



Security Council

UN LIBRARY

PROVISIONAL

FEB 23 1987

S/PV. 2736

19 February 1987

UN/ST COLLECTION

ENGLISH

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

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Thursday, 19 February 1987, at 3.30 p.m.

President: Mr. ZUZE

(Zambia)

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

Mr. DELPECH
Mr. GARVALOV
Mr. LI Luyue
Mr. BALE
Mr. BROCHAND
Mr. LAUTENSCHLAGER
Mr. GBEHO
Mr. BUCCI
Mr. AOKI
Mr. BELONOGOV
Mr. AL-SHAALI

Sir John THOMSON
Mr. WALTERS
Mr. AGUILAR

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

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

The meeting was called to order at 4.10 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, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, the German Democratic Republic, Guyana, India, Kenya, Kuwait, 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. Cesar (Czechoslovakia), Mr. Badawi (Egypt), Mr. Ott (German Democratic Republic), Mr. Karran (Guyana), Mr. Dasgupta (India) Mr. Kiilu (Kenya), Mr. Abulhassan (Kuwait), 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: I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Cuba, Ethiopia, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and Mongolia in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those

(The President)

representatives to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Oramas Oliva (Cuba), Mr. Tadesse (Ethiopia), Mr. Treiki (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) and Mr. Nyamdoo (Mongolia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

The PRESIDENT: I should also like to inform members of the Council that I have received a letter dated 19 February 1987 from the representatives of the Congo, Ghana and Zambia which reads as follows:

"We, the undersigned, members of the Security Council, have the honour to request that during its meetings devoted to consideration of the item 'The question of South Africa' the Security Council extend an invitation, under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure, to Mr. Lesaoana Makhanda, Chief Representative of the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania (PAC) at the United Nations".

That letter will be published as a document of the Security Council under the symbol S/18706.

If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Council agrees to extend an invitation under rule 39 to Mr. Makhanda.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

I would furthermore inform members of the Council that I have received a letter dated 19 February 1987 from the Permanent Representative of Kuwait to the United Nations which reads as follows:

"I have the honour to request that the Security Council invite

Mr. Ahmet Engin Ansay, Permanent Observer of the Organization of the Islamic

(The President)

Conference to the United Nations to address the Council under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure on the matter currently before it for consideration".

That letter will be published as a document of the Security Council under the symbol S/18707.

If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Council agrees to extend an invitation under rule 39 to Mr. Ansay.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

The Security Council will now resume its consideration of the item on its agenda. Members have before them document S/18705, which contains the text of a draft resolution submitted by Argentina, the Congo, Ghana, the United Arab Emirates and Zambia.

The first speaker is the representative of France, on whom I now call.

Mr. BROCHAND (France) (interpretation from French): At the outset, Sir, allow me to congratulate you and to say how pleased the French delegation is at your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council.

I wish also to express my delegation's gratitude to your predecessor, Ambassador Aguilar, for the exemplary way in which he conducted the Council's work in January.

The constant worsening of the situation in South Africa and the increase in the suffering inflicted on the immense majority of its people by the continuing system of apartheid are a source of deep concern to my Government.

While the country is sinking more and more each day into violence, the South African Government seems to be singularly lacking in realism and political vision. It invokes the few reforms that have recently been enacted, but those measures are for the most part purely theoretical and do not affect the heart of the system.

(Mr. Brochand, France)

The basic apartheid laws are still in force, and there is no sign of a real willingness to abolish them.

In the face of that extremely serious situation, the South African authorities have become entrenched in an attitude based on repression. For example, last June a state of emergency of unprecedented severity was proclaimed throughout the country. That has led to a new wave of mass arrests of opponents of apartheid, and thousands of persons - some of them less than 15 years old - are being held without trial. Nothing can be resolved by these repressive measures, of course, any more than by the news blackout enacted at the end of the year by the South African Government. The rumble of rebellion grows ever more menacing in the townships, while the list of victims becomes longer and the suffering more acute.

The French Government can only express again its total repudiation and utter condemnation of apartheid. It is convinced that the system cannot be reformed and that it must be abolished as soon as possible. That is the message which France chose to send on the occasion of the International Day of Solidarity with the Struggling People of South Africa, held last June in Paris during the World Conference on Sanctions against South Africa. It is the same message that the French Prime Minister restated quite clearly at the beginning of this year on the occasion of the installation of the French Consultative Commission on Human Rights. He said :

"France rejects most emphatically the unacceptable system of apartheid practised in South Africa, a system which is a particularly repulsive form of onslaught on human rights".

France, like the whole of the international community, intends to take part in the quest for a solution. It is clear that the commencement of a dialogue with all the forces opposed to apartheid is the sole non-violent option that can lead to the

(Mr. Brochand, France)

transition of South Africa towards a democratic, non-racial society. That is the way we must go. The conditions for an authentic national dialogue are well known: the unconditional release of Nelson Mandela and the other political prisoners and the abrogation of the emergency laws and all the restrictions on the activities and free expression of the anti-apartheid movement, particularly the lifting of the ban on the African National Congress of South Africa and the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania.

It is in order to induce the South African Government to engage in such a dialogue that it is essential to apply pressure to it, including sanctions. In this field, the French Government does not believe, however, in the advisability of comprehensive mandatory sanctions, which would not bring us any closer to the desired goal: the effective and complete abolition of apartheid.

(Mr. Brochand, France)

It seems to us that the gradual approach must be the most productive. It is essential to adapt means of exerting pressure to the evolution of the situation and to keep open the possibility of intensifying them if necessary. From that point of view, comprehensive sanctions would cut South Africa off from any relationship with the international community and there would be a risk of the isolation in which it would then find itself leading to heightened repression. Moreover, mandatory sanctions, depending on their nature and scope, could have the disadvantage of failing to take account of the diversity of situations of the countries that would have to apply them and that would consequently have to bear the brunt of the consequences of all kinds.

It seems to us that a policy of imposing voluntary sanctions would be likely to win a broader consensus in the international community, which is necessary in order to sway the South African Government. My country has moved resolutely in that direction and has taken several initiatives, multilaterally and nationally. It was on our proposal that the Security Council adopted in July 1985 resolution 569 (1985), calling on Member States to take a series of measures against South Africa. The French Government went even further by deciding shortly afterwards not to renew contracts for the import of South African coal.

Moreover, restrictive measures have been adopted in the European Community. France is prepared to support any new sanctions that seem appropriate within that framework.

We must consider another aspect of the situation. The worsening of the crisis in South Africa and the broadening of sanctions against that country give a new dimension to the region's problems. The French Government fully shares the disquiet of the front-line countries, faced with the rising violence and the serious risks of human, economic and social fallout of sanctions on their own

(Mr. Brochand, France)

situation. We assure those countries of our full support. Being aware of the urgent need for determined action in that field, France helps the front-line countries by taking part in various operations within the European Community and bilaterally. Bilaterally, F500 million in aid has been granted, including a donation of F165 million.

In addition, France has decided to take part in the Africa Fund. It welcomed the establishment of the Fund, and I am pleased to announce here that the French Government has decided that beginning this year its share will amount to F20 million. In view of the budgetary procedures already set in motion for the current year, our contribution will be applied in specific ways. We are pleased to give our support to a venture designed to allow the front-line countries to free themselves of their dependence on South Africa.

The South African Government must realize how much its refusal to be realistic is disturbing Africa and the whole international community. The situation is critical, but not all chances of a peaceful settlement have yet been lost. On behalf of my Government, I urge the South African authorities not to allow them to pass.

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

Sir John THOMSON (United Kingdom): It gives my delegation special pleasure, Sir, to see Zambia, a fellow-member of the Commonwealth, occupying the presidency of the Security Council. I am sure that you will bring to your task all the ability and personal characteristics which made your mission in London so successful.

It is particularly appropriate, Sir, that you should be presiding over a debate on a subject of such importance to both our Governments. You are the right

(Sir John Thomson, United Kingdom)

man in the right chair at the right time. You have even managed to make us meet on time, although I see it may have taken the drastic step of having the Security Council clock removed to achieve that. My delegation looks forward to working very closely with you.

I also, Sir, congratulate your predecessor, Ambassador Aguilar, who presided with great distinction and in a very statesmanlike way in over a month in which we had very many difficult problems.

The Council last met to consider the question of South Africa a little over eight months ago. Since then there have been a number of important developments, including the two visits to southern Africa undertaken by Sir Geoffrey Howe in July, at the request of the Heads of State and Government of the twelve member States of the European Community, and the Marlborough House and Brussels meetings in August and September. In October last year the sanctions legislation put forward by the United States Congress entered into force.

In South Africa itself the situation has continued to deteriorate. Increasing violence has been accompanied by the reimposition of the state of emergency over the whole of the country. The strong evidence that forced removals from black townships have resumed, the continuing and indefinite detention without charge of large numbers of people and the imposition of Draconian new restrictions on press freedom have each brought more sharply into question the South African Government's claim to be committed to democratic values. South African forces have also continued to mount armed attacks against neighbouring countries. As recently as the beginning of this month the South African Government was again threatening Botswana. We strongly condemn these attacks and threats and have conveyed our concern about them directly to the South African authorities. The South African Government should be under no illusion that it has any sympathy from us.

(Sir John Thomson, United Kingdom)

Against this disturbing background we need to think carefully about how the Council can best contribute to solving the difficult and complex problems that exist in South Africa. There is, I hope, no disagreement on the basic issue. Apartheid must go. It is repugnant and wrong, and runs counter to the basic principles of human rights. Our first task, therefore, must be to send a strong and united signal to the South African Government of the need for political change. Nelson Mandela and other political prisoners must be released, and the bans on the African National Congress, the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania and on other political parties must be lifted. This is the only way in which we can hope to secure a suspension of violence on all sides and create an atmosphere in which the dialogue so urgently needed between the South African Government and leaders of the black community can begin.

The Council must work constructively - and I emphasize "constructively" - for fundamental change in South Africa. Let us be guided here, as elsewhere, by the principle of self-determination, that inalienable right enshrined in the United Nations Charter. I interpolate here a short passage resulting from my having just read the speech that the representative of South Africa gave early in this debate, in which he said:

"This will be achieved by promoting maximum self-determination and fulfilment". (S/PV.2732, p. 21)

(Sir John Thomson, United Kingdom)

I do not know what he means by "maximum self-determination". If he means self-determination, we approve; if he means something short of that, we do not.

We are trying to help all the people of South Africa to choose their own future, not to tell them what constitutional provisions they must adopt. We should not attempt to dictate solutions, only to help them along. Unlike the other items on our agenda, South Africa is an internal problem for itself. It is also a moral problem for the international community. There are no clearly definable answers. It would not be right for us to prescribe South Africa's future constitutional arrangements, except to the extent that apartheid must be replaced by a non-racial representative system of government with proper safeguards for minorities. This means a democratic electoral system with multi-party participation and universal franchise for all adult South Africans. But whatever we do, we must respect the right of the South African people to rule themselves. We must not do anything which would manifestly make this situation worse.

And in our view, the surest prescription for making this situation worse would be the imposition of punitive economic sanctions. As I said in my statement to the General Assembly on 29 October 1985, we do not believe that such sanctions are an effective way to end apartheid. They would exacerbate the present conflict and put reform to the bottom of the South African Government's agenda and repression to the top. They would encourage a siege mentality amongst white South Africans. This would help no one and only make a peaceful solution more difficult. It is noticeable that since the United States congressional sanctions package entered into force last autumn, the South African Government has become more intransigent both internally and externally. Only by maintaining political contacts will we be able to influence - indeed insist on - the process of reform. Punitive economic sanctions undermine this policy. They will increase the unfairness and suffering in South Africa, without helping to abolish apartheid.

(Sir John Thomson, United Kingdom)

It is also essential for the international community to consider the effect of mandatory sanctions on neighbouring States. We must recognize realistically that such sanctions are likely to precipitate an economic confrontation with South Africa which could have swift and deeply damaging consequences for neighbouring States. Economies which in many cases are already precarious and heavily dependent on South Africa could suffer untold damage. The results of years of patient developmental efforts would be wasted.

Surely what the international community should now be directing its efforts towards is strengthening, not weakening, the position of the neighbouring States. We should help them to reduce their economic dependence on South Africa and to develop the alternative transport routes which they so urgently need. By such means we can hope to preserve the future stability and prosperity of southern Africa as we work towards the peaceful abolition of apartheid.

This is why we were greatly encouraged by the constructive and business like spirit of the recent and very successful Southern African Development Co-ordination Conference (SADCC) meeting in Gaborone. Those present joined in common cause for a common aim. Britain, for its part, announced an additional contribution of \$15 million of aid to SADCC. This brings our current pledges to SADCC to a total of \$52.5 million designed mainly to assist in the desperately needed improvements of regional transport systems. In addition to our aid to SADCC, we provided in our financial year ending last March some \$162 million to individual SADCC States through our bilateral programmes, as well as considerable sums through other multilateral channels. In all, over the five years 1981 to 1986, we have provided over \$840 million in bilateral aid to the region and some \$1 billion through bilateral and multilateral channels taken together. At the same time, we continue

(Sir John Thomson, United Kingdom)

to play an active role in improving the security defences of a number of States in the region through the provision of military training.

To complement our attempts in South Africa itself to secure a suspension of violence and the start of a political dialogue we have embarked upon a programme of positive measures designed to help the victims of apartheid. On 1 July last year, we announced the provision of additional aid, worth over \$19 million over five years, to be devoted to training activities for non-white South Africans.

Action to implement this programme is well in hand and will build substantially upon existing bilateral and multilateral programmes amounting to nearly \$3 million in 1987 for educational and social development and welfare of South African blacks.

In addition to these positive measures we have also put in place a number of restrictive measures which are designed to act as a political signal to the South African Government. The scope of these measures was extended by the agreements entered into at the Marlborough House and Brussels meetings of the Commonwealth and European Community respectively in August and September 1986. They include bans on new investment in South Africa, on the promotion of tourism to that country and on the import of iron and steel and of gold coins from South Africa. We have implemented all these measures and those to which we committed ourselves earlier at the meeting of the European Community Foreign Ministers in Luxembourg in September 1985 and the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting in Nassau in October that year.

These measures have been carefully balanced and are meant to emphasize to the South African Government that they must seize the opportunity for political change, without destroying the South African economy in the process. All South Africans, black and white, will depend for their future on this economy. We have followed up

(Sir John Thomson, United Kingdom)

these signals with continuing efforts to encourage dialogue - by talking to all the parties and groups whose participation will eventually be necessary to make such dialogue possible.

The short-term prospects for change in South Africa may be clearer after the elections there in May. We shall need to take stock of the results of that election and in the light of our assessment decide what next we can usefully do to encourage the process of reform. Those of us outside the country, however well-intentioned, cannot solve the crisis, unless South Africans themselves are prepared to commit themselves to peaceful negotiations for fundamental change. All parties in South Africa must be prepared to make the compromises which alone can make such negotiations possible. The alternative is too terrible to contemplate and will leave no winners, only losers. For our part, we remain convinced that steps can be taken to encourage and sustain dialogue in South Africa. We are ready to lend our good offices and support to all efforts to bring an end to violence and create a truly democratic South Africa.

It is our hope that this debate will send a clear signal to the South African authorities and to the white community in South Africa that change is long overdue. We must avoid sterile political exchanges which lend comfort only to the supporters of apartheid. We must make clear that the international community shares a common goal - the rapid and total abolition of apartheid - and that we are each prepared to play our part, in the way we think best, to achieve this goal.

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

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

Mr. ABULHASSAN (Kuwait) (interpretation from Arabic): I should like at the outset to convey to you, Sir, my delegation's congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for this month. We are quite convinced that owing to your experience as a seasoned diplomat the Security Council will be able to carry out its tasks successfully.

My delegation is very pleased to be able to take part in the Council's deliberations on the situation in South Africa under the presidency of the representative of Zambia, a friendly country with which we share many principles and common attitudes. Zambia, as the Chairman of the front-line countries, adds to these deliberations a further dimension which is totally in line with international efforts in the struggle against the apartheid régime.

May I also express our gratitude to your predecessor, Ambassador Andres Aguilar of Venezuela, for the way in which he guided the Council's work last month and for the success of its deliberations.

Despite the indignation and consternation evinced daily by the international community in the face of Pretoria's obstinacy in practising apartheid, despite the ever-growing isolation into which that régime has been forced, and despite the growing number of States that reject its policies, South Africa continues its obstinate attitude and constant defiance.

Recently that racist régime increased its repressive arsenal by adopting measures which only bear witness to its defeatism and despair: it launched within its frontiers a disinformation campaign and threw into prison almost 20,000 heroes

(Mr. Abulhassan, Kuwait)

from among the oppressed majority, including almost 300 children. This internal repression is accompanied by sustained acts of aggression outside its borders to destabilize the neighbouring States and undermine their economic infrastructures.

The international community has on many occasions reaffirmed in a number of organs that it condemns Pretoria's racist policies. Only a few days ago that position was reiterated by the Fifth Islamic Summit Conference, at which 44 Islamic Heads of State or Government were present. It was a privilege and honour for Kuwait to be host to that Conference.

The Conference considered very carefully the racist policies of apartheid, which run counter to the values and principles of Islam, which enshrine the principles of equality among individuals and the inadmissibility of discrimination on the basis of skin colour or racial origin. The Conference unanimously condemned Pretoria's policies and reaffirmed its support for the resolutions adopted by the United Nations demanding the abolition of apartheid in all its forms and manifestations. The Conference urged its members to adopt comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the Pretoria régime and requested the Security Council to implement the provisions of Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter. The Conference also decided to set up a committee to monitor the situation in South Africa and Namibia and invited member States to participate in the Africa Fund for assistance to the countries in southern Africa, which was established last year by the Non-Aligned Movement at its Eighth Conference, held at Harare, Zimbabwe.

At the same time, my delegation cannot fail to welcome what was said by His Highness the Prince of Kuwait at the Fifth Islamic Summit Conference, presided over by His Highness, which indicated the striking parallelism between the struggles being waged by the African and Arab peoples, respectively, against two racist States, South Africa and Israel, which maintain very close co-operation in

(Mr. Abulhassan, Kuwait)

the political, military and scientific fields and which interfere in the internal affairs of neighbouring countries and pursue policies of violence and terror against those peoples struggling to secure their right to self-determination and national independence.

The Conference very clearly set forth the position of the vast majority of the international community when it condemned the existing complicity between Pretoria and the Zionist entity, particularly in the nuclear field, to enslave the Arab and African peoples and impede their economic and social development. Likewise, the Conference welcomed the decision of the United States Congress to impose economic sanctions against the Pretoria régime and that of certain European States to broaden their sanctions against Pretoria. It also welcomed the decision taken by certain commercial enterprises and Western banks to withdraw their business from South Africa.

At the same time my delegation would like to express its gratification - which is undoubtedly shared by most of the international community - at the report submitted by the Commission set up by the United States Administration in which the failure of the policy known as "constructive engagement" is affirmed, thus corroborating what we have said many times in the past about the legitimacy and correctness of the international community's appeals for the abrogation of laws classifying individuals according to their ethnicity, for the release of political prisoners, the restoration of power to the majority, and the speeding up of independence for Namibia.

(Mr. Abulhassan, Kuwait)

The Islamic Summit paid a tribute to the people of South Africa - a people struggling for its unity - for its steadfast opposition to the so-called constitutional proposals as well as to the policy of bantustanization. The Conference condemned Pretoria for enacting such measures and requested the Governments of the member countries not to recognize them.

In accordance with the principles recognized by the Organization of the Islamic Conference and its charter, which are in keeping with the policy of my country, the Muslim leaders attending the meeting in Kuwait reaffirmed their support for the national liberation movements in South Africa and Namibia and declared that they would provide both peoples with all the support they needed at this stage of their struggle. They once again requested that the political prisoners be released unconditionally, including Nelson Mandela, the illustrious African freedom fighter.

We are aghast when we read the United Nations report that appeared in Geneva nine days ago which indicates that the violation of human rights in South Africa has reached unheard of proportions. It has resorted to the death sentence, to torture, curfews, arbitrary arrest and all the kinds of violence that form part of its arsenal of repression. All of this is being perpetrated by the racist police and security forces.

My delegation wished to address the Security Council, the main body responsible for maintaining international peace and security, today in order to reiterate its conviction that the violence and terror practised against the vast majority of the population and the front-line States will not deter the struggle being waged and will not prevent their just cause from triumphing over racism in order to recover their rights, which are enshrined in all revealed religions and international law.

(Mr. Abulhassan, Kuwait)

My delegation has studied the draft resolution before the Council and believes it represents the very least that can be done by the Council in the light of present circumstances. Its principles and main ideas, including the imposition of mandatory sanctions once again reaffirm the principles we hold dear and express our hopes not only for those fighting in South Africa but indeed for all peace and justice loving forces throughout the world.

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

Mr. LI LUYE (China) (interpretation from Chinese): Please allow me to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month. China and Zambia enjoy a traditional friendship and close and friendly co-operation. Zambia, an African front-line State, has carried out a persistent struggle for, and has made outstanding contributions to, the just cause of opposing the system of apartheid in South Africa and striving for the independence of Namibia, thus winning respect and acclaim from the international community. As a worthy representative of Zambia, your talent and rich experience in diplomacy will surely enable you to guide the Council to success in its work in February.

I also wish to express my thanks to your predecessor, His Excellency Ambassador Andres Aguilar, for his excellent performance in discharging his duties as President of the Council for January.

I would also like to take this opportunity to express on behalf of the Chinese delegation a warm welcome to the representatives of the new members of the Security Council of 1987 and our readiness to co-operate closely with them.

Since last February, when this Council met to consider the question of South Africa and adopted resolution 581 (1968), the situation in southern Africa has

(Mr. Li Luye, China)

continued to deteriorate instead of showing improvement. Refusing to implement Security Council resolutions, the South African authorities have clung stubbornly to racist rule by playing the dual tactics of brutal suppression, on the one hand, and political deception, on the other.

Last June, the South African régime reimposed the "state of emergency" and extended it to the entire country. Killing in cold blood several hundred people so far, and detaining more than 20,000, including even teenagers, the régime has also tried such sinister tricks as sowing discord among the black people and creating chaos by inciting them to fight each other in an attempt to realize its criminal objective of divide-and-rule. Despite all the glib talk of reforms, dialogue and power-sharing on the part of the South African authorities, the facts have shown clearly that all this is sheer deception. To this day the black people in South Africa remain deprived of their political rights, and laws such as the Group Areas Act and the Population Registration Act, which were designed to perpetuate the apartheid system, remain in effect. The obstinate stand of the South African régime in denying the black people their minimum rights of equality has made it all too clear that apartheid cannot be reformed. It can only be destroyed.

It should also be pointed out that the South African régime has continued its practice of aggression and harassment against the neighbouring countries, disrupting their economies and trying in vain to pressure them into abandoning their support for the just struggles of the peoples of South Africa and Namibia. Furthermore it has persisted in obstructing the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibian independence and prolonging its illegal occupation of that country. Recently it has amassed troops in Cunene Province, in southern

(Mr. Li Luye, China)

Angola, ready to launch large-scale attacks. The aforementioned actions of the South African régime have posed a serious threat to peace and stability in that region.

In today's world, when the colonial system has long since disintegrated, the apartheid system practised by the South African régime runs diametrically counter to the trend of historical development and is a great insult to humanity. It is but natural that it has been resolutely opposed by the South African people and universally condemned by the international community. It is obvious that as long as the South African authorities refuse to abolish the apartheid system and abandon their reactionary policies of illegal occupation of Namibia and aggression against neighbouring countries, the root cause of turmoil in southern Africa will remain.

(Mr. Li Luye, China)

In order to put an early end to apartheid and normalize the situation in southern Africa an ever greater number of countries have come to support the just struggle of the peoples of South Africa and Namibia and the African front-line States with concrete actions. Some Western countries have also started to adopt sanction measures against South Africa, either individually or collectively. It is regrettable, however, that there are still a few countries which continue to pursue a policy of appeasement towards the South African régime, a policy that can only serve to inflate its arrogance.

It is the bounden duty of the international community to give energetic support to the just struggle of the South African people for racial equality and fundamental human rights and to put an early end to the ruthless rule of the South African racists so as to safeguard the basic principles of the United Nations Charter. All countries that uphold justice should step up their concerted efforts in support of the people of South Africa and bring powerful pressure to bear on the South African régime in all areas. The Chinese delegation is therefore of the view that the Security Council should strongly condemn the South African régime for the atrocities it is committing by prolonging the state of emergency, brutally suppressing the black masses and persecuting anti-apartheid leaders and demand that the régime immediately lift the nationwide state of emergency, stop forthwith all political trials and release unconditionally the black leader, Mr. Nelson Mandela, and all other political prisoners and lift the ban on such liberation organizations as the African National Congress and the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania. In view of the fact that the refusal of the South African régime to implement Security Council and General Assembly resolutions on the question of southern Africa already constitutes a grave provocation to the United Nations and a threat to international peace and security, the Council should adopt effective sanction measures against

(Mr. Li Luye, China)

that régime in accordance with the relevant provisions of the United Nations Charter. After careful study of the draft resolution submitted by the non-aligned members of the Council, we are of the view that the document is a practical and realistic one. The measures proposed as a first step to bring sanctions against South Africa are those the international community, including some major Western countries, has adopted in recent years.

While expressing our support for it, we sincerely hope that this draft resolution, which reflects the broad aspirations of the international community, will be unanimously endorsed and adopted by the members of the Council.

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

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

Mr. ORAMAS OLIVA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): Allow me to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of this important body for this month. The fact that you are in charge of the Council's work is a striking symbol of the new course of history in which States newly emerged from the night of colonialism are now part of the community of nations that, meeting here, is demanding that a non-racist, independent South Africa and Namibia come to participate with the rest of us in the quest for solutions to mankind's most pressing problems.

I should also like to express our gratitude to Ambassador Andres Aguilar of Venezuela for the elegant and effective manner in which he guided the Council's work last month.

The African States have once again been compelled to resort to the Council and to demand that it take action to halt the genocide now being daily inflicted on the South African people and to put an end to the undeclared state of war South Africa

(Mr. Oramas Oliva, Cuba)

is cruelly waging against its neighbours. These things have made it crystal clear that on the day apartheid disappears the causes of instability and subversion in southern Africa will also cease to exist.

We have come to the Council on many occasions to consider South Africa's ongoing acts of aggression against neighbouring States or the horrendous crimes committed by the racist police gangs against the black population of South Africa. We have on many occasions been told that we must exercise great caution in order to avoid making the black masses of South Africa suffer the consequences of an implementation of the provisions of Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter against the racists of Pretoria. Such statements have always surprised us, because they mean that no account is being taken of the indescribable sufferings those same South African masses have endured over the years as a result of the cruel policy of apartheid. Indeed, some have gone so far as to create a theory to justify the maintenance of relations of all kinds with Pretoria - the policy of "constructive engagement" devised in Washington. After a number of years, a group of eminent North Americans has noted that the arguments in support of that policy are insubstantial - I would say that it has been a further cruel attempt to mislead public opinion.

The year 1986 was one in which the international community waged one of its most intensive campaigns on behalf of the struggle of the suffering black population of South Africa and against apartheid. In many parts of the world, demands were heard for the adoption of broad mandatory sanctions against South Africa. The British Commonwealth took some important steps in that direction; the European Economic Community, heedful of the voice of reason and the popular outcry, agreed on certain selective sanctions; and the United States Congress also adopted

(Mr. Oramas Oliva, Cuba)

a package of selective sanctions of particular importance to the efforts to put an end to the bloodbath and grief of the South Africans.

All of that shows the extent to which the odious régime of apartheid is repudiated, based as it is on racial discrimination, which the international community has described as a crime against humanity and, consequently, as a violation of Article 1, paragraph 3, of Chapter I of the United Nations Charter. With each passing day the apartheid régime has been intensifying its repressive internal measures, declaring a state of emergency that enables it to inflict indescribable sufferings upon millions of human beings. It is inconceivable that just because his skin is black a South African should be regarded as a creature from another galaxy in the very land of his birth.

(Mr. Oramas Oliva, Cuba)

Much has been said in an attempt to justify the unjustifiable - not to adopt sanctions against the racist régime of South Africa and including that the South African people is divided on this question. That is utterly false, as shown by the fact that a few days ago during his visit to the United States the President of the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC), Oliver Tambo, came out unequivocally in favour of comprehensive mandatory sanctions. Prestigious South African leaders and political, religious and intellectual figures have often said the same. Moreover, along with the worldwide accusations unanimously levelled at Pretoria, many individuals from all sectors have vigorously stated that the time has come for action, and that fine words, declarations and policies are not enough to bring to its senses a gang unparalleled except by Berlin's Third Reich. They have said it is time for the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa.

Cuba joins all the other nations which, in this Chamber, have called for respect for the principles of equal rights and self-determination in South Africa, and for the adoption by the Security Council of appropriate measures against racist South Africa, which would strengthen peace for all the peoples of southern Africa, peoples which today are victims of the Pretoria racists' undeclared war and of their cruel policy of State terrorism. Those measures would bring independence to Namibia with no pre-conditions, in conformity with Security Council resolution 435 (1978); they would bring about the withdrawal of South African troops from southern Angola, a halt in assistance to the racists and to the UNITA and RENAMO bandits in Angola and Mozambique. There is much evidence to prove the Pretoria racists guilty of the international crimes of aggression and intervention. Such measures would also undoubtedly do much to relieve international tension and to

(Mr. Oramas Oliva, Cuba)

create the climate of trust necessary if all the peoples of that region are to dedicate their resources to development.

History shows that when timely action is not taken, the consequences of this political short-sightedness can often bring enormous suffering to others, who are human beings just like ourselves. Thus, the long-suffering South African masses and the other peoples and States of southern Africa are entitled to expect us to do more than merely voice our concern. The Spanish word historia can sometimes mean a fairy tale, and sometimes a true history lesson.

Looking at racist South Africa we see there a people that knows the high price of freedom and that it must choose between living without it and paying that price, as the national hero of Cuba, José Martí, once said. The South African people has a vanguard that, sooner rather than later, will lead it to victory: the African National Congress.

I wish in conclusion to say that we endorse the eloquent remarks made yesterday by the Ambassador of Zimbabwe, whose country currently holds the chairmanship of the Non-Aligned Movement, who concisely told the Council the hard-hitting truth about the situation in southern Africa and about the role of racist South Africa and certain Western Powers.

Cuba is among the nations that unequivocally demand the imposition without delay of the sanctions provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter against racist South Africa. We believe the time has come for the international community through this Council to consider appropriate measures of material and moral support for the front-line States, which have been the victims of the dirty war waged by South Africa, which through its armed bands has persistently obstructed the communication routes in order to prevent the normal development of trade relations between those countries and the rest of the world.

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

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

Mr. CESAR (Czechoslovakia) (interpretation from Russian): I wish first of all to thank the members of the Security Council for granting my delegation the opportunity to make a statement on the item before the Council.

I congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council. Your country, Zambia, is well known for its active support for national liberation movements, for the struggle to end interference in the internal affairs of African countries and for efforts in the struggle for disarmament and international peace and security. I am convinced that during your presidency you will be able to foster the further realization of these principles and that the work of the Security Council will meet with success under your guidance.

We commend the work of your predecessor, Ambassador Aguilar, Permanent Representative of Venezuela, which was characterized by ability, objectivity and responsibility.

The United Nations - or rather its organs, including the Security Council - has had to deal with the situation in southern Africa virtually since its inception. The reason for this is the policy of apartheid of the racist régime of South Africa. My delegation welcomes the fact that the Council is again considering the situation in southern Africa, because the policies of the apartheid régime pose a grave threat to international peace and security, even though apartheid is now undergoing a serious crisis affecting not only its political system but its entire economic structure.

This debate is taking place at a time when the aggressiveness of the apartheid

(Mr. Cesar, Czechoslovakia)

régime is becoming increasingly rampant. At recent meetings of the Commission on Human Rights, a parallel worsening of the methods used by apartheid against those struggling to eliminate racial discrimination was noted. The policy of apartheid is accompanied by unprecedented waves of police terror, brutality to demonstrators, mass arrests and the imposition of harsh censorship. The legitimate demands constantly reiterated here in the United Nations have met with a response from the apartheid régime in the form of bloody repression and widespread State injustice.

The adoption of these methods has involved an increasing number of opponents of apartheid being killed or thrown into prison without trial. In the last eight months alone, since South Africa's imposition of a state of emergency, 25,000 further political prisoners have been placed in Pretoria's gaols.

(Mr. Cesar, Czechoslovakia)

But what have these oppressed people really done to make the apartheid régime carry out such harsh methods against them? The reply to that question can be found in the following words used recently by Oliver Tambo, the President of the African National Congress:

(spoke in English)

"Our people want freedom now. They want to rule their country and decide their destiny now, not tomorrow. The people are fed up with all the talk about how their liberation from oppression has to be delayed for one reason or another. Today the struggle for freedom is the only meaning of their lives. They no longer fear death, because to them life is synonymous with freedom".

(continued in Russian)

There can be no doubt that that goal is in full consonance with the fundamental provisions of the Charter.

In that connection, the vast majority of the members of the international community have constantly supported the efforts to eliminate apartheid and have forthrightly condemned the Pretoria régime for the bloody reprisals and the criminal activities and terror it carries out against the black population and the national liberation movement as a whole. Therefore, the international community has been urging the release of Nelson Mandela and other patriots who have risen up to struggle against the apartheid régime.

It must be pointed out, however, that although repressive measures remain the main tool in the efforts of the Pretoria authorities to put down the forces of protest, they are no longer able to stem the tide of resistance to the apartheid régime. Therefore, Pretoria has been obliged to resort to manoeuvres and stratagems in order to draw the fangs of the national liberation movement and to sow dissension in the ranks of the freedom fighters and deceive world public

(Mr. Cesar, Czechoslovakia)

opinion. But all those self-styled changes do not affect the foundation of apartheid. That is not surprising, since the actual incentive for carrying out these reforms is not a desire to put an end to the disenfranchisement and repression of the population or a desire to put an end to apartheid, but precisely the opposite: to preserve as long as possible the predominance of the white majority over the black population. It is quite easy to understand why so often the Africans describe these "reforms" as being too little and too late.

The aggressive acts of South Africa, which are regularly perpetrated by army units of the racists against neighbouring States, through the organization of subversion and punitive expeditions, and which have led to a large number of civilian casualties and have caused tremendous damage to the economies of the countries in question, are extremely dangerous. These recurrent acts of aggression by South Africa indicate that Pretoria does not intend to give up its foreign policy, that it intends to go on not heeding the norms of international law and the relevant United Nations resolutions.

I should like to recall at this point the following declaration made by the non-aligned countries at their Eighth Summit Conference, in Harare:

"... the occupation of southern Angola by the racist Pretoria régime [is] in large part facilitated by the policies pursued by the United States Administration in the region, especially its support for the UNITA armed criminal bands and its policies of 'constructive engagement'". (S/18392, Political Declaration, para. 76, p. 46)

South Africa continues to occupy Namibia illegally; it abuses Namibia's territory not only for economic purposes but also to carry out acts of aggression against neighbouring States.

(Mr. Cesar, Czechoslovakia)

The Security Council is paying increased attention to the arms embargo against South Africa. Despite that fact, as is indicated in documents of the Special Committee against Apartheid, certain Western countries and Israel continue to co-operate with South Africa in the military-industrial field and also in the creation of a nuclear potential.

From all those facts, which indicate varying degrees of co-operation with or assistance to South Africa, we can draw a single valid conclusion about the real attitude of the members of the international community towards the apartheid régime.

The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic fully supports the only judicious option available in the case of apartheid - namely, the radical isolation of the racists. Therefore, our delegation once again firmly states that comprehensive mandatory sanctions in accordance with Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter must be applied to the apartheid régime.

In regard to the problem of southern Africa, Czechoslovakia has throughout its existence maintained an unchanging, fundamental point of view. I should like to reiterate here Czechoslovakia's unflagging support for the struggle of the African peoples against imperialism and neo-colonialism, and for their efforts to eliminate apartheid. Czechoslovakia and its people stand fully behind the just struggle of the South African people for freedom, democracy and social progress.

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

The next speaker is Mr. Clovis Maksoud, Permanent Observer of the League of Arab States to the United Nations, to whom the Security Council extended an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure at the 2,735th meeting. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. MAKSOUD: On behalf of the League of Arab States, I wish to express my appreciation to the members of the Security Council and to you personally, Mr. President, for extending this invitation to us to address the Council on a very important, indeed vital, issue affecting our brothers in South Africa and the future of peace and security in the world.

I take this opportunity to extend our hearty congratulations to you, Mr. President. It is a historical coincidence that the discussion of the South African situation is taking place under your leadership. For Zambia is the head of the front-line countries and is in the vanguard of support for the liberation movements of the people of South Africa.

It is perhaps another coincidence that the Ambassador of Venezuela was President of the Council last month, when attempts were being made to accelerate the pace of the Contadora Group's activities designed to bring peace to Central America.

It is important to realize at this particular juncture that while the world looks for a measure of objectivity and neutrality in the pursuit of the task of constructing peace with justice in many regions of the world - whether it be Central America or South Africa or the Middle East - a patronizing attitude is taken by some towards efforts engaged in either on the initiative of the United Nations or by the front-line States or the Contadora Group.

(Mr. Maksoud)

It is therefore important to ponder on the advice we often receive about how to approach the various issues pertaining to the rights of the peoples of the world. The situation in South Africa is perhaps the element in the world situation that most clearly reveals the tragedy that at times leads to the erosion of the credibility of genuine international and United Nations efforts. That is what will happen if the United Nations does not step in firmly and decisively to end colonialism, racism and apartheid, for the Charter has prescribed ending them as being among the Organization's functions.

As we look at the tragedy proceeding in South Africa, we see that it is repeated in many other regions of the world. We in the Arab world in particular find ourselves in tune with the people there, not only in sympathy and solidarity, but almost experiencing the same pattern of events, for some of our people are dispossessed and disfranchised in a way identical to that which is taking place in South Africa today.

That is why we feel duty-bound to express our support for the liberation struggle inside South Africa and Namibia and to express our indignation at the inhuman and illegal practices of the apartheid régime. We are indignant not only because we, too, have been the victims of racism and racial exclusion, but because we feel that postponing dealing firmly with the racists tends only to exacerbate the polarization that is taking place. Unfortunately, at times it is along racial lines, because one particular race has arrogated to itself the right to be at the top of the hierarchy and to exclude the others from enjoying human equality.

Because of this attempt to arrogate to a system the privilege of excluding others from the enjoyment of equality and of sharing the political economic, social and cultural benefits that an equal society provides, we must probe into the methodology of, for example, constructive engagement. We see a growing

(Mr. Maksoud)

sensitivity in the United States, especially in the Congress, which has requested that sanctions be imposed. We have seen how the moral outcry in the United States and in certain Western countries has led to some movement by their Governments and to their making certain gestures. But when we find that those welcome gestures, however significant, are made in a manner intended to prevent actual condemnation of apartheid and the imposition of sanctions against the apartheid régime, the peoples of Africa, Asia and the third world in general have a growing tendency to begin to interpret them as an attempt to weaken the thrust towards equality and liberation.

It is here that there comes about an unfortunate and unnecessary confrontation between the West and ourselves in the third world, whether in South Africa or elsewhere. We feel that those gestures are no longer signals of growing sensitivity but implements to prevent the fruition of liberation and equality. That feeling creates a great deal of the disposition towards violence. The liberation movement in South Africa is not a violent movement; it is a peaceful movement to which violence is the option of last resort, while the apartheid régime, in order to pursue its policy of discrimination, racial prejudice and structured apartheid, uses the coercion of violence in order to perpetuate disfranchisement and dispossession. The nemesis of violence that we witness, which leads to a great number of unfortunate killings, results from a deliberate system of coercive violence.

The liberation movements in South Africa resort to the United Nations, to the Security Council, to exhaust all peaceful means. There are peaceful demonstrations and all sorts of civil disobedience, and non-violence is advocated in order that the peaceful option, persuasion, may lead to the achievement of human and national rights. Yet the apartheid régime in South Africa has throughout considered the peaceful methods, the non-violent approaches of the liberation movements, to be a

(Mr. Maksoud)

sign of weakness, a sign of readiness to submit, and has therefore deliberately enhanced its powers of coercion and of violence. The liberation movements did not commit themselves to violence; it was an option of last resort.

When the African Group, the non-aligned countries and the Islamic countries - we are represented in all three groupings - come to the Security Council to seek to impose what is elementary and logical, they do so in order to avoid violence, as an indication of their conviction that the mechanism of the Security Council can be put into motion to deter apartheid, whose continued presence mars the map of the civilized world.

That being so, we consider the imposition of mandatory sanctions against South Africa to be long overdue. Certain countries in the Western world have in the past vetoed their imposition. If they had imposed them earlier, we should have avoided a great deal of hatred, polarization and violence. Perhaps now is the time ~~to~~ send a signal that continued coercion, continued discrimination and continued racism are costly.

Warnings that economic sanctions might be counterproductive for the people of Africa - especially for the neighbouring countries and the black Africans of South Africa and Namibia - are a surreptitious form of patronization, suggesting in a way that the national liberation movements and the front-line countries do not know exactly what they want, that they must be tutored into recognizing the limitations of their demands, that they must be told that requesting sanctions is more a matter of rhetorical sloganeering than suggesting an effective penalty.

(Mr. Maksoud)

I think it is high time for the United Nations Security Council to take the lead once again in enhancing the Charter and in bringing the United Nations back to being a focus of commitment, an anchor to which mankind can come to be shielded from those who seek to violate elementary human rights and the national rights of peoples.

It is therefore our hope that the elementary sensitivities that have developed in recent months in some of the Western countries that had previously exercised their veto will come to grips with the problem and will realize that any further paralysis with respect to the imposition of sanctions on South Africa at this particular time would unfortunately only lead to reinforcing suspicion and polarization, which, in a global sense, we are trying to avoid and transcend.

The PRESIDENT: I thank Mr. Maksoud for his kind words addressed to me.

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

Mr. TADESSE (Ethiopia): Mr. President, at the outset I should like to express the gratitude of my delegation to you and the other members of the Council for affording us the opportunity to participate in this important debate. My delegation would like to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of February. Cognizant of Zambia's unswerving commitment to the struggle for the total liberation of southern Africa and keenly aware of your personal experience and proven abilities, we are confident that the deliberations of this Council on this item of crucial importance will culminate in the adoption of concrete measures with the view to facing the critical challenges posed by the apartheid system.

(Mr. Tadesse, Ethiopia)

I also wish to express the appreciation of my delegation to Ambassador Andres Aguilar of Venezuela for the able manner in which he guided the work of the Council during the past month.

The situation obtaining in South Africa continues to deteriorate with every passing day. In fact, the plight of the African majority in that unhappy land has gone from bad to worse. The continued existence of the apartheid régime has meant the further regimentation of a racially divided society created and perpetuated to serve the narrow interest of the minority ruling clique. As recent events clearly indicate, the apartheid régime is bent on adding new penal codes and regulations to its existing catalogue of Draconian laws. The racist régime has issued a new set of regulations aimed at stifling the normal functioning of black schools. It has also continued to pursue its policy of arrest, incarceration and murder against all who stand in favour of a democratic South Africa. In its vain attempt to subdue the will of the people of South Africa, the racist régime has subjected even defenceless women and children to all forms of inhuman treatment, in effect making them civilian casualties in an undeclared war. In the same vein, Pretoria continues to wage its odious campaign of destabilization against neighbouring States. Armed as they are, with all the military hardware that Western technology can offer, the occupation forces of South Africa continue to create havoc in the entire region of southern Africa. The security agents of apartheid have yet to cease the stage-management of the nefarious activities of renegade entities such as UNITA and MNR. The régime persists in undertaking measures aimed at immobilizing the economies of the front-line States.

This seems to be Pretoria's answer to the repeated appeals of the international community for an end to apartheid policies and practices. While the liberation movements persevere in their defensive actions in order to meet State

(Mr. Tadesse, Ethiopia)

coercion with co-ordinated mass action and State terrorism with armed resistance, the international community has demonstrated its commitment to justice, democracy and peace in South Africa by standing behind these valiant forces which continue to wage the fight for human dignity in that part of the world. It is particularly gratifying to note that the popular organs and legislative bodies of some of the countries known to be the traditional allies of apartheid have taken it upon themselves to adopt legal measures aimed at the isolation of the apartheid régime.

Yet the pipeline of Western assistance to that régime is far from running dry. Apartheid is sustained with the covert and overt collaboration of Western multinationals. The coercive apparatus of Pretoria is still being buttressed by the military-industrial complex of some Western countries and their partners. Thus, although the international community has persevered, apartheid is yet to manifest a modicum of reform, let alone enduring change that is likely to lead to the formation of a democratic South Africa. That is why we have, all along, demanded the imposition of mandatory sanctions against apartheid. On more than one occasion we have appealed to the Security Council to take concrete enforcement measures against South Africa under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter, primarily because the piecemeal and often unco-ordinated attempts made thus far to bring pressure to bear on the apartheid régime have not yet yielded the anticipated results. Our collective efforts have failed to influence the abrasive stature of the apartheid régime because some Member States of the United Nations had, for reasons known to one and all, decided to assist South Africa in circumventing the effects of sanctions imposed on it by a large community of nations. Our honest endeavours had been rendered fruitless because those who are the most likely to prevail over the régime in Pretoria have very often given solace and comfort to that racist régime. Our well-thought-out strategies could not

(Mr. Tadesse, Ethiopia)

materialize because those with legislative leverage over the multinational corporations which have enhanced the nuclear capability of South Africa were hesitant to take concrete measures against those corporations.

(Mr. Tadesse, Ethiopia)

Thus it is abundantly clear that the well-intentioned efforts we have deployed so far are not commensurate with the stringent measures required to compel the apartheid régime to abandon its heinous policies and practices. We shall therefore continue to demand the imposition of mandatory sanctions against South Africa until the entire edifice of the apartheid régime is dismantled.

In demanding that the Security Council impose stringent measures to bring the apartheid régime to its knees, we are keenly aware of the role that all States Members of the United Nations, in particular the members of the Security Council, are likely to play in the meaningful adoption and implementation of a Council resolution on this crucial issue. In this regard, while we salute those nations that have imposed selective voluntary sanctions against South Africa, we appeal to them to undertake collateral measures likely to enhance their effectiveness. In the same spirit, we call on those States which continue to maintain close links with South Africa to reconsider their position in a manner which will allow the international community to take concerted enforcement measures against apartheid. Sympathy for the oppressed in South Africa and concern for that integral part of humanity must be supported by concrete legal and administrative measures that make collaboration with South Africa punishable so long as apartheid persists.

Those who have expressed concern for the respect of human rights in South Africa are morally obliged to co-operate in all international efforts aimed at bringing apartheid to a resounding end, thereby enabling the people of South Africa to live without fear of State terrorism and perpetual intimidation. Those with special responsibilities for the maintenance of international peace and security should augment the Security Council's capabilities to adopt mandatory measures against the major cause of instability in southern Africa. Indeed, all nations committed to the cause of liberation, democracy and peace should act in concert to

(Mr. Tadesse, Ethiopia)

ensure the people of South Africa freedom from a perpetual state of servitude and terror. It is only then that the security of Africa and the world at large will cease being subjected to the belligerent and unpredictable acts of the callous apartheid régime.

In conclusion, let me reiterate Ethiopia's militant solidarity with the liberation movements and the front-line States and reaffirm that we shall do everything on our part to make a meaningful contribution towards the materialization of such a global action.

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

The next speaker is Mr. Lesaoana Makhandia, to whom the Council has extended an invitation under rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. MAKHANDIA: On behalf of the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania (PAC), the custodian of the genuine aspirations of the dispossessed, oppressed, exploited and discriminated against but heroically resisting masses of Azania, I congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of this venerated body, the Security Council. My delegation is confident that the proven leadership qualities and diplomatic skills which you have shown as a leader of your country, Zambia - whose sacrifices on our behalf we truly admire - will guide us to arrive at a truly just and honourable decision.

May I also express our appreciation to your predecessor, the Ambassador of Venezuela, for the way in which he led the Council last month.

I wish also to express our gratitude to the Council members for allowing my delegation to participate in this debate at this very critical period in the history of my country, Azania.

(Mr. Makhandia)

Authority is a tremendous thing in the universe - nothing overshadows it. God - Allah - alone is authority in all things. All the authorities of this Earth are instituted and allowed by Him for as long as they carry out His divine will. The Security Council therefore bears an awesome and singular responsibility as God's delegated authority on this Earth. Its decisions have a tremendous impact on mankind's sense of justice, righteousness and truthfulness. In other words, we believe that there exists a relationship between the violence, rebellion and lawlessness around the world and this Council's decisions.

In Azania, the oppressed people's violence has fortunately been channelled into revolutionary and defensive methods by the national liberation movement, rather than reactionary terrorist objectives such as those practised by the racist Pretoria régime. The racist régime has always massacred the oppressed majority in Azania: in 1960, at Sharpeville during a campaign organized by my organization, at least 69 persons were murdered in cold blood, most of them shot in the back; in 1976, during the Soweto student protests, at least 800 children were mercilessly butchered merely for protesting against inferior education and other grievances; in 1985, during the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Sharpeville massacre, again defenceless persons in Uitenhage walking to bury their dead were ruthlessly machine-gunned in cold blood by jittery racist police; and during the past two years over 2,500 Azanians were murdered by the racist army that occupy not only our townships but also our children's schools.

In every instance it has been the oppressed, the dispossessed, the exploited and the discriminated against majority that have been the victims of this calculated genocide. In each case we have approached this Council to ask for redress, to ask that racist South Africa be punished for this lawlessness and evil. To date we have received only rejection from the Council. Some Council members, especially its permanent members from the West, have instead asked us to

(Mr. Makhandu)

stop violence in the process of our seeking a resolution to our oppression, dispossession and exploitation, while they have continued to strengthen and, in some instances, arm our adversary. The decision that the Council will take at the end of this debate will either add strength to the aforementioned observation or open up a new chapter for all of us to take note of.

The PAC of Azania comes before this Council to support Egypt's recommendation that the Council adopt punitive sanctions against the racist Pretoria régime. We also want to reiterate our long-standing position that only comprehensive mandatory sanctions will avert the impending confrontation that will and, within the logic of history, must come in Azania - unless serious measures are taken to defuse it.

(Mr. Makhanda)

In this regard we of the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania will continue to demand the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the illegal, racist South African régime. If there is any régime that qualifies to have Chapter VII of the Charter invoked, it is this régime whose policies have been declared a crime against humanity. We are also convinced that the great majority of States Members of the United Nations are in favour of the imposition of these sanctions against the apartheid régime.

The racist régime in Pretoria, after butchering almost 1,000 of our children in 1976, has 10 years later resorted to detaining them in prisons and concentration camps, which it euphemistically calls "rehabilitation centres". As early as last December the racists acknowledged the detention of those minors, some of them as young as 11 years old. J.P. Coetzee, the racist Police Commissioner, in a statement issued on 8 December 1986, said they had gaoled only 256 children under 16 years of age.

The fact of the matter is that at least 4,000 children have been detained in racist gaols all over Azania since the declaration of the state of emergency.

In the Witwatersrand area, in the Transvaal, more than 400 children are in detention. In Port Elizabeth, in the Cape, 284 were gaoled in St. Albans Prison in the first week of November 1986. Of those, 121 were 16 years of age or less. In the Eastern Cape 418 children were reported detained; 17 per cent of these were under the age of 18, and the youngest detainee was only 12 years old. Those statistics were collected by a white women's group in Azania called the Black Sash, and have been corroborated by a number of church and community groups engaged in monitoring the atrocities. In the majority of cases parents are often not informed that their children have been detained or where they are being held. These children are totally isolated from the outside world or any source of aid.

(Mr. Makhandia)

If anyone here would care to check the effects of child imprisonment in racist South Africa, the story of 11-year-old Fanie Guduca, who spent 57 terrifying days awaiting trial as a prisoner in a Johannesburg police cell is recommended. It is contained in the newspaper The Sowetan of 3 February 1986 under the title "Fanie still lives in fear".

May I here express the PAC's appreciation for the quick and timely action of the Secretary-General, His Excellency Javier Perez de Cuellar, concerning the racists inquiring about these barbaric, uncivilized and utterly evil actions against our children. We appreciate that gesture, and we want to say so publicly.

During this entire period of the iron-fist policy of bloody repression and genocide, the racist régime has been telling the international community that it is "moving on a programme of controlled political and constitutional reform" and that "it shall continue to seek a new dispensation to provide fully for the aspirations of all".

The only programme the racists have followed is that of naked repression against a people whose only crime is their firm and uncompromising demand for self-determination in the land of their birth and for the establishment of a truly non-racial Azania in which anyone owing his or her loyalty and allegiance to Africa and accepting African majority rule is regarded as an African.

This racist programme has been accomplished by full-blooded censorship of the press. Television coverage of this repression is banned. Journalists are detained and not allowed to report what they see; they are to report only what the Fascist Bureau of Information feels they should see.

Their only programme is that of destabilization of the front-line and neighbouring States at a cost of \$1.6 billion.

(Mr. Makhanda)

The only programme the racists are following is one of lies and duplicity. One has only to read what The Guardian of 5 February 1987 reported: "Afrikaners' secret strategy for survival - Broederbond plan for black power" and what The Times of the same date said under the headline "Leaked paper on power for blacks puts Botha on spot" to understand what I am talking about in reference to racist duplicity.

If perhaps what is reported in the two articles did not find confirmation in any racist statements, one would dismiss it as a mere mental exercise, or what some have called a mere "working paper". But, alas, the statement of the racist representative here on 17 February 1987, Mr. Leslie Manley, confirms every bit of the positions expressed in those two articles.

The PAC believes that the vehicle for change in Azania is the oppressed, the dispossessed, the exploited majority, and not the racist minority. The only thing that the latter can do is to delay that change. They can never bring it about. Throughout his statement and throughout their utterances the racists see only a solution based on group interests, which are nothing other than colour interests. The racist régime thinks it will impose a racist solution in Azania. This preoccupation with colour is the racists' downfall. There never will be peace as long as some entity in the population wants its interests protected because its skin happens to be white.

Any settlement, negotiated or not, in Azania that purports to safeguard apartheid or group interests as against individual human interests will be very short-lived and will ultimately fail, and fail lamentably. This will be so regardless of which groups or parties effect that deceit. In his statement Mr. Manley put across the warped logic that any African or non-white society is democratic if it safeguards the interests of a minority which is white; conversely,

(Mr. Makhanda)

a society that does not do so, even if its Government is of the majority, is ipso facto not democratic - truly racist reasoning.

The overwhelming majority of the oppressed and the dispossessed in Azania have expressed their support for punitive sanctions. Various trade-union affiliates, community groups and churches, especially in the oppressed communities, and other leaders of the oppressed have given their support for sanctions - this in spite of the fact that doing so would land them in prison as there is a law in the racist statute books against advocating sanctions. The only people who have spoken against sanctions are those who have always benefited from the exploitation of the Azanian toiling masses, who have even carried out studies which are mere figments to support their discredited positions.

The dispossessed masses of Azania have successfully instituted their own sanctions inside the country - by boycotting racist-owned stores and outlets, by withholding their labour and by withholding their purchasing power from time to time. Those actions have had a devastating effect on the oppressive system of apartheid.

A number of small-time Afrikaner businessmen have had to bypass their representatives and appeal directly to the racist President for their situation to be alleviated as they depend on the buying power of the oppressed majority for their livelihood. This has been true in a number of rural areas in Azania. In some instances the racist régime has had to use police and soldiers to force the oppressed majority to patronize those businesses.

This internal action by the oppressed has also added to the depression of business activity - thus the selling by the multinationals of their holdings and plants to internal capitalists. Many of the professionals have emigrated to other countries, further depressing business activity.

(Mr. Makhandu)

The suicide rates among the whites, not only in the army but also among the oppressing population, has reached astronomic proportions. Real estate has reached a depressing low. There are more houses in the white suburbs than there are occupants, while the oppressed blacks have only squatter camps for a home. Retrenchment has increased the despair among the privileged population.

These are the realities that are driving the racists seemingly to want to resolve the impasse. They will deepen with time. The struggling masses of Azania are very much aware of these trends, and we are not about to slacken our efforts.

(Mr. Makhanda)

To date, this kind of action has had the desired effect, namely, to get the attention of the racists and to bring them to address the issue of the dispossessed and oppressed, albeit grudgingly. The Council can help to speed up this non-violent approach by adopting punitive measures against the racists.

We of the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania none the less believe that our people are their own liberators and that we have a responsibility to increase their capacity to bring about the desired change to a non-racial, democratic and socialist Azania. To this end, we have declared the year 1987 as the year of arming our people, arming them physically and mentally, because we believe no people can stand by as its children are massacred and dragged into prisons at a tender age and fail to take up arms to defend them. To do so would be to violate the sacred principle that holds that it is of children that the Kingdom of God is made.

The PRESIDENT: I thank Mr. Makhanda for the kind words he addressed to me.

The next speaker is the Permanent Observer of the Organization of the Islamic Conference, Mr. Ahmet Engin Ansay, to whom the Council has extended an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. ANSAY: Since this is the first time we have spoken in the Security Council this month, I take this opportunity to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council and to wish you the best of success in the Council's work and deliberations. I believe that your well-known professional merits will enable you to conduct this month's proceedings in the Council successfully. Permit me to salute you on this occasion for the important role your

(Mr. Ansay)

great country, Zambia, is playing as a front-line State in the defence of freedom and in the liberation struggle in southern Africa and elsewhere.

I should also like to pay a well-deserved tribute to your predecessor, Ambassador Andres Aguilar of Venezuela, for the skill and ability with which he conducted the work of the Council last month.

I would like to express my gratitude for the opportunity afforded me as the representative of the Organization of the Islamic Conference to participate in these discussions of the Security Council on the situation in southern Africa. We are meeting once again to consider the persistence of the Pretoria régime in its policies of oppression, racism and colonialism directed against millions of our African brothers who continue to struggle and to face up to the colonialist presence and racist policies in the southern African region. We participate in this debate to express our deepest concern vis-à-vis the situation prevailing in southern Africa and the policy of racial segregation imposed on the proud people of southern Africa.

The frequency with which the Council has met to consider the South Africa case alone proves that the situation created by apartheid and racial segregation in South Africa is a threat to international peace and security and that it is of concern to the international community.

The Muslim world, guided by the noble precepts of Islam, stands for the equality of all human beings irrespective of race, colour or creed, condemns apartheid and racial discrimination and fully supports the just struggle of the people of Azania against the illegal racist minority régime in Pretoria and for the achievement of their just and inalienable rights.

My Organization - which has always kept a close watch on developments in Africa since 24 of its members belong to that great continent - has actively

(Mr. Ansay)

participated in all efforts exerted by the United Nations, the Organization of African Unity, the Non-Aligned Movement and a number of other international bodies and organizations, to bring the apartheid policy and minority rule in South Africa to an end, and at the Fifth Islamic Summit held at Kuwait from 26 to 29 January 1987, it once again solemnly declared that the eradication of apartheid in all its forms and manifestations and the establishment of a majority Government based on the free and full exercise of universal suffrage by the entire adult population in a united and non-fragmented South Africa constitute the only basis for a just and lasting solution in southern Africa. The Organization of the Islamic Conference reaffirms its support for the struggle of the valiant people of South Africa and their national liberation movement to put an end to the apartheid régime and to enable the South African people to exercise their fundamental rights and democratic liberties.

We take this opportunity to express our full solidarity with the front-line and other neighbouring countries in their support for the struggle of the African National Congress of South Africa, the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania and the South West Africa People's Organization, as has been previously stated in this body by His Excellency Mr. Pirzada, Secretary-General of the Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC). The Fifth Islamic Summit at Kuwait requested that our member States extend every kind of aid to those countries so that they might withstand the repeated acts of aggression of the racist Pretoria régime against their peoples, their sovereignty, their territorial integrity, security and stability.

The Fifth Islamic Summit at Kuwait decided, inter alia, to establish an OIC committee on South Africa and Namibia chaired by our Secretary-General. This ministerial committee will be composed of six members, designated by the OIC

(Mr. Ansay)

Secretary-General, in consultation with member States, on the basis of geographical distribution.

The Fifth Islamic Summit also urged the Islamic countries to promote the opening and establishment in their respective capitals of representation offices of the liberation movements of Namibia and South Africa and to grant them the privileges and immunities needed for the accomplishment of their mission.

The Fifth Islamic Summit also solemnly reaffirmed the legitimacy and justness of the heroic struggle waged by the peoples of South Africa and Namibia to liberate themselves from colonial domination, racist oppression and apartheid and strongly condemned the minority régime for its heinous racist apartheid policy, which constitutes a veritable crime against humanity and is a real threat to international peace and security, as well as for its continued illegal occupation of Namibia and its repeated aggression against the front-line States. The Summit also condemned the collusion, especially in the nuclear field, between the South African régime and the Zionist entity aimed at exercising hegemony over the African and Arab peoples and at hindering their economic and social development. The Summit noted with satisfaction the adoption by the United States Senate of economic sanctions against the Pretoria régime and the extension of the range of sanctions adopted by certain European countries against that régime. It also noted with satisfaction the withdrawal of some commercial firms and Western banks from South Africa and called for the continuation of such measures.

The Fifth Islamic Summit also urged the Security Council to impose wide-ranging and effective sanctions against South Africa in conformity with the provisions of Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter. It is unfortunate that a number of States have encouraged the racist Pretoria régime in persisting in its illegal and aggressive designs by their political, military, economic and other

(Mr. Ansay)

forms of assistance and support. Is it not ironic that Israel has always been especially generous in its support for the racist Pretoria régime? Is it not also ironic that the formula of so-called constructive engagement helps the Pretoria régime to be even more intransigent?

(Mr. Ansay)

It is high time for those countries to recognize the bankruptcy of their policies, which are opposed by their own peoples. It is their duty, their obligation, their solemn responsibility unequivocally to join the rest of the international community in support for the black majority in South Africa in its just struggle.

The Organization of the Islamic Conference, in accordance with the teachings of Islam and the aims and objectives of its charter, which are based on the principles of non-discrimination, equality, justice, human dignity, tolerance, peace and harmony, will continue to exert all efforts towards the total eradication of racism, racial discrimination and apartheid in all its forms and manifestations, wherever they exist.

The PRESIDENT: I thank Mr. Ansay for the kind words he addressed to me.

There are no further speakers for this meeting. The next meeting of the Security Council to continue consideration of the item on the agenda will take place tomorrow, Friday, 20 February 1987, at 10.30 a.m.

I must again appeal to members and ask that we start our meetings on time. We went past the hour today because we started late; so I ask again that we all make a special effort to arrive on time so that we can start promptly at 10.30.

The meeting rose at 6.25 p.m.