



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-SECOND YEAR

1994th MEETING: 28 MARCH 1977

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1994)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The question of South Africa: Letter dated 9 March 1977 from the Permanent Representative of Nigeria to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/12295) .	1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/. . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements of the Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

1994th MEETING

Held in New York on Monday, 28 March 1977, at 10.30 a.m.

President: Mr. Andrew YOUNG
(United States of America).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Benin, Canada, China, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, India, Libyan Arab Republic, Mauritius, Pakistan, Panama, Romania, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America and Venezuela.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1994)

1. Adoption of the agenda

2. The question of South Africa:

Letter dated 9 March 1977 from the Permanent Representative of Nigeria to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/12295)

The meeting was called to order at 11 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The question of South Africa

Letter dated 9 March 1977 from the Permanent Representative of Nigeria to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/12295)

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decisions previously taken by the Council [1988th-1991st meetings], I invite the representatives of Algeria, Bahrain, Botswana, Egypt, Ghana, Guinea, Indonesia, Kenya, Liberia, Madagascar, Mauritania, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, the Syrian Arab Republic, the United Republic of Tanzania, Yugoslavia, Zaire and Zambia to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber, on the usual understanding that they will be invited to take a place at the Council table when they wish to address the Council.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. A. Rahal (Algeria), Mr. S. M. Al Saffar (Bahrain), Mr. T. Tlou (Botswana), Mr. A. E. Abdel Meguid (Egypt), Mr. T. B. Sam (Ghana), Mr. M. S. Camara (Guinea), Mr. A. Marpaung (Indonesia), Mr. F. M. Kasina (Kenya), Mrs. A. Brooks-Randolph (Liberia), Mr. H. Rasolondraibe (Madagascar), Mr. M. El Hassen (Mauritania), Mr. L. O. Harriman (Nigeria), Mr. M. Fall (Senegal), Mrs. S. Y. Gbujama (Sierra Leone), Mr. I. B. Fonseka (Sri Lanka), Mr. M. Allaf (Syrian Arab Republic),

Mr. S. A. Salim (United Republic of Tanzania), Mr. J. Petrić (Yugoslavia), Mr. Umba di Lutete (Zaire) and Mr. D. W. Kamana (Zambia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

2. The PRESIDENT: In addition, I should like to inform members of the Council that letters have been received from the representatives of Cuba, Mongolia and Togo, in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the question on the agenda. Accordingly, I propose, in accordance with the usual practice and with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, under the provisions of Article 31 of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

3. In view of the limited number of places available at the Council table, I invite those representatives to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber, on the understanding that they will be invited to take a place at the Council table whenever they wish to address the Council.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. R. Alarcón (Cuba), Mr. T. Puntsagnorov (Mongolia) and Mr. A. Kodjovi (Togo) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

4. Mr. KIKHIA (Libyan Arab Republic): Mr. President, first of all I should like to welcome and congratulate you on both your new assignment as the Permanent Representative of the United States to the United Nations and your assumption of the presidency of this august body, the Security Council, during the current month.

5. I should like, on behalf of my delegation, to avail myself of this opportunity to thank your predecessor, Ambassador Murray, the Deputy Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom, for the excellent manner in which he conducted the proceedings of the Council during the month of February.

6. Also, I should like to take this occasion to express the sympathy of my delegation and my Government as well as of my people to the people and Government of the Socialist Republic of Romania on the news of the earthquake that has recently tragically devastated parts of that country. May I also be allowed to request our colleague, the representative of the Socialist Republic of Romania, to forward these heart-felt expressions of sympathy to the Romanian Government and people.

7. We have been saddened by the death of His Excellency, Mr. Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed, President of India. The noble efforts and devotion to duty displayed by him are a tribute not only to his own person but also to the noble and great country that he led. His memory will be honoured for a long time to come. I ask that our colleague, the Permanent Representative of India, convey these sentiments and the condolences of my delegation, my Government and my people to the Government and people of India.

8. The tragic death just a few days ago of the President of the People's Republic of the Congo, Commander Marien Ngouabi, also saddened us for, as fellow members of the Organization of African Unity, we have come to appreciate his own and his Government's progress on our continent. We are confident that the people of the People's Republic of the Congo will endure with patience their sorrow and the loss of their great leader.

9. Seventeen years have elapsed since the brutal massacre at Sharpeville of unarmed Africans demonstrating against the inhuman treatment inflicted upon them by the racist régime of South Africa. Since that time, the African people in South Africa have intensified their struggle against the inhuman policy of *apartheid*. The United Nations has adopted several resolutions demanding that the racist régime of South Africa respect the principles of humanity and its international obligations under the Charter. Yet, instead of complying with those resolutions, the racist minority régime of South Africa has consistently defied the international community and intensified its racist oppression against the indigenous people of South Africa. The Soweto massacre of 16 June 1976, which was strongly condemned by Security Council resolution 392 (1976), was a clear indication that that racist régime intended to continue its evil policy of *apartheid*.

10. In Namibia, the racist minority régime continues its illegal occupation of that Territory in defiance of Security Council and General Assembly resolutions. Such illegal occupation prevents the United Nations from exercising its responsibility for the people and Territory of Namibia. The racist régime continues to establish military installations in the Territory for use as a springboard to commit aggression after aggression against neighbouring States. In this regard, the Security Council, in its resolutions 387 (1976) and 393 (1976), has condemned the racist régime of South Africa for its flagrant aggressions against the People's Republic of Angola and the Republic of Zambia during the past year.

11. There can be no doubt that the situation in South Africa is extremely grave and at a stage where it threatens international peace and security, and there can be no doubt that the cause of that tension is the nature of the ruling racist establishment in South Africa. That racist régime perpetrates the inhuman policies of racial discrimination and *apartheid* and is determined to continue perpetrating those policies which contravene the principles of the Charter, those principles which express the hope and faith of mankind in human rights and in the dignity and value of the individual without distinction of any kind as to race, colour, sex, language or religion.

12. The policy of *apartheid* is rejected and condemned by both the Security Council and the General Assembly, as well as by the whole international community which considers it a crime against the dignity of the human being, constituting a source of tension imperilling international peace and security.

13. In order to maintain itself and its domination of the African people in South Africa and in order to deceive world public opinion, the racist régime in South Africa has resorted to its policy of so-called African homelands or bantustans. The creation of those so-called bantustans is directed at the division of the African people into tribal entities and they are so arranged as to become mini-hostage States, completely dependent upon and prisoners of the white minority racist régime of South Africa. In such a manner, the economies of those so-called homelands will serve mainly the purposes and ambitions of that racist minority.

14. The racist minority régime at Pretoria seeks to achieve many objectives through its bantustan policy. Among those objectives are the following.

15. First, it seeks to mislead world public opinion and deceive the international community into believing that the racist minority régime is attempting to provide those so-called homelands with their independence and their right to provide those so-called homelands with their independence and their right to self-determination. But the world community has not been deceived and has taken a strong stand against those manoeuvres. In fact, that policy has been shattered by the General Assembly, in its resolution 31/6 A, calling for non-recognition of the Transkei. In this regard, it is worth noting here that the General Assembly's declaration was preceded by those of the thirteenth Summit Meeting of the Organization of African Unity, held in Mauritius, and the fifth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries held at Colombo, both of which called for non-recognition of that counterfeit entity.

16. Secondly, it aims to divide the indigenous inhabitants of South Africa on the basis of tribalism in order to portray them as belonging to different communities not related one to another and as not being related to one country or one nation. In this manner, the white racist minority would be presented as being the largest single group when individually compared with the different African tribes. In fact, these attempts were blatantly revealed by Mr. Connie P. Mulder, Minister of Information of the Vorster régime, when he said "The white population in South Africa is not a minority but a majority since the four million whites outnumber each tribe."

17. Thirdly, the régime seeks a continuation of the economic exploitation of the inhabitants of those so-called homelands. Those African people are obliged to work for the benefit of the economy of the white areas, in mines, in agriculture and in industry, with wages so low that they are in most cases below the poverty line. Furthermore, those so-called homelands have been allocated arid and poor areas for the express purpose of making their inhabitants completely dependent on work in the mines and factories

of the white inhabitants of South Africa. On this occasion, it is of interest to quote Mr. Vorster who, in 1968, said in Parliament,

"It is true that there are blacks working for us. They will continue to work for us for generations. . . . The fact of the matter is this: we need them because they work for us. . . . Under no circumstances can we grant them those political rights, neither now nor ever."

18. The so-called homelands policy pursued by the Pretoria régime to deprive and oppress the indigenous inhabitants of South Africa is a corner-stone of the overall policy of *apartheid*. Like the overall policy of *apartheid*, that policy has faced extensive criticism and fierce opposition both inside and outside South Africa.

19. Inside South Africa, there have been demonstrations and riots in which various sectors of the inhabitants of South Africa have participated, including students, workers, members of sporting clubs and many others. Those riots and demonstrations, which have occurred throughout the country, beginning at Soweto and then at Johannesburg and Cape Town, can only be viewed as an unambiguous indicator of the opposition of the inhabitants to the policy of *apartheid* and therefore to the policy of so-called homelands. Those riots and demonstrations and the turmoil South Africa is experiencing, are the expected and inevitable result of the oppression and deprivation that has faced the African people over the years and still faces them today. The minority régime in South Africa opposed those demonstrations with force and violence in the mistaken belief that it could thereby further suppress and control the African peoples of Soweto and elsewhere. However, the demonstrations continued and in fact spread to all parts of South Africa, indicating beyond all shadow of a doubt that the people of South Africa were determined to persevere in their struggle against the policies of *apartheid*.

20. The policy of so-called homelands is opposed even by the chiefs of the African tribes and by leaders of the so-called homelands themselves. In this regard, I should like to draw the attention of the Council to the conference of the chiefs of the eight remaining so-called homelands, held in the middle of November 1974. At that conference, the proposal to grant autonomy to those so-called homelands was rejected. Instead the chiefs demanded equal rights with the white-minority inhabitants within the framework of a single State in South Africa. That demand was well expressed by Chief Gasunkulu of Transvaal when he stated that if the indigenous African people were to agree to the so-called bantustan scheme, they would lose their claims to South Africa's wealth and they would have to abandon their claims to an economy which they had helped to build up. At the same conference, Chief Buthelezi declared "South Africa is one country. It has one destiny. Those who are attempting to divide the land of our birth are attempting to stem the tide of history."

21. With the collapse of the Portuguese racist régime in April 1974, the Vorster racist régime lost a very important ally. Since then, the racist régime of South Africa has spared no effort to strengthen its relations with the racist

Zionist régime in occupied Palestine. The relationship and co-operation between the two racist régimes was presented in detail in the report of the Special Committee Against *Apartheid*.¹ That report clearly shows how the rapid growth and expansion of the relations between those two racist régimes reached a higher level after the visit of the Prime Minister of South Africa to the Zionist entity in occupied Palestine in April of last year. Also, on 15 March 1977, *The Christian Science Monitor* referred to that co-operation between the two racist régimes. It said:

"South Africa has long been purchasing arms from Israel, supplying it with diamonds and other raw materials, and sharing technology in such areas as railroads, development of gas energy from coal, and arms manufacture."

The same newspaper continued:

"The Israeli daily newspaper *Maariv* reported last December 9 that Israel's Tadiran electronics firm, a subsidiary of Israel Aircraft Industries, has built a plant at Rosalene, near Pretoria, in partnership with a South African group under the name Consolidated Power."

This relationship of co-operation was strongly condemned by the General Assembly in its resolution 31/6 E. I should also like to quote from the first Afro-Arab Summit Conference Meeting, held at Cairo from 7 to 9 March 1977, which declared:

"The Afro-Arab Summit Conference decides that increased efforts should be made within the Organization of African Unity, the League of Arab States and the United Nations and all other international forums to find the most effective ways and means of accentuating, at the international level, the political and economic isolation of Israel, South Africa and Rhodesia, so long as the régimes of these countries persist in their racist, expansionist and aggressive policies. To this effect, the Conference affirms the need to continue to impose a total boycott, political, diplomatic, cultural, sporting and economic and, in particular, the oil embargo against these régimes." [S/12298, annex, para. 8.]

22. The Vorster racist régime would not be able to defy United Nations resolutions and world public opinion were it not for the material and moral support it obtains from the same industrialized countries. It is indeed absurd that those Powers, while claiming to be opposed to *apartheid*, are increasing their support for Vorster and his racist régime. They are defending him in the General Assembly and in the Security Council in order to prevent any international decision on the implementation of effective measures against the racist régime. These States and others which continue their non-compliance with United Nations resolutions and which continue to expand their economic relations with the racist entity must be made aware of their responsibilities to the international community. Those who aid and abet the racist régimes in Africa must know that they are aiding the enemies of Africa, and that they will

¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-first Session, Supplement No. 22A*.

face the consequences of their actions. They must choose between Africa and the enemies of Africa. These countries must be made aware that the Africans, supported by all peace-loving peoples, will never forgive these irresponsible and sometimes criminal actions.

23. On 7 March, *Time* magazine published an interview with Vorster. Asked if he was still convinced that his policy of creating black homelands within South Africa was the way to solve the country's racial discrimination, Vorster said: "I absolutely believe that this is the only solution. Any other solution will lead to chaos." In reply to another question—why it was not possible for blacks to have the vote within South Africa itself—he answered: "I'm prepared to give them all the opportunities for local government, for recreation and social activities. But political rights in the white area, no."

24. Certainly, the racist régime in South Africa persists in its criminal racist policy because of the help, encouragement and protection received from its partners among the Western industrialized Powers.

25. Both experience and history teach us that there can be no peace without justice and that justice cannot be attained except in the context of equality. A peace that is imposed and enforced by force of arms is not peace at all; it is surrender and subjugation. Those people who are struggling to achieve freedom and independence will never bow down and allow themselves to be subjugated. In order to ensure peace in southern Africa, the African people of South Africa, Zimbabwe and Namibia must obtain justice with self-determination and independence.

26. At this critical stage, the Security Council is bound to carry out its responsibility to maintain peace and security, and in particular, first, to condemn strongly the racist régime of South Africa for resorting to massive violence and repression against the African people and demand that this racist régime end and abolish its policy of bantustanization, abandon its policy of *apartheid* and work to achieve majority rule based on justice and equality; secondly, to take the necessary measures under Chapter VII of the Charter to end the defiance by this racist régime of United Nations resolutions and to end its illegal occupation of Namibia; thirdly, to demand that all States cease forthwith the sale and shipment of all kinds of arms to the racist régime of South Africa, and that those which have not yet done so, sever forthwith all relations with this racist régime; fourthly, to support and assist the people of southern Africa and their authentic liberation movements in their struggle for the dignity and freedom of man.

27. In conclusion, I should like to assure you that my country will continue, as it has always done, to give vigorous support and assistance to the people of southern Africa in their struggle against racism and *apartheid* and for freedom, self-determination and independence.

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

29. Mr. SAM (Ghana): The question of South Africa has remained intractable for so long and contains elements so provocative of serious threats to the peace of southern Africa, and, progressively, that of Africa and of the entire world, that no apology should be necessary for the increasing preoccupation of both the General Assembly and the Security Council, not to speak of other international organizations and bodies, with the consideration of all possible ways of resolving it. The delegation of Ghana has requested to be allowed to participate in the Council's debate in the hope that its views will contribute to a final solution to the problem.

30. I should like to express my delegation's gratitude to you, Sir, and the members of the Security Council for agreeing to listen to our views. It is a refreshing experience for my delegation to address this most distinguished body under your presidency. We of the Ghana delegation have studied with care and have been impressed by the statements which you have made since your assumption of the duty of Permanent Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations. My delegation is honoured by the opportunity to work with a man of such distinction, imbued as you are with a dedication to the struggle for the restoration of the rights of individuals. There is no doubt in our minds that the rights of the majority population of South Africa will command even greater attention from a man of your calibre and from the Government which you represent.

31. The Government of the United States, under President Carter's leadership, has inspired new hopes for justice and peace. My country has noted with considerable satisfaction the stupendous role which the President has played in persuading the United States Senate to reimpose the ban on the importation of chrome from Rhodesia. Ghana therefore hopes that henceforth, and through United States leadership, the Western world in particular will begin to adopt a more realistic and positive attitude to African aspirations and concerns, particularly those affecting the African population of South Africa. We recall in this connexion the following noble words used by President Carter during his inauguration address:

"Because we are free we can never be indifferent to the fate of freedom elsewhere. Our moral sense dictates a clear-cut preference for those societies which share with us an abiding respect for individual human rights."

We of Ghana translate those words to mean a declaration that the announced clear-cut preference cannot possibly apply to South Africa, which, as is common knowledge, can be accused of anything but an attachment to the fate of freedom or respect for individual human rights, or both.

32. The history of the problems created by white settlers in South Africa and their predecessors is so well known and has been so often repeated in the Council and other organs of the United Nations, that my delegation should be excused for not wanting to give the Council another lecture on the history of South Africa. It is sufficient to recall that the sole purpose of the long list of atrocities which the racist minority régime and its supporters both within and

outside South Africa have continued to perpetrate against the indigenous Africans of that country, and indeed against all people who are neither European in descent nor obviously white, is to perpetuate their greed at the incalculable expense of non-whites on the basis of the disgraceful myth that would have their whiteness viewed as synonymous with some divine right to racial superiority. But for this greed and penchant for materialism to the exclusion of all other considerations, it would be totally illogical for the racist minority régime of South Africa, even when it suited its purposes, to bestow, among other things, the dubious accolade of "honourary whites" upon non-whites of any type, no matter how considerable the latter's economic weight or clout might be.

33. It is that combination of uncontrolled greed and a consciously and systematically ingrained racism which makes the régime of South Africa, like Hitler's Nazi régime, a serious danger to world peace and security. The veritable threat to peace posed by South Africa is made more serious by the fact that South Africa has in recent years, again like Hitler's régime, pursued a policy of aggression against neighbouring African States, in a futile effort to cow them into submitting to its domination and to its brand of racist exploitation. Through that policy, South African troops have launched attacks against the new Republic of Angola and against Zambia, and continue to occupy the United Nations Territory of Namibia. Further, it is largely through South African encouragement and open assistance, that the illegal régime of Ian Smith has had the audacity to launch attacks on Mozambique, Botswana and Zambia.

34. South Africa's desperate policy to add to its already huge arsenal of weapons can be intended to achieve only one objective: that of creating a situation which will, the régime hopes, undermine or stifle the determination of the vast majority of its population to continue to resist the archaic, immoral and dangerous policy and practice of *apartheid*. Fortunately, the will of the indigenous people of South Africa has prevailed and shown that *apartheid* has no future and is therefore bound to fail.

35. The question has all too often been asked—but it will bear another repetition—as to why South Africa has always felt so secure in its policy of defiance of international opinion. There can be only one answer. That answer is that it has been encouraged in that feeling by its very powerful friends. Those powerful—mainly Western—countries continue to insist that the huge investments they have made in that country and what in their view constitute their strategic interests can only be protected and made secure by a régime as autocratic, as offensive, as racist, as murderous and as determined as the South African régime to oppress its majority population and keep them working at starvation wages, without any regard whatsoever for any of their human rights—least of all, their political rights.

36. My delegation shudders at the thought that, if the situation should arise—and such a situation is fast approaching—in which the industrialized countries of the West were faced with a choice between defending their investments in South Africa and supporting the legitimate demands, through struggle, of the oppressed African popu-

lation, the scales would tip in favour of South Africa—that is, in favour of the racist system in that unhappy country. The consequences of such a development would be too ghastly for the civilized world to contemplate. Thus my delegation wishes to tell the West to act now and to save themselves from that unhappy dilemma.

37. The considered view of the delegation of Ghana, as you might well imagine, is that investments in South Africa are investments in support of racism, oppression and inhuman and degrading treatment. They are therefore a threat to peace and security. As the custodian of international peace and security, the Council is faced with the choice of one of only two options: either to act now to stave off future conflict of huge dimensions, or to fail to act now and thus make such a conflict inevitable. This is the rationale behind our call to the Council to impose an embargo on all further investments in South Africa and to ensure the institution of machinery for the supervision of the total withdrawal from that country of all past investments as well.

38. The persistent intransigence of South Africa also derives from the encouragement it has always received to view itself as a protector of Western strategic interests in the South Atlantic and Indian Oceans. The premise of this argument would seem to be that any black African government in South Africa, however democratic it might be, even in Western terms, and however studiously faithful it might be to all the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, could only be regarded as an enemy of the West. My delegation views this as a most sickening proposition. If this is not a clear case of giving a dog a bad name for the sole purpose of hanging it, I do now know what else is.

39. It is this blind theory which has been mainly responsible for the support which the West has continued to give to the racist régime, and which has prolonged the suffering and nightmares of the African population. The time has come when all of us have to examine our consciences critically. Freedom and justice under majority rule are the stakes in South Africa—not any one ideology. The idea that the indigenous people of South Africa are struggling for majority rule only to surrender their freedom to another foreign Power is too offensive, too insulting and too thoughtless for my delegation to wish even to argue against it. If freedom and justice cannot be attained through any other means than by armed struggle, then armed struggle is legitimate and help received from any quarters for that purpose can only be welcome and considered as friendly. It is for this reason that we are most grateful to our friends of the socialist world for their continued assistance in this regard. We appeal to them to continue to offer such assistance.

40. Other friends who aid the African struggle for independence and majority rule through their humanitarian assistance, however, insist that the struggle is permissible only if it is carried out by peaceful means. But they do not indicate what means will be so peaceful as no longer to endanger the lives of the majority population of South Africa, Namibia and Zimbabwe. All the avenues for peaceful change in those territories, and particularly in

apartheid South Africa, have been tried. From 1910 to the Sharpeville massacres in 1960 and those at Soweto only last year, the South African régime has had only one set of answers to struggle by peaceful means. The régime's answer has been more imprisonments, more banishments, more bans, more oppression and repression and more murders of the unarmed. Thirty-one years of discussions and resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council have proved equally futile. It is no wonder then that the patience of the people of South Africa is now at its lowest ebb. A people can never allow itself, and indeed has no right, to remain peaceful in the face of all determined efforts either to decimate it or to keep it enslaved forever.

41. At this point I would remind the Council of a statement attributed to Mr. Connie Mulder, the Information and Interior Minister of the racist minority régime of South Africa. The statement appeared in an article written by Mr. Jim Hoagland in *The Washington Post* of 16 February under the title "South Africa, with U.S. Aid, Near A-Bomb". Without denying or confirming the alleged United States assistance to South Africa in its development of nuclear technology to within two to four years of manufacturing an atomic bomb, Mr. Mulder stated:

"Let me just say that if we are attacked, no rules apply at all if it comes to a question of our existence. We will use all means at our disposal, whatever they may be."

He then added, rather pointedly:

"It is true that we have just completed our own pilot plant that uses very advanced technology, and that we have major uranium resources."

42. One may well ask who this potential attacker of South Africa could be? Is it an African country or some other foreign Power? It is obvious to my delegation that the attack that the racists of South Africa have in mind can come only from within South Africa itself and only from the long-disenfranchised majority. Now we have further proof of the intentions behind the rapid arms buildup and development of atomic energy. Those weapons are to be used to wipe out the indigenous Africans if needed. This is the additional reason for the racist régime's herding those Africans into bantustans which will provide easy targets.

43. At last the opportunity that protagonists of peaceful change have always sought has arrived. This is the last opportunity for peaceful means. Those means lie within Chapter VII of the Charter. Let those protagonists have the courage and foresight to decide upon a mandatory embargo of arms and shipments to and investments in South Africa in accordance with the numerous wishes expressed by the vast majority of the international community, particularly in General Assembly resolution 31/6 of only three months ago.

44. In this connexion, my delegation feels proud also to draw attention once again to the resolution adopted at Accra by the young men and women of the World Federation of United Nations Associations, at the session of their Executive Committee held from 19 to 21 March this

year. That resolution which, on the instructions of my Government, I have had the honour to communicate to the Secretary-General for the attention of both the General Assembly and the Security Council, has since been published as an official document. With your permission, I shall quote that resolution:

[For the text, see S/12305 of 24 March 1977.]

45. My delegation is of the view that this is one time when the Council should not conclude its debates without adopting a resolution. Failure to adopt a decision would necessarily be seen as proof of the Council's unwillingness to have the question of South Africa resolved without further bloodshed and suffering; it would be too obvious an invitation to an intensification of the armed struggle and to unnecessary sacrifice of lives, not only in South Africa but also in Namibia, Zimbabwe and the entire southern African area. The Council's failure to adopt a firm resolution in support of total sanctions, particularly including a total mandatory embargo on investments in and arms for South Africa, would be too cynical and too cruel an invitation to a racial war, with unforeseeable consequences for the peace of Africa and probably of the entire world. History could never forgive such callousness.

46. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Kenya, whom I invite to take a place at the Council table and to make a statement.

47. Mr. KASINA (Kenya): Mr. President, first I should like to convey to you my delegation's warm congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month. Secondly, I should like to thank you and the members of the Council for allowing my delegation to participate in this important debate, over which it gives me great pleasure to see you presiding. Your contribution to the cause of human rights in your own country is well known and admired by the people of Kenya and indeed the world over. It is really fitting that you should be in the Chair when we are discussing the problem of political and human rights which are so indiscriminately violated in southern Africa.

48. The situation in South Africa continues to threaten international peace and security. The attention of the Security Council has been drawn to that grave situation on numerous occasions by many States and international organizations and yet the Council has not come up with a final solution. The reason for this failure is mainly that friends and supporters of the racist régime have continued to resist world opinion against the régime.

49. For the last 31 years, the United Nations has been seized of the problem of the policies of *apartheid* in South Africa. Numerous resolutions have been adopted each year in which the South African régime has been requested to abandon its policies of *apartheid*. It is all clear to us that, in contravention of international appeals, the racist régime continues its ruthless oppression of the black people and the opponents of *apartheid* in South Africa.

50. We are witnessing today one of the most reprehensible of the evils confronting mankind in the last quarter of the

twentieth century. The policies of *apartheid* represent the most flagrant and glaring violations of human rights and a system of racial tyranny without equal in human history.

51. The barbaric Sharpeville massacre 17 years ago is a reminder that South Africa was determined to enforce its policies of *apartheid* by the use of force and police brutality. Though South Africa was condemned by this body for the Sharpeville massacre, it was quite clear that such condemnation was not enough to deter the racist régime from such heinous crime. We warned then that unless South Africa was punished for that crime, it would be encouraged and would continue to perpetrate further atrocities against the innocent Africans. Apologists of the Vorster régime were quick to come to its defence. They told us that the Sharpeville massacre was only an isolated incident and that, in any case, it was an action taken to preserve law and order.

52. No sane person can claim that the brutal police killing that has been going on in South Africa since that massacre is a step taken to maintain law and order. It is systematic police brutality to force the black people to accept the inhuman policies of *apartheid*. That wanton and brutal suppression culminated in the wave of mass killings of innocent people at Soweto on 16 June last year. What happened at Soweto, Cape Town and other areas, was an act of courage on the part of non-whites in South Africa. The demonstrators were not rioters, as the racist régime tried to convince the world. The recent mass uprising at Soweto, Cape Town and other areas of South Africa, has been a spontaneous reaction of the people against oppression, repression, continued exploitation and the denial of their fundamental human rights and dignity. The war for freedom has set foot on Azania. Vorster and his collaborators must realize that Azania will be free. No amount of brutal murders, suppression and detention of black and non-white will turn back the hands of the clock of freedom in Azania.

53. The *apartheid* system, in the disguise of what Vorster calls "separate development", is the biggest fraud ever conceived by the régime. This is the creation of the so-called bantustans or homelands for black people. The blacks are being forced into the so-called homelands, which are economically non-viable and non-contiguous tracts of empty veld. The so-called homelands are scattered among the so-called white areas. The fraudulent aspect of this exercise is the fact that the whites, with less than 17 per cent of the country's population, have 87 per cent of its land reserved for them by law. The non-white 83 per cent of the population is left to share only 13 per cent of the land.

54. Is it possible for anyone to envisage the homelands as flourishing independent countries whatever their shape and size? They are mostly unwanted land—what was left by the pioneer white farmers and miners—with virtually no industries. What is more, nearly half of South Africa's Africans do not live in those so-called homelands. By the system of bantustanization, if ever it were to be accepted, more than half the black population of South Africa would automatically be condemned to become stateless people in their own

country. How is it possible for anyone to accept this as a proposal to create "independent" African States inside South Africa? At its thirtieth session, the General Assembly adopted a resolution rejecting South Africa's policy of bantustans and calling upon Member States not to recognize such "independent" States [resolution 3411 D (XXX)]. It is really ironical that some Members could not support the resolution calling for non-recognition of the so-called homelands.

55. The system of *apartheid* of the racist régime of South Africa has been extended to Namibia. The régime continues to occupy and colonize Namibia, in defiance of the United Nations and international opinion. This situation is intolerable. The illegal occupation and the imposition of the abhorrent *apartheid* system are not only a violation of fundamental human rights but also the denial of the Namibians' inalienable right to self-determination. Condemnation of the illegal occupation is not enough. We have condemned it many times. What is needed now is positive action to dislodge and end the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa. Effective means, such as economic and other sanctions, must be taken to force South Africa to comply with the decisions of the international community. We request all countries to put the interests of human dignity above short-term economic interests and to cut their economic ties with South Africa so long as that régime continues its defiance of the United Nations as manifested by its illegal occupation of Namibia.

56. The internal problems of South Africa are not confined within the country; the régime has tried on many occasions to extend its policies of aggression to independent African States. Immediately after the collapse of Portuguese colonialism in Africa, the racist régime of South Africa was quick to rush its troops to Angola to establish its own type of colonialism, and to prevent the consolidation of an independent State of Angola. Last year, in the Council, we heard a record of well-documented acts of aggression committed by this régime against the Republic of Zambia. In the same year, again in the Council, we heard the complaint of the Government of Lesotho, when the same régime closed its borders with Lesotho, with the obvious intention of forcing that country to recognize its policies of bantustanization. Such acts of aggression convince us that South Africa, in its effort to perpetuate its racist policies inside the country, is prepared to carry the war to the neighbouring independent States, which are strongly opposed to its *apartheid* policies. Such acts must be condemned by the international community.

57. The recent military expansion by the South African régime is a proper reflection of its aggressive policies in southern Africa. The enlargement of the military budget has been carried out to safeguard the security of the *apartheid* system. The actions of the régime do not give signs of a search for possible means of peaceful change. On the contrary, it has chosen to live in an armed camp portraying military aggressiveness to maintain the *status quo*, no matter what the cost, in both human and economic terms. My delegation would like to urge the world community, collectively, to persuade or to force South Africa to face the inevitable. The will of the people is

stronger than the gun and, in the end, it is the will of the people that will triumph. This fact has been demonstrated in human history many times.

58. For its military and economic strength South Africa is almost, if not wholly, dependent on certain Western countries. With the military and economic support, which South Africa obtains from certain Western countries, it has been able to build a powerful military force which has made it feel comfortable enough to defy any resolution of the United Nations. As long as Members of this Organization, and particularly those Western countries continue to supply South Africa with arms and to trade and invest in that country, we shall not be able to persuade the racist régime to change its racial policies.

59. It is lamentable that, despite numerous appeals by the United Nations to all Member States to cut their economic ties with South Africa, trade between certain Western countries and that régime has increased tremendously. Indications are that there is a massive flow of foreign capital into South Africa in long-term loans to both government and private sectors. The South African Government is certainly using this expansion of trade and foreign loans to acquire more armaments. Such economic transactions directly and concretely help to perpetuate the repugnant policies of *apartheid* and colonialism. How can we the Members of this Organization force the South African régime to abandon its brutal policies when certain powerful Members contribute so much to its economic growth and military strength? Respect for human dignity and the principles of human rights should not be mortgaged simply because of short-term economic gains. Those States should subscribe to the noble ideals of the promotion and protection of human rights. Therefore, no Member of the Organization should trade with a country that has in its legal system legislation for the enslavement of the majority of its people.

60. My delegation cannot, nor indeed can Africa and the entire group of the non-aligned countries, be accused of not having explored all channels for a peaceful political settlement in southern Africa. The Lusaka Manifesto² and the Dar es Salaam Declaration on Southern Africa, both of which the racist régime spurned with impunity, speak for themselves. Having exhausted all the channels for a settlement, my delegation sees no other way open to us now except that of requesting the Council to invoke Chapter VII of the Charter and to ensure the complete cessation on the part of all States of the supply of arms, ammunition, military vehicles and spare parts thereof and any other military equipment to South Africa. It will be recalled that this stand was adopted by the General Assembly last year in resolution 31/6 D, and that that resolution transmitted recommendations to the Council. A mandatory arms embargo against South Africa is not, in my delegation's opinion, a violent proposal. It should create no problem for those delegations which have persistently advocated a peaceful solution. The imposition of a mandatory arms embargo against South Africa is the minimum that the Council could do to solve a problem that has preoccupied

the Council and the United Nations in general for the last 31 years.

61. My delegation wishes to appeal to those Powers which have in the past vetoed mandatory arms embargoes against South Africa to desist from using their veto to protect the *apartheid* régime. This is an appeal that was made by the General Assembly to the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States. After 31 years of appeals to the racist régime, the Council should adopt a more effective way of finding a solution to this problem. Furthermore, the Council should adopt measures to discourage any foreign investments or loans to the South African racist régime. We should all realize that the racist régime's existence depends on those who trade and maintain trade relations with it. Those countries which maintain economic relations with South Africa must realize that, in so doing, they are directly helping South Africa to perpetuate its abhorrent policies and practices of *apartheid*.

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

63. Mr. PUNTSAGNOROV (Mongolia) (*interpretation from Russian*): Mr. President, first of all I should like to express my gratitude to you and the other members of the Security Council for the opportunity you have given me to speak on the question of South Africa. I should also like to congratulate you on your appointment to the post of Permanent Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations and your assumption of the important post of President of the Security Council for this month.

64. The Mongolian delegation would like to express its great sympathy to the representative of the Socialist Republic of Romania in person and to the friendly people and Government of Romania and also to the representative of Iran in connexion with the recent earthquakes which have caused so much loss of life and material damage.

65. The fact that the Security Council, upon the initiative of the African countries, is once again discussing the situation in South Africa, confirms once more the great seriousness of a problem which has been awaiting a solution for more than three decades. The explosive situation in that part of the world, which has arisen as a result of the policy and practice of *apartheid* pursued by the Pretoria régime, is in sharp contrast to the background of the contemporary international situation, which is marked by the expansion and deepening of the easing of international tension. The inhuman policy of *apartheid*, which defies the lofty goals of the Charter of the United Nations, the principles of the historic Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and also disregards numerous resolutions and decisions of the Council and the General Assembly, has now become a dangerous source of international tension fraught with the most serious consequences.

66. As we are well aware, the *apartheid* régime of South Africa is a system of violence practised by the white

² *Ibid.*, Twenty-fourth Session, Annexes, agenda item 106, document A/7754.

minority against the overwhelming majority of the indigenous inhabitants who have been deprived of the larger part of their ancestral lands and the most elementary civil rights and freedoms, and are subjected to oppression and exploitation on the basis of a system which has been elevated to the status of state policy, that is, the barbarous ideology of racism.

67. Naturally, the consequences of such a situation—which is entirely incompatible with the spirit of our times—have aroused deep concern on the part of States, regardless of their geographical location. The course of events has shown that the problem of eliminating racist régimes in southern Africa not only affects the interests of the peoples of that area and the African continent as a whole, but has also become a matter of concern to all States of the world and all people of goodwill. It is no accident that the movement of the opponents of *apartheid* has assumed such a broad international character.

68. It is precisely within that context that the Mongolian delegation attaches particular significance to the efforts aimed at the liberation of almost 20 million Africans from racist and colonialist oppression. It is quite obvious that a just solution to the southern African problems would eliminate one of the sources which poison the international political atmosphere and would substantially facilitate the establishment of stable peace in Africa and the final and total elimination of the last remnants of colonialism on earth.

69. It should be pointed out that, in recent years, great changes have occurred in the direction of the total elimination of the remaining bastions of colonialism and racism in Africa. That is demonstrated by the collapse of the Portuguese colonial empire and the emergence of new progressive States in the southern part of Africa. However, the racists are doing everything in their power to maintain their domination and are stepping up their repressive measures in an attempt to curb the intensifying liberation struggle in southern Africa.

70. As we are aware, last year the world once again witnessed bloody repression by the South African racists of participants in a peaceful demonstration of schoolchildren at Soweto who were protesting against inhumane *apartheid* laws. In June 1976, although the Security Council at a special series of meetings adopted a resolution [resolution 392 (1976)] calling on the Pretoria régime immediately to cease violence against the African population and to take urgent measures to eliminate *apartheid* and racial discrimination, the racist régime of South Africa disregarded that resolution and the appeals of world public opinion. Furthermore, it actually stepped up its policy of *apartheid* by creating the Transkei, one of the homelands which, according to the calculations of the racists, are meant to split the Africans along ethnic lines and prevent the formation of a single, united front of anti-*apartheid* fighters.

71. In addition, the Vorster racists are persisting in their occupation of the international Territory of Namibia and extending to that Territory their shameful system of *apartheid*. As shown by the documents of the Committee

of 24³ and of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*, the most flagrant violations of human rights, arbitrary arrests and torture have become everyday practices in that Territory which is groaning under the yoke of the South African racists.

72. Pretoria, along with the minority régime in Southern Rhodesia, is playing the role of an advance post of imperialism and neo-colonialism in Africa. The Smith régime, in its attempts to preserve its power over the 6 million Africans of Zimbabwe, is relying on support from the South African racists. It is no secret that the racist régimes in southern Africa are being maintained so far by the political, economic, financial and military support and assistance rendered to them by certain Western Powers and their transnational monopolies. Such broad co-operation with the racist régimes on the part of a number of Western countries can be viewed only as direct encouragement of Pretoria in the pursuit of its policy and the implementation of *apartheid*. It is quite obvious that the vast natural resources, cheap labour and extremely high profits from the exploitation of those resources, as well as their global military and strategic goals, are reasons for the special interest Western Powers and their monopolies take in maintaining Vorster's racist régime.

73. Legitimate alarm has been aroused by the intensive growth of the military potential of the racist régime which represents a real threat to international peace and security. Thanks to arms deliveries by certain Western Powers, the South African racists possess a well-equipped army and police force, which are used to suppress the national liberation movement in South Africa and in the Territory of Namibia which it occupies. In addition, the racists are threatening the sovereignty of neighbouring independent African States and have frequently committed acts of aggression against the People's Republic of Angola and Zambia.

74. The Mongolian delegation associates itself with the demands addressed to the Western Powers to desist from all military and military-technical co-operation with the racist régime. We call upon the Security Council to take effective measures to establish an embargo on arms deliveries to South Africa.

75. The attack on Benin, the dastardly murder of the President of the People's Republic of the Congo, Marien Ngouabi, and other distressing acts have reminded the peace-loving peoples of Africa and other continents that it is still necessary to maintain vigilance with regard to the designs of the imperialists and reactionary forces.

76. The Mongolian People's Republic, like so many other States, believes that the time has come to adopt more decisive and effective international measures against the racist régimes, pursuant to Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations. The position of the Mongolian People's Republic on the question of the situation in South Africa has repeatedly been set forth in official documents and

³ Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

statements. The Mongolian People's Republic categorically supports the peoples of southern Africa which are struggling for their national liberation and free and independent development along the road to social progress, and calls for the cessation of racism and *apartheid* in South Africa, freedom for Namibia and the unreserved transfer of power to the people of Zimbabwe. We express our solidarity with those fighting against *apartheid* and recognize as legitimate the liberation struggle of the indigenous population of South Africa.

77. Guided by our policy which is designed to promote the national and social liberation of oppressed peoples, our country has been giving and will continue to give all the assistance that lies within its power to the national liberation movements of South Africa, Namibia and Zimbabwe. The Mongolian People's Republic was one of the first States to sign and ratify the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of *Apartheid*, adopted at the twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly [resolution 3068 (XXVIII)]. That policy of Mongolia flows from the very essence of our social system, in which the exploitation of man by man does not exist and in which denials of national and racial equality and the instigation of racial hostility are penalized by national legislation.

78. In conclusion, I should like to express the hope that the decisions which emerge from this series of meetings of the Security Council will be an important step towards the elimination of the remnants of colonialism and racism in southern Africa.

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

80. Mr. RAHAL (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, before making the contribution of my delegation to this debate, I should like to express my personal satisfaction at seeing you in the President's chair at the time when the Security Council is discussing the situation in southern Africa. I should also like to take this opportunity to welcome you to the diplomatic family of the United Nations, where your reputation has preceded your arrival. It is a reputation which depicts you as a man of goodwill, imagination and action, free of prejudice and anxious to understand before condemning, to verify before judging and to listen to the voice of reason rather than the voice of power. I wish to assure you that, in this, you will meet with not only whole-hearted sympathy and co-operation from my delegation, but also with a desire, no less strong than your own, to engage in sincere and constructive dialogue based on mutual esteem and confidence and on the inexhaustible will to solve the problems between us and to narrow our differences by seeking beyond them for the elements of better harmony between our peoples and in the world at large.

81. The question of South Africa, which is the subject of this debate in the Security Council, in fact embraces several problems which the Council and the General Assembly have already had many opportunities to discuss and on which innumerable decisions have been taken. It is clear, however,

that it is the problem of *apartheid*—the establishment of the system of *apartheid*, the persistence of that system, its evil consequences and the measures to which its advocates have to resort in order to perpetuate it—which, in our view, constitutes the central element of the situation in southern Africa and which determines the overall evolution of that situation.

82. The problem of *apartheid* is one of those which, in all logic, should best have lent itself to effective action on the part of the international community, bearing in mind the unanimity with which the *apartheid* régime has always been condemned. I would add that action designed to eliminate such a régime would certainly have received unprecedented support from the world public, almost all of which is perfectly well informed on this problem and which never misses an opportunity to express its hostility to a racist system which clashes so violently with the most fundamental concepts of our civilization.

83. In the multiracial society of mankind, and in our world which is growing smaller every day, it must be obvious to all that the very existence and persistence of a system like that of *apartheid* represents one of the most serious threats to the maintenance of peace. Nothing could be more dangerous, in our view, than to confine ourselves to considering *apartheid* as an institution that is certainly immoral and inhuman, but that is at the same time a geographically limited phenomenon without any immediate effect on the rest of the world. The question of *apartheid* is not just a question of individual or social ethics; it is not merely a question of respect for the human person. It is a question which goes well beyond the strict framework of morality or human rights, and while its social aspect is the most obvious one, its immediate and long-term political implications represent a real danger to Africa and certainly to the whole world.

84. The question of *apartheid* cannot therefore be considered as falling exclusively within the ambit of the domestic politics of South Africa. The debates here and elsewhere on this problem make it clear that there is no controversy on this subject. The racist régime of Pretoria realizes how much hostility surrounds it, not only on its immediate frontiers but in the world at large. It also knows that the African population, which it is exploiting through its policy of racial discrimination and human degradation, will never accept that situation passively. Its constant resistance to *apartheid* is something it has never been possible to crush completely, in spite of police repression whose excesses and ferocity are familiar to everyone. On the contrary, that resistance has been strengthened from year to year and has finally become a conscious and organized revolutionary movement which nothing can now check. The Pretoria régime also knows that in the fight between it and the black people of South Africa, the rest of Africa will continue to provide whole-hearted and effective support to those whose final objective is the restoration of the dignity and freedom of the Africans. We should not be surprised, therefore, at the attempts of the racist leaders of Pretoria to extend their direct or indirect control over neighbouring areas and thus to create a security belt for their own protection. The problems of Namibia and Rhodesia are thus closely linked with that of *apartheid* in

South Africa. More precisely, Namibia and Rhodesia represent for Pretoria outer defences for the protection of the *apartheid* régime.

85. The accession to independence of Mozambique and Angola and the beginning of an essentially revolutionary movement in South Africa, in Namibia and in Zimbabwe have brought the situation in southern Africa to the forefront of international affairs. The renewed interest that has been shown recently in the quest for a settlement of the Rhodesian problem is perhaps proof that the situation in southern Africa has finally been viewed in its proper perspective and is considered a danger to peace in the area. We have already had occasion to applaud the moves that were made at that time. We have stressed their merits and have pointed out that we should judge them only by their results. If those initiatives were to develop and lead to a solution that would satisfy the aspirations of the African majority, we should of course give this our whole-hearted support.

86. But, having made that quite clear, we feel it our duty to say and to repeat here that we are convinced that no attempt can be made to solve the problems of Rhodesia and Namibia without dealing directly with the problem of *apartheid*. Moreover, it seems to us an illusion to imagine that we could associate the representatives of Pretoria with the settlement of the problems of southern Africa without directly—whether wittingly or unwittingly—is another matter—giving a certain guarantee to the *apartheid* régime. And not merely a guarantee, for how could the representatives of Pretoria offer sincere co-operation in the search for a solution to a crisis in which what is finally at stake is nothing other than the very survival of the system of *apartheid* or its disappearance?

87. I am sure we shall be forgiven for once expressing our puzzlement at the attitude of the Western Powers with regard to the situation in southern Africa and our difficulty in understanding the real reasons for what so manifestly appears to be a flagrant contradiction between their declared and confirmed condemnation of South African policy and their individual or collective attitude as expressed in the relations they maintain with Pretoria.

88. We are aware of the important economic links between South Africa and certain Western countries; we are also aware of the assistance South Africa continues to receive for the strengthening of its armaments and even for the acquisition of nuclear power. We are in a good position to know that those who are pursuing economic and material interests are generally not much bothered by idealistic or philanthropic considerations. Their deals with the racist régime at Pretoria have, as we are aware, as their sole purpose the guaranteeing of their profits and the satisfaction of their greed. So, when we call upon them today to reconsider their position and to check their calculations, we have not the least intention of attempting to stir their feelings or of arousing in them any sympathy—which would, in any case, come very late in the day—for the Africans. We are calling upon them to display vision and clear-sightedness in terms of their own interests and the guarantee of any profits they may expect; for they should not for a single moment doubt that the future of southern

Africa belongs to the Africans themselves. *Apartheid* is a régime doomed sooner or later to disappear. In banking on *apartheid*, those who have these economic interests are in fact sacrificing, for the sake of immediate profit, much longer lasting and much more secure advantages.

89. Strategically speaking, certain Western countries make no attempt to conceal their concern to prevent the emergence in the countries of southern Africa of movements or Governments hostile to Western policy in a general way. It is no secret that the Pretoria régime has always proclaimed itself the representative and champion, at the southern point of Africa, of Christian civilization and the security of the Western world. May we be permitted to say how disappointing that attitude is to us, in that it shows that the most powerful of the world have really learned nothing from all the experience of recent years. For, after all, why should they always be at such pains to categorize the liberation movements in the third-world countries as friends or enemies of the West? Can they not understand that the Africans of Namibia, Rhodesia or South Africa have but one goal: that of their own liberation, their own dignity, the restoration of their own identity as peoples and nations; and that, in order to achieve that goal, they are ready to accept any assistance, from whatever source. They do not want their freedom for the purpose of becoming pro-Western or anti-Western; they want their freedom above all in order to be themselves, to be Africans, to be men.

90. The African countries have come once again to the Security Council to ask it to live up to its responsibilities in a situation the dangers of which they have ceaselessly denounced, a situation which in their view constitutes an imminent and grave threat to world peace. Like all the members of the Council, we prefer peaceful solutions to violent ones; we understand the virtues of patience and we even find in our material weakness further reason to have recourse to persuasion rather than threats or invective. Throughout these years we have heard these appeals to reason, even to resignation. But where does reason lie? Is it in the tame acceptance of a situation unworthy of any self-respecting people? Indeed, has it not been necessary to have new uprisings, new murders, new victims, and—why not say it—the fear that the extension of these disorders may endanger strategic positions or sources of supply of raw materials, in order that the need to act should finally become apparent? And not even to act decisively, to provide a final cure to the ill, but to go on attempting to do things “on the cheap”, to preserve from the old system those advantages that can be salvaged and thus to transform what could have been the victory of civilization, of human brotherhood, of the great ideals of our Organization into an interminable succession of horse-trades without dignity and probably without honour.

91. The struggle against the system of *apartheid*, as we have already said, embraces the settlement of problems which arise from that system or are the consequence of the system, in particular the problem of Namibia and that of Zimbabwe. It is by taking action with regard to the very régime that underlies these problems that we shall be embarking upon the course of their effective solution. However that may be, this struggle, which is first and

foremost the struggle of Africans, has ceased to be exclusively theirs. It is a struggle of the entire international community. It represents a test of the will of our Organization to remain faithful to its vocation and worthy of its mission. This struggle is also—and everyone should understand this clearly—a testing ground for all Governments, whatever their tendencies and whatever the size of their responsibilities, a criterion for the measure of their sincerity and their determination to carry out their commitments and to make their deeds match their words.

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

93. Mr. UMBA DI LUTETE (Zaire) (*interpretation from French*): As this is the first time, Sir, that I have had the opportunity to speak before the Security Council in this month of March, may I be allowed to join the previous speakers in congratulating you on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for this month. For reasons beyond our control, it has not been possible, in spite of our desire to do so, to tell you personally how pleased my delegation, like others, has been to see you assuming the important and delicate functions of Permanent Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations. May I therefore take this opportunity to extend to you our congratulations and best wishes.

94. It may perhaps be felt—and rightly so, I believe—that the debate on this burning problem, coming as it does under your presidency, could not be better timed. I say that because, to our way of thinking, you represent a certain image, a certain hope. Indeed, everyone here is familiar with your record as a staunch and active militant of the worthy cause of human dignity. We are all aware of the personal interest you have constantly shown for the problems of human rights, equality and human dignity. Thus you have not only made your mark on the history of civil rights in your country, but, in addition, you have always taken an interest in the problems of our African brothers who still live in ignominious bondage.

95. As a member of Congress, you often went to Africa for meetings of the African-American Institute, whose debates have frequently focused on those problems. I remember, in 1975, at the session at Kinshasa, when I was presiding over some of the meetings, being much impressed by your keen insight and by your passion for the right and your idealism, not the blind passion or the idealism so typical of the young, but rather the kind of passion and idealism that betoken a nobility of spirit. I also remember, at the end of last year, your going to Lesotho, on the very threshold of the lion's den of South Africa. Could anyone express greater interest? Finally, at the beginning of this year, when you had just assumed your present post, you went to Africa, where you had a number of working meetings with heads of African States on the problems of southern Africa. So it is, Sir, that you not only are familiar with the problems of southern Africa, but, what is more, you know our aspirations, and certainly your convictions are based on a solid foundation.

96. I trust you will forgive me, Mr. President, for having devoted so lengthy an introduction to you personally, but in so doing I wanted to indicate the kinds of hopes that you had aroused and, finally, how delicate your task was, even though all Africans and all people that love peace and justice, had taken a common stand on this question. We do not doubt for a moment that you will live up to these expectations and that the new Administration that you represent will do likewise.

97. Some may be surprised to hear me speaking so cheerfully in the Council at a time when my people and I are in mourning and when my people is binding its wounds. I should be shedding tears over the desolation wrought by the wanton, barbaric aggression against my country. That aggression is the work of bogymen, of ideology-mongers, of mercenaries of a false latter-day crusade, of werewolves masquerading as liberators. For he who arms a murderer is himself a murderer, and indeed of the worst kind. Why? Because he is a coward and a criminal working on the sly, for he will not show his true face.

98. If I have nevertheless been anxious to speak on this question, it is because the situation in southern Africa is not the kind of question on which one can remain silent or to which one can be indifferent: it is too important and serious a matter. I also wanted to show, at this decisive moment, the closeness and solidarity which my people feels with the masses in Azania, whose dignity and self-respect have been wounded, because even if our respective persecutors belong to different camps, they are basically the same because they are equally cynical; they are unprincipled and lawless.

99. The problem of South Africa currently before the Security Council was with us even before the days of the United Nations. It is not something new. How many times has this problem been taken up in the Security Council, the General Assembly, and even in the specialized agencies? And yet the problem remains intact. It may even be said that, to a certain extent, the problem of southern Africa is, with that of the Middle East, one of the two thorniest problems that our Organization has ever had to deal with. The fact that there has not yet been even a semblance of a solution casts doubt on the prestige of the United Nations, to such an extent that some even wonder, albeit somewhat perfidiously, about the utility of the Organization. Perhaps they forget that, in the end, the worth of the United Nations is only the worth of its Members. If the Members are not business-like, if they are not sincere, then we cannot expect very much of the Organization.

100. Nevertheless, at the end of last year the General Assembly did have occasion to devote several plenary meetings to these questions and a number of pertinent resolutions on the subject were adopted. But since then, has the problem of South Africa begun to be solved? Not at all: on the contrary, it must be noted that South Africa is more arrogant than ever, for it even dares to pose as the guardian of Rhodesia.

101. In these circumstances, one wonders whether the current Security Council debate is at all useful. One may

also wonder whether the resolutions adopted will be implemented in any way. I believe that, despite everything, it is important, because the strength of the United Nations is different from other types of strength, in that it is not based on hired mercenaries or paid assassins; the United Nations does not have any atomic bombs or other weapons of that kind. But at least the United Nations has a clear conscience and is sure of having right on its side. Why? Because it represents the universal conscience, which as the representative of Algeria has just pointed out, unremittently condemns South Africa.

102. But what has been lacking in past years, I believe, is cohesion and unanimity in the Security Council, for the reluctance on the part of some of the more prominent members of the Council to condemn the South African régime and to implement the sanctions which could have weakened and isolated it, can only strengthen its stubbornness, arrogance and scorn.

103. Hence, we believe the time has come for South Africa no longer to be allowed to enjoy any protection that might tend to perpetuate its wayward, sinister policies. I say this because we have been encouraged by the intentions so often expressed by President Carter to take a firm moral stance in defence of human dignity and human rights. Could one name any other country in the world where human rights and human dignity were so disregarded and flouted as in South Africa? It is understandable, in these circumstances, that some have stressed that the problem at present before us in the Council could be a real test and might answer our question of whether this moral stance in defence of human dignity applies to the world as a whole or whether it is a selective policy. Why? Because the draft resolutions which will be presented to the Council will have the aim not only of isolating South Africa but also of safeguarding the dignity of the black man in South Africa. Vorster and his clique of henchmen must be made to feel that their régime is ostracized by the entire world.

104. If South Africa has been able to pursue its brazen policies, it is because it has always felt supported. It receives highly sophisticated weapons, the better to defy the United Nations, threaten and attack the independent States of Africa and oppress the blacks who are its own citizens. It receives various funds to promote the prosperity of the minority which exploits the black majority.

105. We believe that now the time is ripe for the unanimous adoption of the draft resolutions to be introduced by the African Group and the Group of Non-aligned Countries in the Council. The result of those resolutions must be the complete isolation of the barbarous régime of Pretoria. A total economic, financial, oil and military embargo must be imposed on South Africa.

106. However, it is not enough merely to condemn South Africa. That is much too easy. It is too convenient. South Africa, after all, is not even represented here. Minimum honesty requires that we examine our own conscience and engage in self criticism. To what degree are we, certain of us—and not necessarily those who spring instantly to mind—not also guilty of encouraging South Africa by not

respecting the resolutions which we adopt after loud debates in which we have often made the most noise? Listening to us anyone would come to the conclusion that we were all saints, and yet how often have we denounced the practices of certain States in co-operating or trading with South Africa? Each time we have been answered by cries of indignation and statements denying all contact with South Africa. I think that we should condemn that policy of duplicity and also denounce the convenient ploy, which has frequently been used, of arguing that our official Government has no contact with South Africa but that private companies, by virtue of the very principle of freedom, escape condemnation. I think that is a specious and indeed scandalous argument.

107. Many of the States represented here have strict legislation on drugs for example, and those who raise funds for drug pedlars, when they are aware of the unlawful activity, are considered accomplices and are thereby liable to harsh penalties. I believe that the Security Council should also adopt a resolution inviting States to enact legislation banning not only the sale of arms to South Africa but also any transfer of capital to that country, because lending money to South Africa, when one knows that that money is going to be used to perpetuate *apartheid*, is even more criminal, if anything, than financing trade in drugs.

108. South Africa is not only a signatory of the Charter of the United Nations, which recognizes equal rights, but it is also a signatory of the Inter-Allied Declaration of 12 June 1941, signed in London, which is generally considered to be the first of the actions which led to the creation of the United Nations. That Declaration affirmed in particular that:

“The only true basis of enduring peace is the willing co-operation of free peoples”—and I stress “free peoples”—“in a world in which, relieved of the menace of aggression”, and I also stress “the menace of aggression”—“all may enjoy economic and social security.”

We have inevitably found that everything that South Africa does is the very antithesis of that commitment, and that means that the leaders of that State can be neither excused nor spared. Still less can they be encouraged in their criminal enterprise.

109. Mr. President, I am confident in your presidency. I have confidence in the members of the Security Council and I hope that the draft resolutions which will be introduced here will be not only unanimously adopted but also implemented by all the members of the Council, above all, the permanent members, and by all the Members of the United Nations. To what must these resolutions finally lead? Not only to the economic, political and military embargo. They must also lead to the restoration of human dignity in South Africa, the restoration of the rights of the majority and the independence of Namibia.

110. The PRESIDENT: The final speaker is the representative of Indonesia, whom I invite to take a place at the Council table and to make a statement.

111. Mr. MARPAUNG (Indonesia): Mr. President, allow me to congratulate you upon your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of March. My delegation is hopeful that, under the leadership of a diplomat known for a career dedicated to the advancement of racial justice and human well-being, the Council will be able to make progress in dealing with the grave problem represented by South Africa's racial policies.

112. I should also like to take this opportunity to thank the members of the Council for having invited my delegation to participate in and make a modest contribution to this debate.

113. The situation in southern Africa as a whole and in South Africa in particular has now entered a crisis stage, both for the people of that region and for the members of the international community. It has been 31 years since the delegation of India raised the question of racial discrimination at the United Nations. Since that pioneering effort, the international community has made it clear time and again that the practice of racial discrimination in any form whatsoever is repugnant to the generally accepted standards of international conduct.

114. Despite the numerous resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council condemning the practice of all forms of racial discrimination and despite other international efforts to convince the Government of South Africa to alter its policies, it has persisted stubbornly in implementing its odious system of *apartheid* and in relegating the vast majority of the people of South Africa to the status of second-class citizens. Its callous and obdurate attitude has been responsible for inhuman suffering inflicted on untold millions of people for generations. That policy has separated husbands from their wives and children from their parents and has meant that black Africans are treated as intruders in the very land of their birth—the home of their ancestors for uninterrupted generations. In short, as a result of that policy, black South Africans are totally denied their basic and fundamental human rights.

115. The Indonesian people, as a people which once suffered three and a half centuries of colonialist oppression and racial discrimination, deeply sympathize with the plight of the South African people. In our view, the violation of their fundamental rights and dignity constitutes an assault upon the rights and dignity of human kind. It should therefore be universally opposed. In this context, it seems important to my delegation to emphasize the fact that the demands of the people of South Africa are indeed very moderate ones. They simply desire their basic right to be free, free from oppression and from starvation. They simply desire their elementary right to live as human beings and to control their own destinies, a right which has been recognized as a fundamental principle of justice and equity throughout the world and one upon which this Organization is founded.

116. Nevertheless, the South African régime has persisted in its policy of oppression and in its refusal to countenance the just demands of the black majority. Increasing resistance has been met by even more repression. Black South

Africans have not been cowed by such repression, however. The disturbances at Soweto last year sparked a chain of demonstrations and a spirit of resistance among the repressed majority of the South African people which has since increased in strength and spread throughout the country. Each week adds new names to the lists of martyrs who have been killed by the police or have died while in detention. Hundreds more are arrested and sentenced to long prison terms while the normal social and economic life of the country is thrown into chaos.

117. Despite this rising evidence of internal resistance to its policies, the Pretoria régime has continued with its plan to enforce *apartheid* in South Africa. The keystone of that policy—the establishment of the system of bantustans throughout the country—was once again condemned by the General Assembly in resolution 31/6 A. It is significant that no member of the international community has seen fit to recognize the independence of the first of those wholly artificial so-called homelands, the Transkei.

118. South Africa has been able to continue its policies of oppression and violence solely because it has received substantial economic support from certain members of the international community. While many of those States publicly condemn South African racial policies, they have continued to trade with that country, providing it with the essential economic underpinning for its odious social structure. The representative of Mauritius, speaking in the name of the President of the Organization of African Unity, has provided the Council [1988th meeting] with a picture of the growth of trade with South Africa which has taken place during the last 20 years, the increase in economic development and, particularly, the growth of the military establishment. As he pointed out, a thirty-fold increase in military expenditure has taken place in less than two decades.

119. While that large amount of trade and investment has been responsible for considerable advances in the economic well-being of white South Africans, its benefits have largely been denied to the black majority in accordance with the *apartheid* doctrines. It is a fact that that economic advance has relied very heavily on foreign trade and investments. In the light of this consideration, my delegation would like to take this opportunity once again to urge the trading partners of South Africa to use their influence to bring about a change in its policies. Indeed, it is our view that such nations have a special obligation to humanity at large to do their utmost to induce the South African Government to accede to the just demands of the black majority.

120. In this connexion, we must ask ourselves why it is that a violation of the human rights of 10 or 15 people in certain countries can raise an international outcry, while far more extreme violations and more inhuman oppression affecting 20 million black people in South Africa are invisible to the Pretoria régime's trading partners. Is it because of the black skin of the victims? Is it because the oppressors and their supporters in foreign countries share the same skin colour? Why should it be so difficult to apply the same criteria to all people regardless of their race, colour or creed? Whatever the reason, the international

community can no longer accept the application of such an odious double standard where the fundamental human rights of the black majority in South Africa are concerned.

121. It is important to recognize, in the view of my delegation, that the situation in Namibia and Zimbabwe is inseparably linked with that in South Africa and that it arises from the same racist and colonialist mentality that has conceived and fostered the odious system of *apartheid* itself. It has been Pretoria's aid and support alone which have made the perpetuation of racist and colonialist practices possible in Southern Rhodesia; it has been South Africa's racist ideology and economic interest which have sustained its illegal occupation of Namibia.

122. The violence and massive repression which South Africa has practised against its black population have also been extended to the peoples of Namibia and Zimbabwe. Recognizing this, the General Assembly revoked South Africa's Mandate over Namibia in its resolution 2145 (XXI) and assumed direct responsibility for the United Nations in the administration of the Territory. Although this resolution's validity has been reaffirmed on many occasions by the Security Council, as well as by the International Court of Justice in its Advisory Opinion of 1971,⁴ South Africa has never complied with its provisions; it adamantly refuses to withdraw from the Territory and continues to implement its policies of repression and racial discrimination there. Through the years, those policies have included arbitrary arrests, imprisonment and judicial murder of freedom fighters and civil rights leaders who represent the genuine aspirations of the Namibian people. Even women and children have been imprisoned and tortured. The illegal occupying régime has also sought to impose its system of bantustans upon the Territory, seeking to fragment its people and their land and thereby consolidate its illegal rule through the use of classic colonialist tactics. Recently it has pursued this aim through the convening of a sham "constitutional conference", which is designed to rubber-stamp the decisions of the occupying régime.

123. The list of the South African régime's crimes has been repeated so often in this chamber that we know it by heart and become sick after each session on *apartheid*, Namibia and Zimbabwe. I have no intention of torturing us much longer, but must mention that in addition to the foregoing measures, the Pretoria régime has instituted a massive military buildup in Namibia. Reliable sources report that South Africa has substantially reinforced its troops already stationed in Namibia. Those troops are provided with the most modern weapons of war, as well as with underground bunkers and aircraft hangars. A no man's zone has been created in the northern part of Namibia where thousands of innocent people have been driven from their homes and land in order to permit the illegal régime to strengthen its hold on the Territory by cutting off the flow of aid to the freedom fighters in Namibia under the leadership of SWAPO [*South West Africa People's Organi-*

zation/. Moreover, those troops have committed aggression against peaceful neighbouring countries. No objective observer can fail to conclude that these activities represent a preparation for war against the unarmed black population of Namibia, recognized as the rightful owners of the Territory by the members of the international community, at least in speeches and statements at the United Nations.

124. The situation in Zimbabwe is equally serious. Since its illegal unilateral declaration of independence in 1965, the Smith régime has managed to survive despite the condemnation of the international community and the sanctions voted by the Council, largely because of the vital aid with which it has been supplied by the South African Government. All its essential imports of military equipment and the bulk of its exports have moved through South Africa. At various times, South Africa has provided military personnel to assist the Smith régime in its repressive policies. In addition, members of the South African Government have on various occasions voiced the threat of intervening in the situation in Rhodesia should the Zimbabwe freedom fighters gain the upper hand. As recent reports make clear, that eventuality is growing more probable with each passing day, as the freedom fighters increase their forays into every part of the Territory. The Smith régime has launched attacks, also with South African aid, on the territories and populations of peaceful neighbouring States. Those acts represent an additional distinct and growing threat to the peace and security of southern Africa, stemming directly from the racist and colonialist policy pursued by the Pretoria régime. As many speakers have pointed out, the problem which confronts the Council at this critical juncture is thus a much broader one than that of the *apartheid* system alone.

125. The consequences of a failure on the part of the international community to act in the face of such threats can only be of the most serious nature. At the very least, it would mean a long period of protracted war between the black majority and their oppressors. We already see the beginnings of such a struggle by the people of Zimbabwe. Should such a conflict assume full-scale proportions in all three countries, the human suffering and bloodshed would be horrible indeed. Even more sobering, however, is the prospect that a desperate and defeated South Africa might resort to the use of the most terrible weapons of modern warfare with literally unimaginable consequences. It is therefore imperative that the international community take steps to end this danger at once, for the time available for action is very short.

126. In accordance with the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter, the Security Council is empowered to impose mandatory economic sanctions in such cases. We have already noted the vulnerability of the South African economy to such measures. In view of the Pretoria régime's unaltered refusal to comply with the decisions of the international community, my delegation wishes to take this opportunity to urge the Council most strongly to take such action, as an appropriate response to this obdurate defiance. In addition to that, we should like to urge the members of the Council to consider seriously the imposition of an arms embargo against South Africa as an

⁴ *Legal Consequences for States of the Continued Presence of South Africa in Namibia (South West Africa) notwithstanding Security Council Resolution 276 (1970), Advisory Opinion, I.C.J. Reports 1971, p. 16.*

appropriate means of stemming the rising tide of violence and killing, which has already afflicted a number of peaceful neighbouring States. In my delegation's view, it is imperative that the Council take action now to avert a crisis which possesses the potential for developing into a conflagration which could spread even beyond the borders of the African continent itself. It is only by decisive action that such a disaster can be prevented.

127. For its part, the Government of Indonesia will steadfastly continue to provide moral and material support to the struggling people of South Africa. In this connexion, I should like to quote from the message sent by President Suharto of Indonesia to the Secretary-General and the

Chairman of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* on the occasion of the International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination:

"On behalf of the Indonesian people, and on my own behalf, I reaffirm this historic commitment to the cause of freedom and racial equality, and express their determination to continue to assist those oppressed by racism and colonialism until the last vestiges of those twin evils are eradicated from the face of the earth."⁵

The meeting rose at 1.25 p.m.

⁵ See A/AC.115/L.462.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم . استعلم عنها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب إلى : الأمم المتحدة ، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف .

如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经售处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.
