrelenting brutalities of apartheid but black-on-black violence, because black-on-black violence reinforces the bigotry of those who seek justification for South Africa's racial tyranny. No interest is afforded the obvious fact that black-on-black violence is neither self-initiating nor self-propelling and/or sustaining. The bigoted would have us believe that the black tribes of South Africa are to blame for the crimes of apartheid, that the states of emergency and

(Mr. Legwaila, Botswana)

other Draconian laws in South Africa derive their rationale from the benevolent need to save South Africa from the scourge of tribal warfare and conflict.

Thus we see today the emergence of an ominous pattern of indifference and carefreeness in the world vis-à-vis the question of South Africa. Yes, we have listened to tough statements issued by some major Western countries recently in reaction to Pretoria's action against the 17 organizations and 18 individuals. Unfortunately, the statements, we must admit, are neither new nor meaningful enough in either their intent or objective. We know that their authors are capable of doing much more to help change the situation in southern Africa.

What I say here comes straight from the bottom of my heart. We know the constructive and decisive role that South Africa's influential friends can play in the evolution of change in South Africa. We know how frightened the Western Powers are of even the mere mention of economic sanctions against white-ruled South Africa. I can assure the Council that we are all frightened, in particular those of us who share geographical space with South Africa, more so the victims of apartheid in that country. We share geographical space with South Africa, and there is no way we can be spared the effects of economic sanctions against that country. But what about those who enjoy the comfort of distance, what about those who are thousands of miles away? Why are they so frightened of even the mention of sanctions?

But we concede that sanctions are not the only weapon against apartheid. In truth, sanctions are to us the weapon of desperation, when either nothing else has been found to work or when alternative weapons have not been tried or have been rejected. In truth, Botswana, a peace-loving country, would have been far happier if the fear of sanctions by the Western Powers could have forced those Powers to adopt the anti-apartheid weapon we favour most, that is, the exertion of real and meaningful pressure by the West on the white minority régime in South Africa to

(Mr. Legwaila, Botswana)

force it to negotiate a democratic constitution for South Africa with the real leaders of black South Africa, namely, Mandela, Mothopeng and the rest. This type of pressure the West has not exerted. The West has been too busy dissipating its massive energy on finding escape routes from sanctions. All we hear is that sanctions cannot work, and we hear nothing about alternative attempts to get South Africa to co-operate. Let me quote the wisdom of a Chinese fortune cookie, which says that "In great attempts it is glorious even to fail". We can see that no great attempts have been made by the West to confront Pretoria with the moment of truth it must face.

I say all this to challenge the West's sense of justice vis-à-vis the situation in South Africa. The West did absolutely nothing meaningful when two years ago South Africa scuttled the Commonwealth initiative, whose sole aim was to get the parties to the conflict in South Africa to negotiate the demise of apartheid and negotiate it peacefully. The West knows that the Commonwealth initiative was scuttled because it was on the verge of success. An historic opportunity to end the violence of apartheid peacefully was thus allowed to escape the grasp of the international community. The West did nothing to save that opportunity. The West was too busy running away from sanctions, not realizing that sanctions would have been rendered obsolete if the Commonwealth initiative had succeeded.

And now Pretoria's resolve to defy the international community has been stiffened considerably. The other day the South African representative had no qualms in inviting this Council to go to hell; not for the first time, of course, but the invitation was issued with an unusually stubborn confidence. Of course it should not be difficult to contemplate the fate of this world with this Council burning in hell, consigned there by an impudent South Africa. But to tell you the

(Mr. Legwaila, Botswana)

truth, we have always marvelled at the capacity of this premier organ of the United Nations for permissiveness and/or tolerance, that it can repeatedly tolerate being invited either to jump into the East River and drown or to go to hell by a South Africa that depends for its own survival on the friendship, love and compassion of the Western world.

(Mr. Legwaila, Botswana)

The combined influence of the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Federal Republic of Germany, the French Republic, Japan and Italy, determinedly augmented by the efforts of the African National Congress (ANC), the Pan Africanist Congress (PAC), the front-line States, the Organization of African Unity and the rest of the international community cannot fail to overwhelm the tyranny of the white-minority régime in Pretoria.

That influence has thus far not been put to good use. It has been used to inflate Pretoria's ego with delusions of invincibility and indispensability. All we have seen so far are fruitless pilgrimages to South Africa by a few Western envoys - some of whom are in the service of apartheid in Europe anyway - who go on pilgrimages to South Africa to replenish their bigotry, to celebrate the so-called reforms, whose intent is so obvious, to assure the white minority of the so-called civilized world's abiding love, compassion and understanding.

The fraudulent nature of the reforms Mr. Manley talked about the other is too evident and plain to be confused with the evolution of the meaningful and fundamental change we seek in South Africa. His Government has never concealed the fact that the reforms are designed solely to modify apartheid rather than to abolish it and create on its ashes a new democratic society in South Africa. President Botha himself has made it abundantly clear on several occasions that abolishing apartheid would be tantamount to the white minority's committing an act of abdication of responsible leadership of South Africa. He has made it abundantly clear that non-racial democracy in South Africa will destroy South Africa, and he will therefore not permit it.

And the white-minority régime's daily actions against black South Africans betray no intent on its part to budge an inch from this intransigent stance. The régime has not only outlawed political activity by blacks, all kinds of freedom-seeking political activity, but - and this is very serious indeed - it has

(Mr. Legwaila, Botswana)

criminalized even religious marches or walks for freedom. In South Africa you cannot even walk or march peacefully for freedom.

How else can we explain the arrest of the Anglican Archbishop of Cape Town and his colleagues the other day as they marched quietly and solemnly towards the Parliament buildings in Cape Town. Yes, even peaceful protest by blacks is illegal in South Africa. It falls within the flexible rubric of what is called in South Africa extra-parliamentary activity, from which blacks are barred. Such activity is permissible only within the white community.

The Council witnessed recently the gathering of the Afrikaner neo-Nazis on the steps of the Union Buildings - the administrative headquarters of the South African Government in Pretoria. This despite the existence of the state of emergency and the restrictions of 23 February. What came out of the mouths of those Afrikaners could have amounted to a treasonous act if it had been uttered by a black group like the United Democratic Front. The Afrikaner neo-Nazis were in the company of the police, who did nothing as they listened contentedly to the vile outpourings of hate for black South Africans and their aspirations for freedom in their own land.

The subsequent arrest of Bishop Tutu and his fellow humble men of the cloth bears witness to this painful fact: that it is all right for the Afrikaner neo-Nazis to pursue their Hitlerite vocation undisturbed, and it is wrong and illegal for even men of the cloth, black or white, to march solemnly, prayerfully, for the freedom of the black man in South Africa.

And South Africa's apologists tolerate all this, and they wonder why black South Africans have resorted to armed struggle to assert their God-given right to freedom in their own country. They wonder why there is so much agitation for sanctions. They ask "Why the impatience?" - that is, after 300 years; "Why are you so impatient to be free? Why not give reforms a chance?" - that is, "Why cannot

(Mr. Legwaila, Botswana)

you allow the whites to assuage their conscience by simply tinkering with apartheid?" They ask "Why not negotiate something with Mr. Botha and his Government? Why not accept the tricameral Parliament as a step in the right direction, even if it entrenches the disenfranchisement of more than 70 per cent of the population of South Africa?" They say "Please give them a chance to get on with the tinkering with apartheid." They say "We hate the violence of the ANC" - as if they love the violence of apartheid perpetrated by the South African Government. They hate the violence of the ANC, and yet there is no repercussion for the violence of apartheid. It is acceptable violence because it is perpetrated by an established authority - one that was, fortunately, established by white men.

In his vituperative go-to-hell statement last week, Mr. Manley, the Ambassador of South Africa, stated his Government would "continue to strive to attain a negotiated settlement for the problem facing all South Africans" (S/PV.2793, p. 16). A nice thing to say, and the West would be happy to hear it. But with whom is Mr. Manley's Government striving to negotiate a settlement of the problems of South Africa? This is the catch. Is his Government ready and willing at long last to negotiate the birth of a brand new South Africa with the African National Congress, the Pan Africanist Congress and others without the usual intransigent excuses? If indeed there has been a change of heart on the part of Mr. Manley's Government vis-à-vis negotiations with the real leaders of South Africa, we must then wonder how such negotiations can take place with these real leaders locked up in prison, in hiding or restricted. How does the action of 23 February facilitate negotiations? How?

Mr. Manley's Government has long lost the capacity to cheat with impunity. Left to its own devices, the undeniable fact is that the type of negotiations black

(Mr. Legwaila, Botswana)

South Africans and we seek in South Africa are not the type of negotiations sought by Mr. Manley's Government. Pretoria, left on its own, would want nothing more than modernized structural perestroika to the apartheid system. That is why Mr. Manley's Government will not even tolerate opposition, however peaceful, to the so-called reforms.

(Mr. Legwaila, Botswana)

Mr. Manley stated in his "do your dammedest" speech:

"The intericine warfare"

- spawned and encouraged by Pretoria, of course -

"that has typified the so-called political actions of the groups that oppose reform could not be tolerated any longer". (S/PV.2793, pp. 13-14)

In typical fashion, the South African Ambassador and his Government cannot accept that those poor blacks in South Africa have every right to oppose and reject reforms which are intended to avoid majority rule and entrench white supremacy in a modernistic guise. He cannot understand that black South Africans do not want half-freedom paternalistically dispensed from the ivory tower of white supremacy. They want, and have every right, to participate in the shaping of their own political future.

Mr. Manley says the restrictions of 23 February

"... affect only those activities that endanger the safety of the public and undermine the maintenance of law and order." (S/PV.2793, p. 13)

That is a blatant falsehood. I have already stated that in South Africa those who are opposed to apartheid, those whose activities, peaceful and orderly activities, do not fall within the rubric of extra-parliamentary activity as defined by Mr. Manley's Government, are simply not allowed to protest, march, walk or pray outdoors for freedom. They are not allowed to demonstrate peacefully for the release of their incarcerated leaders. It is a crime to agitate peacefully for Mandela's release. And even without the restrictions of 23 February, in any case, the state of emergency and the arbitrary modus operandi of the South African police have simply made it very dangerous, if not impossible, for the United Democratic Front and other peaceful organizations and individuals to speak of political change and freedom in South Africa.

(Mr. Legwaila, Botswana)

I come from southern Africa. I represent a peace-loving country, one of the victims of the apartheid régime. Therefore, I want to end this statement with a repetition of what I consider to be the most important element of everything that I have said here. I want to reiterate my country's belief in a negotiated settlement to the South African problem.

In addition to appealing to the United States and the United Kingdom not to veto sanctions against South Africa, the Rev. Frank Chikane, of the South African Council of Churches, by telex yesterday morning called for negotiations to arrest the drift towards a tragedy of unspeakable consequences in South Africa. In other words, no one should ever be under the illusion that the front-line States are against negotiations or that the ANC is against negotiations. All that the front-line States, the ANC and everybody else in Africa are against is the chicanery of the attitude we see in the West towards South Africa, with people in the West saying "Please don't impose sanctions. We are not going to do anything to end apartheid, but don't bother about sanctions. We will veto them, but in return we are not going to present South Africa at the conference table to negotiate genuinely for the end of apartheid." In other words, the message to the people of South Africa is "Three hundred years are not long enough. You can continue for decades and centuries more before you can gain your freedom." Oh, those poor South Africans! The only mistake God made was to make them black, and therefore they are not entitled to freedom.

But the very same countries that refuse to force the South African Government to come to the conference table with the real leaders of South Africa will turn around and say "You see, now they are going around killing children, killing whites, those involved in this liberation struggle of yours, with the AK-47 rifles

(Mr. Legwaila, Botswana)

you get from the Russians. You have not been free for 300 years, but you are becoming Communist, because you get your support from the East." So they cannot win.

My country believes passionately in negotiations to end the violence of apartheid peacefully, because neither sanctions nor war will do my people any good. But no one can expect the South African people to throw up their hands and say that because their neighbours will be hurt by sanctions or violence the people of South Africa must not strive for their freedom. It would be unconscionable of their neighbours to say "Please don't be free by any means possible, because you will hurt us by using those means."

I do not know whether the United Nations has received the telex from the Rev. Chikane, which is headed "Appeal to the United Nations". I have received it, and I know that that man of the cloth is simply appealing to the Council to force South Africa to come to the conference table to negotiate peacefully the end of apartheid, and it is up to the Council, even though it has been told to go to hell. We hope that it will wait, and that before it goes to hell it can help us liberate South Africa. For here we agree with the West: unless South Africa can be liberated peacefully, we know that the alternative will be too ghastly.

The liberation movements of South Africa and their incarcerated leaders have repeatedly expressed their readiness to negotiate the creation of a united, non-racial democratic society in South Africa, if their reasonable conditions are met. They are not new conditions; they are the conditions that Mr. Smith had to face and that the Portuguese had to face. South Africa can never hope to negotiate the end of apartheid with leaders of its own choice. The Government of South Africa must negotiate the end of apartheid if it really wants peace in South

(Mr. Legwaila, Botswana)

Africa, and negotiate it with the very people it has locked up. That is the only way apartheid can end. We have seen that with Southern Rhodesia, which tried to negotiate with puppets. The war never ended until those in power negotiated with the real leaders of the people of Zimbabwe. There will be no exception from that rule with regard to the question of South Africa. The reasonable conditions are simply that all those who have been incarcerated must be released and all the Draconian apartheid laws must be abolished, because there is no way in which the Government of South Africa can negotiate the end of apartheid with prisoners.

The front-line States know and are convinced of the seriousness of the liberation movements' intent to negotiate the end of apartheid if the opportunity is given them to negotiate its end peacefully. Their leaders are not bloodthirsty. They want peace for their people.

But the question we ask is: What of South Africa? Are South Africa's friends and backers ready to co-operate by seeing to it that Mr. Botha and his Government proceed to the conference table to negotiate the birth of a new South Africa?

(Mr. Legwaila, Botswana)

Yes, the British, the Americans, the Germans and others know how committed the front-line States have always been to peace in their region. Without the co-operation of the front-line States, the historic United Nations plan for Namibia, set forth in Security Council resolution 435 (1978), would have been impossible 10 years ago. The fact that somehow these Western Powers have today developed cold feet on the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) - for some reason, they have discovered it will not produce the kind of Namibia they anticipated in 1977 and 1978 - cannot negate the fact that they owe the adoption of that important resolution by the Security Council to the co-operation of the front-line States and the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO). There would have been no resolution 435 (1978) if we had not co-operated with the West. That shows our bona fides about wanting peace in southern Africa.

We can replicate that co-operation on the question of South Africa. On the previous occasion, the Western Powers persuaded Pretoria - forget about the motives involved in that persuasion - to scuttle or abandon the Turnhalle circus in Namibia; and, if they want to, they can persuade the very same Pretoria today to abandon the dangerous futility of racist reforms. The challenge is theirs. The alternative to meeting this challenge is of course only too obvious to them. The alternative is mounting pressure for economic sanctions against their friend. And the alternative is also - and this frightens them - that the liberation war against the Government in Pretoria will enjoy a free reign. If the violence of apartheid is not stopped peacefully, the people of South Africa are being invited to fight to the bitter end. The West will be sacrificing its own interests in South Africa. Those interests will go up in smoke if there is fighting to the bitter end. Is that what the West wants? The choice is theirs. Remember the wise counsel of the

(Mr. Legwaila, Botswana)

Chinese fortune cookie: "In great attempts it is glorious even to fail". The West has yet to make great attempts to help free South Africa from the shackles of racial tyranny.

My statement today has come from the bottom of my heart.

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

In view of the lateness of the hour and the fact that there are four more speakers in the debate or in explanation of vote before we proceed to the voting, I shall now adjourn this meeting. The next meeting of the Security Council to continue the consideration of the item on the agenda will take place this afternoon at 3.30.

The meeting rose at 1.20 p.m.