



Security Council

UN LIBRARY

FEB 23 1987

UN/SA COLLECTION

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.2738

20 February 1987

ENGLISH

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND
SEVEN HUNDRED AND THIRTY-EIGHTH MEETINGHeld at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 20 February 1987, at 3.00 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 Luyue
Mr. ADOUKI
Mr. BROCHAND
Mr. LAUTENSCHLAGER
Mr. GBEHO
Mr. BUCCI
Mr. KIKUCHI
Mr. BELONOGOV
Mr. AL-SHAALI

Sir John THOMSON
Mr. OKUN
Mr. AGUILAR

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

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

The meeting was called to order at 3.45 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, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Ethiopia, the German Democratic Republic, Guyana, India, Kenya, Kuwait, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mongolia, Morocco, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Senegal, South Africa, the Sudan, Sweden, Togo, Uganda, 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. Oramas Oliva (Cuba), Mr. Cesar (Czechoslovakia), Mr. Badawi (Egypt), Mr. Tadesse (Ethiopia), Mr. Ott (German Democratic Republic), Mr. Insanally (Guyana), Mr. Dasgupta (India) Mr. Kiilu (Kenya), Mr. Abulhassan (Kuwait), Mr. Treiki (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), Mr. Nyamdoo (Mongolia), Mr. Bennouna (Morocco), Mr. Icaza Gallard (Nicaragua), Mr. Ahmed (Pakistan), Mr. Sarre (Senegal), Mr. Manley (South Africa), Mr. Adam (Sudan), Mr. Ferm (Sweden), Mr. Kouassi (Togo), Mr. Kibedi (Uganda), 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: The Security Council will now resume its consideration of the item on its agenda.

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

Mr. TREIKI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (interpretation from Arabic): First, Sir, I congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month. My delegation is certain that your political skills and wisdom will ensure that the Council's deliberations are fruitful. The important role played by your country, Zambia, in the struggle that has been declared against apartheid and its generous support for the liberation movements are a source of pride for us Africans.

I cannot fail to thank your predecessor, Mr. Andres Aguilar, Permanent Representative of Venezuela and on behalf of my delegation to congratulate the new members of the Council - Italy, the Federal Republic of Germany, Zambia, Japan, and Argentina. We wish them every success.

My country, which suffered from Fascist colonialism and paid dearly for its freedom, well understands the meaning of the phrase "racist colonialism", which makes the citizen to whom the national soil truly belongs into a stranger in his own land, deprived of his human dignity and subjected to brute force and all kinds of harassment. That painful experience, suffered by our people for a long period in its history, has profoundly affected it, and explains its repugnance for racist régimes, which are the enemies of mankind as a whole. Having learned from that bitter experience, during which we were the victims of racial violence, colonialism and expansionism, we are resolutely committed to supporting the cause of freedom and liberation at all times and in all places.

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

Our people has suffered aggression, of which the members of the Council are aware, from forces hostile to freedom and the right to self-determination, which engaged in a desperate attempt to stifle our people and prevent it from playing its role in support of the liberation movements and in rendering assistance to the oppressed peoples. The international community knows perfectly well to what we are referring.

The international community has quite correctly described racism as a crime against humanity. The all-out struggle being waged by the people of South Africa against the policies of apartheid and aggression is a glorious page in mankind's history of struggle for dignity and freedom in spite of the policy of oppression, brute force and massacre practised by the racist entity in Pretoria against the liberation struggle of the people of South Africa, the struggle to achieve the people's objective will continue unabated until its goals are attained.

The list of victims during the last two years has grown. Many thousands have been arrested, including women and children. But it will take more than that to deter the people of South Africa in its noble struggle. The imposition of a state of emergency, press censorship, the granting of discretionary powers to the army and the police have not prevented the struggle of the people of South Africa from spreading throughout the national territory.

The methods used by the racist Pretoria régime against the indigenous people, who are the rightful owners of the land and who form the overwhelming majority of the population, as well as the régime's actions against those who oppose the policies of apartheid, find their exact counterpart in the racist and nazi methods employed by the Zionist entity in occupied Palestine, an entity also born of terrorism which has also practised repression and murder and carried out arbitrary arrests against the indigenous Arab people in occupied Palestine, subjecting them

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

daily to all sorts of penalties in exactly the same way as does the Pretoria régime, the enemy of mankind.

My delegation is convinced that the international community is perfectly able to grasp quite clearly that the forces which implanted those two racist entities, one in Tel Aviv and the other in Pretoria, are the same forces that will support them in the political, economic, military and information spheres and defend them with every means in their power. Those are the forces that obstruct the adoption by the international community of measures conducive to eliminating racism and apartheid. We shall see this support, as we have in the past in this body, when the draft resolution is voted upon. Then we shall see exactly who are those forces to which we refer.

The cynicism and arrogance of the racist entity in Pretoria reminds us of the barbarities of the Zionist entity in occupied Palestine. Even the language of the representative of Pretoria three days ago in the Council seemed to be an exact replica of that used by the representative of the Zionist entity.

The people of South Africa has been patiently suffering for more than 50 years while loudly calling for peaceful dialogue. But its patience has only met with violence, oppression and arrests by the racists. That is why the only solution left was to meet that violence. Armed struggle has now become the only means for that people to avoid its own annihilation and to prevent it from meeting the fate as certain other peoples not so far removed.

Systematic State terrorism is practised not only against the Namibian and South African peoples; it is also a well-planned policy against the peoples of neighbouring African States, particularly those of the front-line States. The

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

Council has learned of the cases of Mozambique and Angola, part of whose territory is occupied by the racists. There are also the cases of Zambia, Zimbabwe, Botswana, Lesotho and Malawi. We have now learned that some are providing the racist régime with the electronic means and the submarines necessary to reinforce their nuclear capacity, and have been selling them refueling planes so that they can extend their murderous reach throughout Africa, preparing to decimate the African population, just as their counterpart in occupied Palestine is preparing to decimate the Arab populations there, with their nuclear capability.

My delegation appeals to the Security Council to be equal to the responsibilities incumbent upon it under the Charter and calls upon it to adopt urgent measures to put an end to the tragedy which is taking place in southern Africa and proceed, given the near-unanimity, to impose comprehensive sanctions against the racist régime in Pretoria pursuant to Chapter VII of the Charter, following the devious failure of all other peaceful means.

My delegation also requests those States that still maintain relations with the racist régime of Pretoria to put an end to them. There can now be no shadow of doubt that the apartheid régime must be uprooted. My delegation also requests the international community to assist the national liberation movements in southern Africa and the front-line States so that they can stand up to the machinations and terrorism of Pretoria. We also call upon the international community to exert greater pressure to obtain the release of political prisoners and to remove the prohibition now imposed on political organizations as well as the state of emergency so as to secure the withdrawal of the police and army from African towns and to end press censorship.

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

In conclusion, I should like to state that it is high time for the Security Council to adopt strong specific measures against the odious régime of apartheid. The Council should take steps to force Pretoria to take seriously the wishes of the international community. I should like to reiterate my appeal to those who are obstructing the will of the international community and ask them to cease doing so, for the black man has the same rights as the white man. Mere verbal condemnation is not enough and only invites derision upon the international community, and serves to prolong the suffering of the peoples of southern Africa. We shall soon see - perhaps in the next few minutes - who really wish to see the end of apartheid and who, on the contrary, wish to perpetuate that abhorrent régime.

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

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

Mr. KIBEDI (Uganda): Permit me, first of all, to extend to you, Sir, the heartfelt congratulations of my delegation and my country on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for this month. We have been very much impressed by the able and exemplary manner in which you have conducted the Council's deliberations, and our satisfaction is all the greater because you come from Zambia, a fraternal African State with which Uganda maintains the most cordial relations. Your country and you personally have been in the forefront of the liberation struggle in southern Africa for many years, and your presidency, in particular during this Council debate, gives us every confidence that the voice of the oppressed will be heard, loud and clear.

I wish also to express our appreciation to your predecessor, Ambassador Andres Aguilar of Venezuela, for the admirable manner in which he guided the Council's work during the past month.

Since this is the first time that my delegation has addressed the Council this year, I take this opportunity to congratulate the new non-permanent members of the Council on their election and wish them every success in carrying out the momentous responsibilities they have assumed.

Over the years succeeding apartheid régimes in Pretoria have proved to be vicious oppressors and ferocious exploiters of the peoples under their domination. The present racist régime has equally demonstrated that it is an aggressive one, pursuing a course of action aimed at achieving military conquest in southern Africa. As the time of reckoning slowly but surely approaches, the régime's brutality inside South Africa and aggressive actions against neighbouring States have attained larger and more perilous levels, not unlike the frantic charges of a wounded beast. Its actions constitute a breach of peace and security, requiring

(Mr. Kibedi, Uganda)

the Security Council to take decisive action under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter with a view to putting an end to this dangerous state of affairs.

The records of the Security Council and the General Assembly are replete with the debates on the serious situation in southern Africa and the danger it poses to international peace and security. All reasonable men and women, young and old, are agreed that apartheid is wicked and immoral and must be dismantled. The General Assembly has called it a crime against humanity. Numerous resolutions have been adopted by this Organization and other international forums calling for the termination of apartheid and all racist practices by the white minority régime in Pretoria. Indeed the Security Council, in its resolution 566 (1985), warned South Africa that if it failed to co-operate with the Council and the Secretary-General the Council would be compelled to meet forthwith to consider the adoption of appropriate measures under the United Nations Charter, including Chapter VII. In spite of the international community's increased condemnation and concern it is plain that the Pretoria régime will not voluntarily abandon its policies of apartheid and aggression against neighbouring States.

Africa has long made its commitment to the liberation of southern Africa well known. In the Lusaka Manifesto, which was adopted by the Organization of African Unity (OAU) as long ago as 1969 and presented to the General Assembly the same year, the OAU made it clear that it preferred a negotiated solution for the dismantling of apartheid, although it also recognized that where all peaceful avenues were closed the alternative was armed struggle. Over the past two decades Africa and the liberation movements have lived up to the challenges of negotiation and armed struggle. Every peaceful avenue has been explored. South Africa, on the other hand, has not shown any serious interest in a negotiated solution and has instead pursued the path of war.

(Mr. Kibedi, Uganda)

All peaceful protests by the oppressed in South Africa have always been answered with brutal force and repression by the apartheid régime. Thus the history of peaceful and non-violent resistance to the racist laws in South Africa is a tragic narrative punctuated by massacres, such as those of Sharpeville and Soweto; individual martyrdom, as those of Steve Biko and thousands more; decades of incarceration in the apartheid régime's prisons, as in the cases of Nelson Mandela, the late Robert Sobukwe, and countless others.

The Pretoria régime has continued to defy the international community. It does not heed moral indignation or warnings, nor does it respond to so-called friendly persuasion. Many initiatives have been undertaken by foes and friends alike to try and convince Pretoria to bring about a peaceful change in South Africa. All to no avail.

Six years ago, against the protests of Africa, the Non-Aligned Movement and the overwhelming majority of the international community, the United States of America embarked on a policy of "constructive engagement" with South Africa. In return for closer ties with the United States of America, South Africa was expected to implement fundamental reforms internally, promote a movement towards the independence of Namibia, and desist from aggression and destabilization of neighbouring countries. A panel set up by the State Department of the United States to evaluate this policy agrees that the strategy of "constructive engagement" has failed abysmally. The panel correctly identifies the fundamental interest of the United States of America - which is also common to all of us - namely, to assist in ending a political and legal system in which over 80 per cent of the population are denied basic individual rights. It recommends

"... against United States endorsement of 'reforms' that fail to address the fundamental concerns of black South Africans".

(Mr. Kibedi, Uganda)

It says that support "for piecemeal reforms has proven counter-productive". It further states that change must be part of a process of negotiation with the entire spectrum of black organizations, including the outlawed African National Congress and its gaoled leader Nelson Mandela. We agree with that assessment.

After chewing and swallowing the carrot offered by "constructive engagement", the South African apartheid régime continued its oppressive and aggressive policies with impunity, and easily evaded the hidden stick, such as it was.

The Commonwealth leaders, anxious to avoid a bloody confrontation in southern Africa, set up the Eminent Persons Group. Much hope was invested in that initiative. Intensive negotiations were indeed carried out. As a clear slap in the face of the Eminent Persons Group the racist régime invaded the neighbouring countries. Its objective - which it achieved - was to scuttle the Group's efforts in search for a peaceful solution to the problems of southern Africa. The régime meted out the same treatment to the Consultative Mission sent by the countries of the European Economic Community for the same purpose.

As the outcry and resistance against apartheid internally and externally intensified, the régime implemented the most Draconian and repressive measures that it had conjured up so far. The régime proclaimed a state of emergency, which on 12 June 1986 was extended to cover the whole country. Mass arrests and brutal repression of peaceful demonstrators now characterize the political scene in South Africa. Police and military action has resulted in the death of many thousands of persons, including children. Despite unanimous condemnation by the Security Council in the past, the South African régime has continued its evil policy of enforced displacement of the black populace. The régime can no longer hide the fact that the resistance is internally based, nor that the liberation movements have intensified the struggle. To hide the truth from the world, the régime under

(Mr. Kibedi, Uganda)

sweeping emergency powers imposed restrictions both on the local and foreign press, but as everyone knows the truth will never ever be suppressed.

As the internal struggle intensifies, the policy of blind repression based on the state of emergency has been coupled with the policy of aggression against the front-line States. South African forces still occupy southern Angola, and through its surrogate UNITA the régime continues to destabilize Angola. It is for us beyond comprehension that, instead of denouncing South Africa for destabilizing Angola, some countries have chosen to encourage South Africa by joining it in arming its UNITA surrogates with sophisticated weapons.

(Mr. Kibedi, Uganda)

South Africa has failed to live up to its undertakings under the Nkomati Accord with Mozambique, thus exposing its total disdain for any peace accord. Zimbabwe, Swaziland, Botswana, Lesotho and Zambia have been targets of South Africa's military actions and the racist murder squads. The South African destabilization programme has resulted in the loss of thousands upon thousands of lives and billions of dollars in material damage.

It is not surprising that the economic infrastructure of neighbouring countries - especially that which would have lessened the dependence of those countries on South Africa - has been the special target of repeated South African attacks. The whole strategy of South Africa is to increase its hegemony and make the whole region safe for apartheid and economically dependent on the apartheid régime.

To mollify its apologists, the régime instituted so-called reforms devoid of any substance. The abolition of the pass laws and the so-called constitutional reforms aimed at co-opting some sections of the oppressed majority in a segregated Parliament must be seen in that light. Those measures are intended to hoodwink the international community into complacency but they will not succeed because they leave the foundation and apparatus of apartheid intact. They cannot deceive anybody. They have appropriately been rejected even by the intended beneficiaries of that dispensation. The international community has also recognized them for what they are, and has accordingly rejected them. The truth is that apartheid cannot be reformed; it must be dismantled.

Brutal as the régime is, the fact is that it will not succeed in breaking the resistance of the people, who are determined to regain human dignity and attain self-determination. The people of southern Africa recognize that they have a

(Mr. Kibedi, Uganda)

primary responsibility in the struggle to dismantle apartheid. The people are prepared to pay any price. It is the responsibility of the international community and those who maintain close relations with racist South Africa to make that price as low as possible. The imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions is therefore imperative. It is the only peaceful way left in which the international community can contribute to the dismantling of apartheid and the maintenance of international peace and security.

We do not find the arguments advanced by South Africa's friends, and echoed by the representative of the Pretoria régime on Tuesday, against the imposition of sanctions persuasive or plausible. It is clear that those arguments are designed only to advance their own interests, to protect and maintain their privileged trade, military and other relations with the apartheid régime.

It is often suggested that sanctions should not be imposed since they will most certainly hurt the oppressed people in South Africa. The authentic leaders of the oppressed black population have clearly called for the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions. Both the black South Africans and the front-line States, aware of those adverse consequences, gave that message to the Commonwealth Eminent Persons Group. Following their long and hard negotiations with the South African Government, on the one hand, and the authentic black leaders, on the other, the Group concluded that the racist régime was not ready to envisage fundamental changes in the existing structures. Consequently the Group emphasized the need for effective pressure. It indicated that the alternative to economic and diplomatic pressure was the acceleration of violence and generalized civil war, with disastrous consequences for the whole region and the world. That is also the message the black leaders in South Africa clearly conveyed to the

(Mr. Kibedi, Uganda)

consultative mission the European Economic Community (EEC) sent to South Africa last August.

If the concern of those opposing sanctions is really their adverse consequences for the front-line States and oppressed black people in South Africa, the logical step would be for them to help those countries reduce their dependence on South Africa by augmenting economic aid to them through the Southern African Co-ordination Conference and other programmes designed to assist the oppressed people in South Africa. It should not be overlooked that South Africa has for years imposed sanctions on its neighbours. As has been pointed out before in this Council, the economic infrastructure of the front-line States has been attacked again and again and in many cases destroyed by South Africa. Through a system of disinformation the difficulties brought about by that economic sabotage are then portrayed as examples of mismanagement by African States. The prolongation of the apartheid status quo would only continue to bleed those countries even more. The sooner apartheid is dismantled, the better for them and for everybody.

The Organization of African Unity (OAU), the Non-Aligned Summit Conference in Harare and the Paris Declaration of the World Conference on Sanctions against South Africa, which was endorsed by the General Assembly, have all underscored the need for comprehensive mandatory sanctions. The case for sanctions has thus gained world-wide support. Many countries have imposed voluntary sanctions, and the Security Council should not lag behind. It should legislate and make these sanctions mandatory.

Uganda pays tribute to those countries that have decided to impose voluntary sanctions in conformity with Security Council resolutions. We welcome the action of the United States Congress in legislating sanctions, albeit selective ones. We

(Mr. Kibedi, Uganda)

believe that for sanctions to have maximum effect they must be comprehensive and mandatory.

Those who hold a veto power in the Council have a special responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. The presumption of the United Nations Charter in granting them the power of the veto is that they will use it responsibly. The challenge is therefore quite clear and plain for everybody to see today.

The Council's efforts to bring the culprit to book have been thwarted by some permanent members. Unfortunately South Africa has interpreted that protection as endorsement of its obnoxious policies and projected itself accordingly as the protector of Western interests in the region. It is our hope that those concerned will not only express pious concern for the suffering of the people of South Africa in their statements but will go a step further and vote positively, or at the very least not obstruct the desire of the international community and the majority of the members of the Council to impose appropriate sanctions.

It has also to be remembered that the people of South Africa will be free one day. It is only a question of when and how. But one thing is certain: when they are finally free they will most certainly remember those who stood with them, side by side, at the bleakest hour of their history. But all Africa will also remember, because the apartheid psyche and philosophy are based on denial of the very humanity of the black race in general and the African in particular. We will therefore have good reason to remember those who were friends of ours at the time of our greatest need.

In the meantime, the struggle continues.

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

Mr. AL-SHAALI (United Arab Emirates) (interpretation from Arabic): My delegation is pleased to see you, Sir, presiding over the proceedings of the Council while it is debating what has for a number of years been one of the most important items on its agenda. You are a son of southern Africa, which is daily suffering this tragedy. We are sure that you will conduct the Council's proceedings wisely and to a successful conclusion.

(Mr. Al-Shaali, United
Arab Emirates)

My delegation would also like to congratulate my friend Ambassador Aguilar, Permanent Representative of Venezuela, who so ably conducted the Council's work last month - work which in large measure went beyond the customary deliberations of this body.

Since this is the first time I have spoken in the Council this year, I am also happy to welcome the new members who have joined us this year: Argentina, Zambia, Japan, the Federal Republic of Germany and Italy. I express to them our best wishes for success and assure them of our full co-operation in carrying out the Council's tasks.

I should like to take this opportunity to salute the constructive contribution of those delegations that ended their term on the Security Council last December - Australia, Denmark, Madagascar, Trinidad and Tobago and Thailand.

The doctrine of racism and the system of racist government are not only a challenge to the South African people and the peoples of the front-line States. They are also ^{also} a challenge to the universal conscience of mankind both throughout the world and here in the Security Council. I do not think that at this stage of our discussions there is any need to dwell upon the crimes of the racist régime. Rather, we must attempt to find and implement remedies for those crimes in order once and for all to put an end to the disease afflicting our African brothers, whose only crime is that they are black and a different colour from those who control their country and resources.

My delegation has on many occasions reaffirmed its conviction that the South African racist régime, like all régimes based upon racism and racial discrimination, cannot voluntarily mend its ways for the simple reason that racism is not the fruit of objective reasoning and cannot be checked by objective

(Mr. Al-Shaali, United
Arab Emirates)

remedies. Racism is the product of a doctrine of racial superiority that prevailed in Europe at a certain period in history. It is also rooted in a desire to serve the economic and political interests of a single race. Those two factors, the moral and the material, are closely linked. They are the reason that the international community has been unable to prevail upon the white racists to abandon this doctrine and why we are convinced that concrete action is the only way we have to bring about change in southern Africa. By that I mean that we must do something about the profits being amassed by the racists through this racist policy and adopt mandatory and comprehensive sanctions against those criminals to force them to mend their ways. Because we are working within the framework of the United Nations and in accordance with its Charter, the only peaceful means available to us is application of the provisions of its Chapter VII.

It would be easy to conclude - at least when we listen to the statements made here in this Council by various representatives - that all the members of the Council share the same view, namely, that the apartheid régime must be done away with. I have never yet heard anyone say anything to the contrary. What is the problem? The problem is to determine how to do away with apartheid. That is the bone of contention among the members of the Council and, perhaps, among the members of the international community as a whole.

Some feel that apartheid will disappear if we continue to maintain relations with the racist régime and attempt to influence its policies, either by means of so-called constructive engagement or some other constructive approach. However, we feel compelled to point out that South Africa does not share the views expressed by the members of the Security Council. Quite the contrary; South Africa is of the

(Mr. Al-Shaali, United
Arab Emirates)

opinion that apartheid must remain in place. The régime may change its style and use different tactics, but it will not change its policy.

It is obvious that the racist régime and those States that continue to do business with it maintain their relations for different reasons: those States hope to bring about the régime's dissolution, but the régime wishes thereby to strengthen its position. The point is: will trading with the régime help bring about its dissolution or, on the contrary, help it to gain strength?

Whatever the intentions of those who continue to maintain relations with South Africa, everything demonstrates that trading with that country only affords it aid and comfort. This has been confirmed over the years. Indeed the number of victims among the oppressed black population continues to increase.

Here, I would refer to the report of the commission appointed by the United States State Department, which clearly notes the failure of the policy of constructive engagement with the racist régime. I do not wish to quote from that report. It is quite detailed and lengthy, and anyone interested in the subject should read it in extenso. Random quotations would only distort its meaning. I would hope that that report will be circulated as an official document of the Security Council so that everyone can see that attempts to deal with the racist régime only help it.

It is for that reason that we do not share the views of those who think we should maintain relations with the racist régime because that would make possible the desired changes. We believe that trading and dealing with that régime - and I speak from experience acquired throughout history - will only result in strengthening it.

(Mr. Al-Shaali, United
Arab Emirates)

That is why we are inclined to the second thesis: that the time has come to adopt comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa. It is in that light that my delegation has endorsed the draft resolution before the Council. We have studied it with the greatest attention, and although it does not quite reflect our aspirations, we wish to take other factors into consideration and facilitate the task of other members of the Council, so that it may be adopted as a first step towards the elimination of the apartheid régime.

We are distressed by recent events in South Africa. We believe that what we are doing here can be seen as one peaceful step towards achieving a solution to the racial conflict in South Africa. Otherwise the only course left to the South African people is violence.

(Mr. Al-Shaali, United Arab Emirates)

Saying that economic sanctions will affect the front-line States and the black population of South Africa is duplicitous. According to that logic many third-world States would have to give up their independence and sovereignty and return to the old colonial days, since only colonialism can exploit their natural resources. Freedom and dignity is quite distinct from economic interests. Those who defend the notion of dealing with South Africa are actually defending a view that experience over the years has shown to be wrong. They oppose the application of sanctions because they cannot propose other credible ways of achieving the desired objective; that is why we cannot take their views seriously. We believe that the divide between verbal denunciation and deeds will be revealed when the draft resolution before the Council is put to the vote.

In conclusion I should like to recall that yesterday the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom, Sir John Thomson, quite rightly said that our first task must be to send a strong and united warning to the South African Government, urging it to proceed to political change. We share that view, and consider that we can do this by adopting by consensus the draft resolution before the Council.

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

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

Mr. INSANALLY (Guyana): As the newly accredited Permanent Representative of Guyana, I felt compelled to intervene in the current deliberations of the Security Council and to add my country's voice to this latest outcry against the evils that continue to prevail in South Africa. This compulsion springs from my

(Mr. Insanally, Guyana)

Government's belief that no opportunity must be missed to force the Pretoria régime into the realization that the international community will not forever endure its callous disregard of the fundamental values of civilized society. In the eyes of my delegation, therefore, the present meetings are fully justified and should be seized as a timely occasion for bringing concerted pressure to bear on those who are intent on preserving power through the inhumane system of apartheid.

Before entering the field of debate, however, I would wish, in this, my first address to the Council, to pay a tribute to the members of this most important organ and to thank them sincerely for giving me audience on the matter under discussion.

More particularly, Mr. President, I should like to convey to you my delegation's profound satisfaction in seeing you direct the Council's work at this time. As a distinguished son of Zambia, a country which has made innumerable sacrifices to the cause of freedom of mankind, you are, in our view, eminently qualified to provide the guidance which will be required of you in the search for co-ordination and consensus.

In assuring you of my delegation's full support, I must also add words of praise for your predecessor in office, Ambassador Andres Aguilar, whose reputation as an accomplished diplomat is a source of pride not only for his native Venezuela but for the entire region of Latin America and the Caribbean.

Mr. President, in deference to your leadership I shall be brief in my remarks, dealing only with those issues which have aroused the greatest attention on our part. Among these is the raison d'être of these meetings, which was challenged earlier by South Africa's spokesman but which, as I have already said, needs neither apology nor justification. The stated purpose of these meetings, as my delegation understands it, is to find general agreement on a strategy designed to

(Mr. Insanally, Guyana)

weaken the stranglehold which the minority South African régime continues to exert on an oppressed and long-suffering people. They must therefore be welcomed as such.

The pros and cons of sanctions as a means of influencing the behaviour of States have been debated ad nauseam in this forum and elsewhere. I shall therefore not add to the nauseam by launching into fresh argument. Suffice it to say that our Charter, to which we have all subscribed, makes provision for their use when the situation so warrents. Chapter VII is very clear on this point and leaves no doubt that sanctions can on occasion be legitimately applied.

They are being invoked in this particular instance against South Africa because the overwhelming majority of States believes that they can be an instrument for change in a renegade State which has defied and continues to defy all reasonable calls for change. It is not a case, I submit, as has been contended, of hypocrisy or double standards on the part of the proponents of sanctions. It must surely be appreciated that the situation in South Africa is qualitatively different from others in which the majority of States have seen fit to deplore the use of sanctions. The argument cannot, therefore, be made to stand on its head merely for the convenience of a régime bent on self-justification.

In desperation, that régime further contends that sanctions will hurt black South Africans and other black States more than they will harm Pretoria. My delegation will ignore that contention since it is more than passing strange that black South Africans and other black States appear ready and willing to submit themselves to the sacrifice required. Moreover, contrary to that régime's asseverations, those who advocate sanctions will not "merely shrug their shoulders and turn away". The Non-Aligned Movement, at its most recent summit meeting, at Harare, decided upon the creation of a Fund for the black peoples of southern Africa which are now fighting for dignity and social justice. It may be, however -

(Mr. Insanally, Guyana)

and I rather suspect that this is the truth - that despite its vaunting the Pretoria régime will not be able to withstand this sustained pressure and will come tumbling down in the debris of history.

My delegation remains convinced that comprehensive mandatory sanctions, strictly applied, can go a long way towards inducing change in the South African situation. We do not believe, like the man who feels that he will hurt the tiger less by cutting off its tail in little pieces instead of in one fell swoop, that we can make sanctions more palatable by making them less extensive. However, we recognize that at this point in time the international community as a whole may not be prepared to implement the full gamut of sanctions available to it. We are therefore persuaded in the circumstances that the selective mandatory sanctions which have been widely agreed upon can, by virtue of their general acceptance and if implemented along with other international efforts, prove to be an effective broadside against the fortress of apartheid in South Africa.

(Mr. Insanally, Guyana)

Accordingly, we fully support the initiative taken by the non-aligned members of the Council to secure endorsement of selective sanctions. It is, as has been said, a step in the right direction. However, should the intransigence of the Pretoria régime persist, there should, in our view, be no hesitation about renewing the call for comprehensive mandatory sanctions.

Enough has already been said in this forum to underscore the need for the Security Council to take urgent action to dismantle the apartheid system in South Africa. The prospects for a peaceful solution are, however, rapidly being diminished by the very actions of the régime itself, actions which not only fuel the anger of the oppressed people but have turned them - men and women, young and old - into fearless militants confronting the racist army everywhere. Their indomitable spirit and heroism must surely move us to action. For, despite the curtain of secrecy which the régime has drawn around South Africa, people the world over have come to understand, we feel, the realities of life under apartheid and know now that the so-called reforms instituted by the régime are no more than a grand delusion.

Disinvestment and sanctions are no longer issues of debate but options which cannot now be resisted. Let us therefore proceed to action, taking care only to ensure that the measures agreed upon are fully respected and implemented.

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

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

Mr. KOUASSI (Togo) (interpretation from French): Allow me to tell you, Mr. President, how gratified my delegation is - for obvious reasons - at seeing you presiding over these meetings of the Security Council. Your personal experience,

(Mr. Kouassi, Togo)

your knowledge of the background and your diplomatic skill and wisdom undoubtedly augur well for the success of our work.

You have acceded to the presidency of the Security Council for the current month at a time when the situation in southern Africa remains one of the major concerns of the African peoples. I regard this as a tribute paid to your country, Zambia, an important member of the Group of Front-Line States, which are all engaged in an unrelenting and pitiless struggle against the inhuman system of apartheid. I also regard this as a tribute paid to Africa, a continent on which history and men have inflicted great suffering and, sometimes, real disaster. In this respect, the hateful policy of apartheid - the subject of our present deliberations - stands at the forefront.

Seeing you presiding over these meetings of the Security Council reminds me of the close links that your country has with the 1969 Lusaka Manifesto, because of the distinguished role played by the Zambian Head of State, Mr. Kenneth Kaunda. The members of the Security Council will clearly recall that that United Nations document, which provided a basis and a non-violent method for the settlement of the South African problem, was scornfully rejected by South Africa.

I recall also that it was the President of your country, Zambia, who in 1970 led the first good-will mission of the Organization of African Unity to Italy, the Federal Republic of Germany, France and the United Kingdom - countries that at the time were regarded as the privileged trading partners of South Africa - to dissuade them from continuing to provide any assistance to the colonial and racist oppressive régimes in Africa and from continuing action that was contrary to Security Council resolutions on South Africa, in the interest of international peace and security and stability in the region.

(Mr. Kouassi, Togo)

It is indeed fortunate that the senior representatives of those Powers are all here today in the Security Council under your presidency. Your task can only be facilitated by the fact that the path to dialogue, negotiation and co-operation has been carefully charted by the President of your Republic.

That is why I wished to congratulate you very warmly on your accession to the presidency of the Security Council - just as I would also pay a tribute to your predecessor, the Permanent Representative of Venezuela, Mr. Andres Aguilar, for the particularly competent and responsible way in which he conducted the Security Council's work last month.

Speaking for the first time this year before the Security Council, I am pleased to extend my warm congratulations to the new members of the Security Council and to wish them every success in their mission.

Finally, I would express my gratitude to you, Mr. President, and all the other members of the Security Council for having been kind enough to invite me to participate in the present work of the Council by making this statement on behalf of my Government.

The fact that the Security Council is once again taking up the question of South Africa, at this critical time in the struggle against apartheid, is a reflection of the international community's refusal to acquiesce in a political system that has turned the stripping of people of their dignity, as well as social oppression, into a State doctrine, and violence into an instrument for managing society. I do not think I need refer to the many political and diplomatic initiatives that have been carried out under the aegis of the United Nations, the Organization of African Unity, the Non-Aligned Movement, the European Economic Community and the Commonwealth in an attempt to make the racists in Pretoria

(Mr. Kouassi, Togo)

listen to the voice of reason. A thousand and one times they have had the hand of co-operation for freedom, peace and justice in South Africa stretched out to them. A thousand and one times the racists in Pretoria have betrayed the international community.

Recent events in South Africa reveal the clear-cut intentions of the racist minority in that country. They confirm the determination of the racist Government of South Africa to continue the inhuman policy of apartheid. They remind those of us who are still clinging to hope - against all reasonable hope - that there will be some change in the arrogant, bellicose behaviour of Pretoria that it is vain to continue to harbour such illusions. Finally, they should be seen in the context of the implacable logic that underlies the very system of apartheid, which cannot survive without repression.

Today more than ever before the racist Pretoria régime has distinguished itself by arbitrary detentions, deportations, uprooting of families and the imposition of a state of emergency that has led to even more killing of innocent men, women and children in the black townships. Those facts indicate that today South Africa is a virtual powder keg.

In view of the threat to international peace and security represented by the existence of apartheid in South Africa and the acts of terrorism and aggression perpetrated by that State against the neighbouring States, as well as the illegal occupation of Namibia, it is absolutely imperative that the international community immediately shoulder its responsibilities and put an end to the abominable system of apartheid. The most direct, the most telling and, at the same time, the most peaceful way to do that is to apply economic sanctions.

Mandatory economic sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter are the minimum of what is required. They are necessary for three

(Mr. Kouassi, Togo)

reasons: first, because the insults, the servitude, the violence and the risks to international peace inherent in the policy of organized racism are a crime against humanity; secondly, because South Africa has thrown down the gauntlet to the United Nations in connection with Namibia; and, thirdly, because this is a constant act of defiance, and direct and indirect attacks continue against South Africa's independent neighbours.

(Mr. Kouassi, Togo)

That is why the international community, facing up to reality, is calling more and more for concerted political, diplomatic and economic action to bring about the total isolation of the country of apartheid. In that connection, we welcome the setting up of the Africa Fund by the Eighth Summit of the Non-Aligned Movement. The Fund, administered by a Committee consisting of India, Zambia, Zimbabwe, Nigeria, Algeria, Congo, Yugoslavia, Peru and Argentina, is, inter alia, designed to give specific, judicious aid to the national liberation movements in southern Africa. It is pleasing to note that the French Government has announced its intention to make a considerable contribution to the Fund.

Furthermore, an out-and-out campaign against apartheid was launched last year, resulting in a certain number of countries' adopting sanctions against the minority régime in South Africa. In this connection, suffice it to recall the seminar on the arms embargo against South Africa, held in London from 28 to 30 May 1986, the seminar on the oil embargo against South Africa, held in Oslo from 4 to 6 June 1986, and the World Conference on Sanctions against Racist South Africa, held in Paris from 16 to 20 June 1986. All three produced tangible results. Apart from the limited sanctions adopted by the Commonwealth, the European Community and the Scandinavian countries, the series of measures adopted by the United States Congress under the Comprehensive Anti-Apartheid Act of 1986 is a serious step in the right direction. We express our relief at the disengagement of American multinationals such as IBM, Honeywell, Coca-Cola, General Motors and others from the land of apartheid.

However, the way in which the racist régime in Pretoria reacted to those sanctions shows that as long as they are voluntary and selective, and therefore limited, the racist minority will always be able to get round them in various ways, because of the complexity of international economic relations. To break this

(Mr. Kouassi, Togo)

deadlock, we must take the next step; the present deliberations must at all costs lead the Security Council to keep pace with history and advance the cause of peace, which is itself closely linked with the cause of liberty and human dignity.

That is why my delegation urgently appeals to all the permanent members of the Council unhesitatingly to impose mandatory economic sanctions against the racist régime of South Africa, in order to liberate millions of South Africans and Namibians from the tragedy and nightmare through which they have lived for decades. The economic bankruptcy that would follow the application of such sanctions would quickly lead the Pretoria racists to co-operate with the international community, towards which it has so far shown only arrogance and defiance.

In that regard, my delegation notes with disappointment that, as the representative of South Africa made clear at the beginning of the current debate, certain countries have constantly opposed the imposition of mandatory sanctions against South Africa. In doing so they have wrongly advanced the argument that sanctions would harm the black population of South Africa and the neighbouring States that are economically dependent on South Africa. My delegation does not accept that argument, because the peoples that are supposed to be protected against the harmful repercussions of economic sanctions are prepared to make any sacrifice. For them, all sacrifices - including those that would result from sanctions - are acceptable, so long as they are short-term, for it is above all a question of fighting against the continuation of slavery, oppression and the destruction of human life and property. Sanctions are at present the only weapons available to the international community to promote democratic and peaceful change in South Africa.

(Mr. Kouassi, Togo)

We find ourselves at a decisive crossroads. We must courageously take the necessary measures to make the South African leaders give up their anachronistic practices, for if apartheid does not disappear the whole subregion of southern African is in danger of undergoing a very violent upheaval.

Togo again appeals to all the permanent members of the Council to come out unambiguously in favour of reason, justice and freedom, in the interests of peace and international security.

My delegation has great confidence in the Council's capacity to contribute to the establishment of peace in southern Africa. However, it can succeed in that only if it is inspired by the timely suggestion of the Secretary-General, in his report to the General Assembly at its fortieth session on the work of the Organization, that:

"the Security Council should, in the near future, make a deliberate and concerted effort to solve one or two of the major problems before it by making fuller use of the measures available to it under the Charter." (A/40/1, p. 3)

We believe that one of those problems today is the challenge presented by apartheid in South Africa.

If at the end of the present meeting the Security Council unanimously adopts a resolution containing effective measures equal to the dangerous situation prevailing in South Africa, it will deserve the confidence we have rightly placed in it. It will also merit the recognition and gratitude of the international community for having made an appreciable contribution to re-establishing peace, security and stability in Africa.

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

Mr. AGUILAR (Venezuela) (interpretation from Spanish): We are very

(Mr. Aguilar, Venezuela)

pleased to see you, Sir, presiding over the Council this month. We know the important role Zambia, a front-line country, has played, and continues to play, in the struggle that is still being waged to eradicate colonialism and secure respect for the fundamental freedoms and rights of all peoples, a struggle with which we are fully identified. We are aware of your long and magnificent service and your devotion to the noble ideals of the United Nations. For all those reasons, we are sure that you will guide our work most successfully. You can, of course, rely on the fullest possible co-operation of the delegation of Venezuela, a country linked with yours by ties of solidarity and cordial friendship.

I must also express my thanks for the very kind expressions of appreciation I have received from you, Sir, and other representatives for my work as President of the Council last month.

The Security Council is meeting once again to deal with the question of South Africa. We can add very little to what has already been said in the debate, which began last Tuesday. What is happening in southern Africa is well known to all. We listened with distress and great concern to the vivid description given by representatives of various countries in the region of the sufferings of the oppressed majority in South Africa, resulting from the brutal repression carried out by the racist minority régime of Pretoria, and the grave consequences of the continuing activities of that Government designed to destabilize the neighbouring countries. We also heard the arrogant statement of the representative of Pretoria, giving further proof of the attitude of a Government deaf to the universal condemnation of its policies and practices and blind to the reality that, in spite of its powerful police and military apparatus, which allows it to hold on to power, sooner or later this edifice based on the humiliation and exploitation of the majority is doomed to fall.

(Mr. Aguilar, Venezuela)

We are very well informed, therefore, and are perfectly well aware that the cause of all those problems is the policy of apartheid, which the South African Government continues to pursue, in spite of its universal repudiation.

(Mr. Aguilar, Venezuela)

This general condemnation is based on the principles of the United Nations Charter itself, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and on other international instruments. It is also clear, as has been so often stated, that the policy of apartheid is incapable of reform. The only solution is the total dismantling of a system which is the worst and most odious example of racial discrimination and an insult to human dignity. Neither can there be any doubt that the slight reforms that have been brought about in the last few years in legislation which actually enshrines this policy do not touch the essence of the system. There is no need for any further proof of the determination of the racist minority of the Government of South Africa to maintain the basic lines of that policy.

I believe that everyone, with the exception, of course, of the South African Government, would agree that the South African situation is getting worse every day and is jeopardizing not only peace and security in the region but also international peace and security.

Nor can there remain any doubt now as to the attitude of the South African Government and its determination to maintain the policy of apartheid indefinitely. The efforts of the United Nations made over the last 40 years to bring about a change in the Government's attitude have proved in vain. So far no useful purpose has been served by the resolutions of the Council, the General Assembly, and the other important decision-making bodies of the specialized agencies of the United Nations family. Even the arms embargo imposed under Security Council resolution 418 (1977), and selective sanctions, which have been voluntarily established by the United States and by the countries of the European Economic Community, have not proved sufficient.

(Mr. Aguilar, Venezuela)

Therefore, what remedy remains? For our part, as we have already said on other occasions - and recently in our statements in this Council on 11 February, 23 May and 18 June 1986 - the only way of forcing the Pretoria Government to abide by the obligations it has assumed as a Member of the United Nations is by the imposition of mandatory measures provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter. Only a clear and unequivocal manifestation of the will of the international community to have recourse to these provisions of the Charter can prevail upon South Africa to understand that it cannot persist in its criminal policies and practices.

For this reason, we wholeheartedly support the draft resolution submitted by the non-aligned members of the Council - Argentina, the Congo, Ghana, the United Arab Emirates, and Zambia - operative paragraph 5 of which decides to impose a number of mandatory sanctions against South Africa, in accordance with Article 41 of the Charter.

The argument that imposing these sanctions will primarily affect the non-white population of South Africa and neighbouring countries has undoubtedly been the most controversial point raised in this debate. Statements made by authorized representatives of the majority in South Africa and neighbouring countries make it clear that they are perfectly well aware of this fact but that it is a price which they are ready to pay.

Of course, according to Article 50 of the Charter, which reads:

"If preventive or enforcement measures against any State are taken by the Security Council, any other State, whether a Member of the United Nations or not, which finds itself confronted with special economic problems arising from the carrying out of those measures shall have the right to consult the Security Council with regard to a solution of those problems."

(Mr. Aguilar, Venezuela)

In the light of that provision, it would appear best to embark upon a consideration of the necessary measures to limit, as far as possible, the ill effects that those sanctions might have on the victims of oppression and on the victims of the continued aggression of the South African Government. It is certainly preferable to help those people who might be affected by the mandatory measures which, sooner or later, will have to be taken to deal with a bloody conflict whose consequences cannot be foreseen.

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

Mr. GBEHO (Ghana): Mr. President, I wish to express the Ghana delegation's enormous pride and pleasure at seeing you preside over the Security Council during the month of February. This pride stems not only from our shared interests as sister African States and members of the Non-Aligned Movement but also from the fact that you have already brought to bear on your responsibilities the personal qualities of charm, diplomatic skill and vast experience. I am pleased to to pay you these compliments on behalf of the Government and the people of Ghana because our two countries, through the very close relations forged between our two leaders, President Kenneth Kaunda and President Kwame Nkrumah, have played a significant role in the history of decolonization in Africa. For these reasons, you can count on the full co-operation of my delegation in the discharge of your duties.

I would also like to pay a richly deserved tribute to your predecessor, His Excellency Mr. Andres Aguilar of Venezuela, for the excellent manner in which he performed his duties. His businesslike attitude, coupled with a very heightened

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

sense of justice and fairness, facilitated the attempts of the Council to resolve the many issues that arose during the month of January. My delegation is indebted to him.

May I also take this opportunity to extend a very warm personal welcome to all our colleagues who have recently joined the Security Council. Although they are new on the Council, they are experienced diplomats from countries that have long traditions in multilateral diplomacy. We hope, therefore, not only to be able to co-operate with them in our common tasks on the Council but also to learn from their wealth of experience.

The Council is seized of the situation in South Africa upon the request of the African Group at the United Nations. The African Group has requested an urgent debate because of the rapidly deteriorating situation in apartheid South Africa; indeed it has gone a step further by requesting that the Security Council now impose mandatory sanctions against South Africa in certain clearly defined areas. In the statements made before the Council, myriad reasons have been adduced to support the request and a clear picture of the current situation in the country has been painted. I do not intend to repeat them. Let me lend emphasis, however, to the undeniable fact that since the declaration of a state of emergency in South Africa, over 2,500 people have been killed and over 30,000 detained without trial. Children have become the special target of the security forces. There are currently 4,000 children either in detention or missing. Since June 1986, some 1,200 children, or 40 per cent of the total number of detainees, have been held without trial. Of this number, 3,000 are 14 years old or younger.

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

The events of the past 18 months or so therefore exemplify in gruesome detail the capacity of the white minority régime, in the face of opposition to its unacceptable apartheid system, to turn its back on reason and pursue a policy of repression, forcible removal of blacks into the so-called bantustans, and to prime its military machine against internal and external opposition.

In the circumstance, the Ghana delegation believes that the Security Council has an urgent duty to act quickly, firmly and in unison to avert what would otherwise escalate into a racial war. We are of the view that persuasive words alone will not have any impact on the Botha régime, largely because it has demonstrated an unmistakable attachment to the apartheid system and also because the institution last year of the National Security Management System, a network of security committees and action system, has taken away from the civilian administration the ability to yield easily to foreign persuasion. In other words, power in South Africa today is concentrated as never before in the hands of the security forces who do not hide their ferocious determination to keep apartheid.

The African States Members of the United Nations have decided to call for a concerted international action in the matter, because it is the only peaceful means now available to check the unhappy events in that country from further deteriorating and taking more human lives. In short, the request for the Council's consideration of this important issue is a response to an overwhelming international opinion in favour of the isolation of South Africa economically, politically and socially because of the violence unleashed against 24 million of its own citizens by a white minority.

The Commonwealth Eminent Persons Group, the overwhelming majority of the European Economic Community and the United States Congress - to mention only a few - all favour a total ban on trade and investment in South Africa. In

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

In addition, the summit meetings of the Organization of African Unity and the Non-Aligned Movement also have endorsed a firm course of action in unequivocal terms.

My delegation believes that all members of the Council are agreed that not only is the apartheid system wrong and cruel but it also represents a moral deformity of our time. We are also agreed that the Council must play a role in quickly bringing this blight on twentieth-century civilization to an end. As members of the United Nations we have in the past few years considered two options open to the Council: first, the art of gentle persuasion or constructive engagement and, secondly, the imposition of sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter.

The thought that currently nags the Ghana delegation is that, in the light of the incontrovertible evidence of violent repression, the torture of men, women and children, detention without trial, denial of human and political rights, meaningless reforms, political assassination, destabilization of and aggression against neighbouring African States, and the definite failure of the policy of constructive engagement - in the light of all these - can the Security Council really convince anyone that further persuasion is the right option?

On the other hand, the second option of mandatory sanctions has been urged by the overwhelming majority of the international community, including Governments. The fear that to retreat from mandatory sanctions at this stage would only destroy the image and credibility of the Council as the highest hope for Governments and oppressed peoples everywhere. The Security Council therefore faces a serious and solemn challenge at this crucial time when the issue of sanctions is high on the agenda of most international meetings. International public opinion - indeed, the

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

constituencies of the Governments we represent around this table - will at the end of this debate demand explanations of how we handled this important issue.

In an apparent attempt to placate the friends of South Africa, the representative of the Botha régime in his statement to the Council on Tuesday, 17 February, touched on familiar things. The Ghana delegation would have preferred to ignore the statement, first for its arrogance and, secondly, because it conveyed nothing new. I have however decided to address some aspects of that statement because it contains quite a number of fallacious and questionable points that should not be allowed to pass without comment and which are all too frequently echoed from familiar quarters.

The representative of South Africa, for example, talked about "hardship and suffering to the communities which they profess to be helping" (S/PV.2732, p. 19-20) - an apparent reference to the well-known excuse of the opponents of sanctions who have always cited the economic consequences of sanctions on the black population of South Africa for their own commercial interests. It is sheer hypocrisy to oppose sanctions because of the "hardship and suffering" of the blacks in South Africa. Indeed, it is rather insensitive to profess exaggerated concern about a few thousand blacks losing their meagre wages when millions of them have for so long been consigned to a situation of dehumanizing poverty under conditions of ruthless oppression. The liberation movements which articulate the aspirations of the oppressed people of South Africa and the front-line States themselves have openly advocated the imposition of sanctions and have declared their preparedness to sacrifice now as the only reasonable alternative to freeing themselves from continued oppression by the racist régime.

Let me also recall the evidence that has already been presented that the continuation of the apartheid system is demonstrably costly to the lives and

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

well-being of the black majority in South Africa and neighbouring States and that only an end to apartheid can bring this cost down, for the thirst for a free, united, non-racial and democratic South Africa is, on the other hand, impossible to give up. Furthermore, I respectfully request members of the Council to remember that when the abolition of slavery became topical in the middle of the last century it was the favourite argument of many slave-owners and their supporters that freedom for slaves would adversely affect them, because they would lose free accommodation, free food, clothing and general support, and not be able to engage in productive economic activity, being without citizenship, land or property. The argument of the representative of the white minority régime is thus hypocritically familiar.

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

We have also been told that

"Far-reaching reforms have already been introduced and much discriminatory legislation has disappeared from our statute book".

(S/PV.2732, p.21)

Those are the words of the Botha representative. Perhaps the representative of South Africa is not aware of the fact that those exaggerated token reforms proffered by Pretoria have failed to impress anybody, not even the conservative friends of Botha. A recent assessment of the constructive engagement policy by a dozen hand-picked officials of the United States, for instance, strongly recommended against the endorsement of reforms that failed to address fundamental concerns of the black South Africans.

In the considered view of the panel, the applause for piecemeal reforms has proved counter-productive. Furthermore, the panelists emphasized, change must be part of a process of negotiations with the leaders of black organizations, including the African National Congress under its leader Nelson Mandela.

In any case, how can the representative of South Africa seek to convince this Council of meaningful reforms in the policy and practices of apartheid while evil legislation such as the Bantu Authorities Act or the Population Registration Act still adorns the statute books of the racist régime? Or by "reforms" does the representative of racist South Africa mean the available official process of changing on paper the pigmentation of South Africans into blacks, Coloureds and whites to satisfy the perverse rules of reclassification?

In the statement on Tuesday by the representative of the racist Pretoria régime there was the familiar attempt to play upon the so-called communist menace, which already has too many gullible customers in the West. In apparent reference to the proponents of sanctions, the South African representative said:

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

"... they side with the forces of violence and anarchy, which do not seek the establishment of a just and democratic society in South Africa, but which openly espouse, through terror and intimidation, the overthrow of democracy in South Africa and its replacement by a Marxist-dominated dictatorship under which they cry for one man, one vote". (S/PV.2732, p. 22)

The fact of the matter is that apartheid itself is inherently violent. Its fundamental tenets - deriving from the seventeenth century Calvinist theory of a chosen race with a divine right to dominate other races which, according to that theory, are perpetually condemned to servitude - have all the ingredients of violence. Furthermore, the continued banning of the African National Congress of South Africa, the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania and other national liberation organs is, it must be emphasized, in itself a direct invitation to violence.

As to the charge of communism or Marxism, we can only comment that it is as false as it is tedious. It is no secret that most people have seen through this excuse because it has always been the glib battle-cry used to rouse extremists and the uninformed. As long ago as 10 December 1965, at Hunter College here in New York, the late Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. said:

"In South Africa today all opposition to white supremacy is condemned as communism, and in its name due process is destroyed; a medieval segregation is organized with twentieth-century efficiency and drive; a sophisticated form of slavery is imposed by a minority upon a majority which is kept in grinding poverty; the dignity of human personality is defiled; and world opinion is arrogantly defied."

The attitude of the racist minority régime in South Africa has not changed even 20 years later.

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

The Security Council is not powerless to arrest the present certain drift towards even more violent confrontation among the racists in South Africa, with its serious implications for international peace and security. The Ghana delegation therefore joins its non-aligned and African colleagues in urging the Council, particularly the friends of South Africa, to accept the realities of the situation and revise their attitudes. Sanctions, mandatory sanctions, are the only firm option for ending apartheid, particularly in the charged atmosphere of today's South Africa.

My delegation has listened to some speakers who have expressed lingering doubt about mandatory sanctions, even in a limited form, and who would prefer a régime of voluntary sanctions. We beg to differ with those who canvass this approach, for it would only serve, wittingly or unwittingly, to buy repression time for the South African administration and death for thousands of the black population in South Africa.

Let us remember that this Council has twice in the recent past - in its resolutions 566 (1985) and 569 (1985) - prescribed limited voluntary sanctions. We believe that a third such action in the present circumstances will only give comfort to the racist régime. Furthermore, my delegation is of the view that all States are as of now welcome to impose voluntary actions against South Africa. Nothing prevents that. Some have in the last months done so in varying severity, and we applaud their courage and their sense of justice. What is obviously required now is to answer the need to make sanctions as widely imposed as possible and also globally co-ordinated in order to make them effective. These needs can only be served by translating the present voluntary sanctions régimes into mandatory ones. That action would have the added advantage of discouraging

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

Governments, companies and individuals from rushing to take advantage of the vacuum created by those who are just enough to impose sanctions.

My delegation is by no means unimpressed by the laudable initiatives of the United States Congress, the Nordic countries, some member States of the European Community, Australia, Canada and a few others. The draft resolution on which the Security Council will soon pronounce itself is geared to achieving action in unison and in definite areas. The aim of its authors is modest, namely to bring under the umbrella of the United Nations all the measures now the result of voluntary initiatives of Member States. The draft resolution does not seek to go beyond those measures already endorsed by the various legislatures of Member States.

We have held our horses on the call for comprehensive mandatory sanctions in deference to our colleagues who have not as yet completed their respective domestic preparations for action of that magnitude. In the selection of products and areas of the South Africa economy, we have not gone beyond what has already been decided upon, albeit on a voluntary basis. Furthermore the language used in both the preambular and the operative paragraphs is modest, and the text is the outcome of intensive and extensive negotiations.

Let me add that on the issue of sanctions a repetitive imposition of voluntary sanctions such as those already in operation will surely fail to impact on the South African régime. That was the case when the commendable actions of the United States Congress obviously omitted vital ingredients. I wish to quote what the South African authorities printed in the South African Digest of 23 January 1987 on the United States action:

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

"An unexpected 'bonus' of more than R4 billion a year will be injected into South Africa's revenue following a decision of the United States to exempt 10 strategic minerals from sanctions.

"The Americans seem to be waking up to the realities of sanctions and the position of South Africa in the Western world's mineral supply,' the Director-General of Mineral and Energy Affairs, Dr. Louw Alberts, said.

"He added that the United States has tacitly acknowledged that it cannot do without South Africa and that the minerals were of vital strategic importance to the United States."

The article continued:

"The Minister of Economic Affairs and Technology, Mr. Danie Steyn, described the United States decision as 'very selfish,' but added that the Government did not intend to withhold these minerals.

"We are not sanctions supporters, therefore any decision that is anti-sanctions is welcomed,' said Mr. Steyn."

Hesitations give comfort to the racist régime, and we must endeavour to move quickly and definitely into affirmative action.

Finally, my delegation urges the Members of the United Nations, particular permanent members of the Security Council that continue to give succour to the racist minority régime and thereby fuel its intransigence, to move away from short-sighted and narrow motives and join in taking concrete and firm action against the racist régime. Indeed, this is the cry of humanity eloquently expressed in several international forums. Those who continue to hold up appropriate action are no longer seeking South African interests; they are putting their selfish interests before the lives of millions of South Africans.

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

Even as we urge the entire membership of the Security Council to action, there is no doubt in our minds that one day black South Africans shall walk the streets of Pretoria, Johannesburg and the Cape free and untrammelled by any special rules and any artificial and diabolical redefinition of their essential being. History has never reversed itself in such just struggles in the past, and it will not do so in the South Africa of today. In the meantime it is the hope of the Ghana delegation that the friends of South Africa will see the wisdom in agreeing to a mandatory-sanctions package, albeit not exhaustive, such as the one in the draft resolution before the Council.

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

It is my understanding that the Council is ready to proceed to the vote on the draft resolution submitted by Argentina, the Congo, Ghana, the United Arab Emirates and Zambia and contained in document S/18705. Unless I hear any objection, I shall put the draft resolution to the vote now.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

I shall now call upon those members of the Council who wish to make statements before the voting.

Mr. BUCCI (Italy): In congratulating you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of February I wish to tell you how pleased my delegation is to work under the able guidance of the representative of a country, Zambia, with which Italy maintains close and friendly relations and which plays such a leading role in the question on the Council's agenda. I would also like to compliment your predecessor, Ambassador Aguilar of Venezuela, for the skilled and effective way in which he directed the work of the Council last month.

(Mr. Bucci, Italy)

The statements we have heard over the past few days have confirmed that the situation in South Africa remains substantially blocked. If there are developments, they are negative. The racial laws continue to be rigorously applied, and the inevitable reaction to them continues to be met with repressive actions. In other words, in order to uphold the apartheid régime a cycle of violence has been put into motion, a cycle which appears unarrestable and, in addition, opens the door to further problems, many of which have been mentioned in this debate.

We have devoted ample time to the condemnation of apartheid. Therefore, my delegation will not reiterate concepts and sentiments which have already been expressed and which we fully share.

The international community cannot remain indifferent before a system which institutionalizes racism, thus depriving the majority of the South African population of its civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights. The Council must take an explicit and unambiguous position in the face of this flagrant and systematic violation of the human rights and fundamental freedoms enshrined in the United Nations Charter and in the Universal Declaration on Human Rights. Moreover, the Council cannot ignore the consequences of the enforcement of the apartheid policies for the peace and stability of the whole southern African region. The spread of domestic violence in South Africa and the aggressive stand adopted by the South African régime towards neighbouring States have created a situation of tension and armed confrontation in the area which cannot but be a matter of serious concern to all of us.

While we remain convinced that dialogue must continue to be the main channel through which peaceful change is to be brought about in South Africa, we are at the same time realistic enough to recognize that dialogue with the South African

(Mr. Bucci, Italy)

authorities has progressively turned into a monologue because of the position of defiance adopted by those authorities towards the international community. We therefore feel that this is the time for the world community to exercise effective pressure on the Government of South Africa.

The means through which pressure should be exercised have been a major issue in this debate, and the importance in this context of positive measures has also been stressed. The European Community and its member States are committed to a major effort in this latter field, and Italy, for its part, as a member of the Twelve, has adopted a number of political, military and economic restrictive measures against South Africa and makes on a bilateral basis a substantial contribution to the programmes aimed at strengthening the economic independence of the front-line States from South Africa as well as to the programmes of assistance to the victims of apartheid.

(Mr. Bucci, Italy)

Accordingly, my Government recognizes that economic sanctions, even mandatory ones, have become a necessary part of a strategy aimed at promoting peaceful change in South Africa, provided they do not deprive the international community of its capability to influence developments in that country. Within the context of a carefully studied and generally agreed strategy, selective mandatory sanctions can in our view play a useful role as a powerful political message and as an instrument to exert gradual pressure for change on the South African Government.

The usefulness of economic sanctions as a means of exercising pressure on South Africa can be a matter for discussion, as can the choice of specific measures, when a selection is made, as in the case of the draft resolution before us, or the question of whether, out of all possible measures, those which are proposed are the most appropriate to help achieve the goals to which we are committed.

What, however, cannot be a matter for discussion as far as my Government is concerned is the human rights issue, particularly when it leads to a threat to peace and stability in a whole region. The essential purpose of the initiative taken by the group of African States in requesting this debate was to attract the attention of world opinion and to request a clear stand by the Council on the policy of apartheid and its implications for peace in the area. We therefore intend to respond to that initiative in a positive way and to vote in favour of the draft resolution before us. We should like our position to be understood as the expression of a real and profound feeling of condemnation of apartheid and as an expression of our firm commitment to the principles and purposes of the United Nations Charter.

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

Mr. OKUN (United States of America): I should like, Sir, to extend the congratulations of my delegation, and my own good wishes, to you as you exercise the duties of the presidency of the Security Council during the month of February. Your tact and decisiveness have already enabled you to carry out your responsibilities in a most impressive fashion. Additionally, the relations between your country, the Republic of Zambia, and mine are deep and long-standing, and we value them.

I should also like to pay tribute to the distinguished and wise leadership provided to the Council during the month of January by your predecessor, Ambassador Aguilar of Venezuela.

Few words in the contemporary political vocabulary are more charged with negative meaning than apartheid. It connotes prejudice, hate, fear, oppression, despair and death. It is a denial of the hopes expressed in the Charter of the United Nations. The very existence of apartheid in 1987 is sobering. It makes us aware once again of the shameful side of human nature.

All of us represented on this Council are searching for ways to eliminate apartheid from the face of the Earth. The principle task at hand is how to persuade South Africans to banish apartheid from their country. That desirable goal, however, would be worth little if South Africa's future history should embody the epigram of Tacitus, "They made a desert and called it peace". Apartheid must be eliminated, but this should be done in a manner which enhances South Africa's ability to develop into a prosperous, multiracial democracy and the principle engine for the development of the southern half of the continent. The alternative, as President P.W. Botha verbally acknowledges but ignores in his actions, is "too hastily to contemplate".

(Mr. Okun, United States)

My Government believes that the majority of Member States shares a common vision for post-apartheid South Africa. We hope to see South Africans replace apartheid with a non-racial democratic system that guarantees citizenship and equal rights to all. We hope that all South Africans will enjoy the legal rights that are considered by the inhabitants of democratic societies to guarantee their individual freedom. We look forward to seeing freedom of the press, religion and speech for all. We hope that South Africans will be free to participate in an economy in which the right to private property is fully respected. We wish to work with South Africans of all races towards these goals. We do not wish to see the imposition of a political system that substitutes one form of tyranny for another.

The United States advocates the restoration of national citizenship to all persons denied such on the basis of race. The United States advocates the repeal of all racially restrictive legislation, such as the Group Areas Act, the Population Registration Act and all remaining apartheid laws. The United States advocates due process of law for all, the freeing of all political prisoners and the reincorporation of the "homelands" into the Republic of South Africa. The United States also advocates an immediate cessation of violence by all parties in order to create a climate for negotiations.

The issue then is what the United States and others can do to transform these goals into reality. The question before us today is whether mandatory sanctions will accomplish this. During the past year, national sanctions imposed by many of us, including my Government, have been immeasurably strengthened. Nevertheless, the situation inside South Africa has incontestably worsened. As the economy is weakened, repression is heightened. Under such circumstances, it would be irresponsible for my Government to assume that mandatory sanctions imposed by this

(Mr. Okun, United States)

Organization will automatically lead to the results desired by the majority of the international community.

To the contrary, my Government is convinced that mandatory sanctions would fail to bring an end to apartheid in a peaceful manner and would make it difficult, if not impossible, to achieve internal reconciliation and regional economic development. My Government believes that mandatory sanctions imposed by the international community at this time would result in the progressive destruction of the South African economy and the heightening of repression in that country as those now in power attempt to consolidate their hold. Who doubts the capacity of the current South African Government to inflict much of the cost of mandatory sanctions on its own black citizens as well as on its immediate neighbours? It is highly unrealistic to believe that aid from the industrialized democracies will be able to cover the costs which mandatory sanctions would inevitably impose upon South Africa's immediate neighbours.

My Government totally rejects the notion that we should eliminate apartheid by provoking the collapse of the South African economy and a subsequent violent revolution. Those who advocate violence as a policy to bring about change in South Africa seem willing to tolerate an enormous loss of life and appear to overlook the fact that such violence might well strengthen rather than weaken oppression. My Government believes that we must pursue every possible avenue leading to the peaceful elimination of apartheid. With this conviction very much in mind, the United States has committed itself to a continuing diplomatic effort to persuade all parties to enter into negotiations.

(Mr. Okun, United States)

In this connection, both Secretary of State Shultz and Under Secretary of State Armacost recently travelled to Africa. Secretary Shultz's meetings with South Africans across the political spectrum are only the latest example of my Government's continuing efforts to contribute to a positive solution to South Africa's problems.

With a negotiated settlement in mind, the United States is also faithfully enforcing limited, selective measures against South Africa. These measures underscore the seriousness of our rejection of apartheid. Permit me to call it to the Council's attention that these measures include an arms embargo that is stricter than that mandated by this Council.

The United States recognizes that other nations also believe that comprehensive national sanctions may assist in the search for a non-violent solution to South Africa's problems. Yet others believe the best policy is to adopt selective sanctions, or pursue means other than sanctions.

My Government therefore opposes the philosophy underlying the draft resolution before us today. The United States does not believe that the United Nations should mandate to all its Members what their appropriate course of action should be. My Government believes that each nation should be free to determine the form and substance of its measures aimed at eliminating apartheid. My Government also believes that the mandatory sanctions which this draft resolution would impose on all Members of the United Nations would be all but impossible to enforce.

My Government has yet another serious objection to this draft resolution. If it were approved, the Council would find it difficult, if not impossible, to agree subsequently on a yardstick by which to measure whether sufficient progress towards dismantling apartheid had occurred in order to warrant the lifting of the Council's sanctions.

(Mr. Okun, United States)

For the reasons I have outlined, my delegation will vote against this draft resolution. In doing so we do not vote in favour of apartheid. My Government will continue to do all in its power to achieve the peaceful elimination of this evil system.

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

We shall now proceed to the vote on draft resolution S/18705.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Argentina, Bulgaria, China, Congo, Ghana, Italy, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela, Zambia

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

Abstaining: France, Japan

The PRESIDENT: The result of the voting is as follows: 10 votes in favour, 3 against and 2 abstentions. The draft resolution has not been adopted, owing to the negative vote of a permanent member of the Council.

I shall now call on members of the Council who wish to make statements following the voting.

Mr. KIKUCHI (Japan): My delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution S/18705 because of our belief that the Security Council should explore every possible way of reaching agreement on concerted action by the international community. As the outcome of this vote demonstrates, the draft resolution cannot provide a basis for such action.

However, we wish to urge South Africa not to draw the wrong conclusion. We are firmly committed to the continued exertion of pressures on Pretoria - with or

(Mr. Kikuchi, Japan)

without a Security Council resolution - until it has completely abolished the system of apartheid.

I wish to refer to the remarks of certain delegations on the behaviour of a Japanese corporation. As I mentioned in my statement Wednesday, Japan has instituted domestic regulations to ensure that private firms do not in any way undermine or weaken the effectiveness of sanctions and other measures taken by other countries. We firmly stand by that commitment.

Mr. LAUTENSCHLAGER (Federal Republic of Germany): I already had the opportunity this morning to make it clear once again that the Federal Republic of Germany will never put up with the injustice of apartheid and that we shall continue to work for the realization of human rights in South Africa. Apartheid is contempt for human dignity; it is not amenable to reform; it can only be abolished.

While we all agree on that goal, there are diverging opinions on the way to achieve it. My Government has never concealed the fact that for reasons of principle it has always taken a sceptical stance towards the use of economic sanctions for political purposes. With regard to South Africa we do not believe that coercive economic measures will lead to the peaceful elimination of apartheid. In June 1986 the Heads of State or Government of the countries members of the European Community therefore decided that positive measures should continue to be the centerpiece of joint European policy. In order to send an unambiguous signal to the South African Government, the Foreign Ministers of the Twelve adopted on 16 September 1986 certain limited measures against South Africa, which I described in my statement this morning. We joined in these measures.

We are not in a position, however, to accede to the far-reaching proposal to impose selective mandatory sanctions. We do not want to resort to means which

(Mr. Lautenschlager, Federal
Republic of Germany)

could affect the vital foundations of the entire South African population and jeopardize the fate of the whole region.

It was for those reasons that we voted against the draft resolution before us.

From that vote, however, the South African Government should not draw any wrong conclusions. Together with our partners, we shall resolutely live up to our convictions and work with all our strength for the realization of human rights in South Africa.

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

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.