



Security Council

UN LIBRARY

PROVISIONAL

FEB 23 1987

S/PV.2737
20 February 1987

UN/SC COLLECTION ENGLISH

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

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 20 February 1987, at 10.30 a.m.

President: Mr. ZUZE

(Zambia)

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

Mr. DELPECH
Mr. GARVALOV
Mr. YU Mengjia
Mr. ADOUKI
Mr. BROCHAND
Mr. LAUTENSCHLAGER
Mr. DUMEVI
Mr. BUCCI
Mr. KIKUCHI
Mr. BELONOGOV
Mr. AL-SHAALI

Sir John THOMSON
Miss BYRNE
Miss PULIDO SANTANA

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

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

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

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

THE QUESTION OF SOUTH AFRICA

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

THE PRESIDENT: In accordance with decisions taken at the previous meetings on this item, I invite the representatives of Algeria, Angola, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Ethiopia, the German Democratic Republic, Guyana, India, Kenya, Kuwait, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mongolia, Morocco, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Senegal, South Africa, the Sudan, Sweden, Togo, Uganda, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the United Republic of Tanzania, Yugoslavia and Zimbabwe to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Djoudi (Algeria), Mr. de Figueiredo (Angola), Mr. Oramas Oliva (Cuba), Mr. Cesar (Czechoslovakia), Mr. Badawi (Egypt), Mr. Tadesse (Ethiopia), Mr. Ott (German Democratic Republic), Mr. Karran (Guyana), Mr. Dasgupta (India) Mr. Kiilu (Kenya), Mr. Abulhassan (Kuwait), Mr. Treiki (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), Mr. Nyamdoo (Mongolia), Mr. Bennouna (Morocco), Mr. Icaza Gallard (Nicaragua), Mr. Ahmed (Pakistan), Mr. Sarré (Senegal), Mr. Manley (South Africa), Mr. Adam (Sudan), Mr. Ferm (Sweden), Mr. Kouassi (Togo), Mr. Kibedi (Uganda), Mr. Oudovenko (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic), Mr. Chagula (United Republic of Tanzania), Mr. Djokic (Yugoslavia) and Mr. Mudenge (Zimbabwe) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

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

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

Mr. KIILU (Kenya): Mr. President, I should like to thank you and through you, the Council, for allowing my delegation to participate in these important deliberations on the question of South Africa.

Before I proceed with my statement, however, allow me to join previous speakers in extending my delegation's congratulations to you, Sir, upon your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of February. Your distinguished career and immense experience and the outstanding role played by your country, Zambia, make you uniquely qualified and suited to preside over the Council's present deliberations. Over the years, Zambia has endured much suffering inflicted by the racist minority régime in Pretoria because of the important role it played in paving the way for the independence of its neighbours. Zambia courageously continues to bear this commitment so that democratic rule may be realized in South Africa itself. It is rare in human history for a State to sacrifice so much for others. With this rich background, we are confident that under your able guidance, the Council's present meetings will yield positive results.

My delegation would also like to pay tribute to your predecessor, the Permanent Representative of Venezuela, Ambassador Aguilar, for his able stewardship of the Council during the month of January.

From time immemorial, mankind has always rallied to eradicate a danger to its survival or an affront to the dignity of man. This concerted concern has always obtained despite the existence of only very rudimentary machinery for international action prior to the creation of the United Nations and its predecessor, the League of Nations. It is, therefore, a cruel irony and tragedy that 41 years after its founding, the United Nations, and particularly this Council, should find itself

(Mr. Kiilu, Kenya)

unable to act decisively in the face of a grave and urgent situation. The pernicious system of apartheid pursued by the racist régime poses a serious and imminent threat to international peace and security. The Security Council, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, is duty-bound to make recommendations or decide what measures shall be taken, under Articles 41 and 42 of the Charter, to maintain or restore international peace and security once it has determined the existence of any threat to the peace or breach of the peace.

The African States, separately and jointly through its continental body, the Organization of African Unity (OAU), have long considered the evil system of apartheid and the dangerous situation to which it gives rise as constituting a threat to international peace and security. Over the years, the international community as a whole, represented by the United Nations, has also joined in condemning apartheid, which has been declared a crime against humanity. At the same time, numerous appeals have been made to the minority racist régime in Pretoria to bring about peaceful change by eradicating apartheid and replacing it with a united, non-racial and democratic society.

These persistent appeals and persuasions by the international community have been met by devious manoeuvres by South Africa ranging from deceitful delaying tactics in the guise of so-called reforms to outright defiance. In the meantime, the wanton loss of human life and destruction of property perpetrated by the minority racist régime have now reached genocidal proportions. Kenya, therefore, vigorously joins the call by the Group of African States at the United Nations to this Council to live up to its Charter obligation and take effective steps capable of preventing and removing all threats to international peace and security posed by the policies and practices of the racist régime.

(Mr. Kiilu, Kenya)

The Security Council, once again, heard the representative of the racist régime add insult to injury last Tuesday, 17 February, when he arrogantly rehashed his régime's now familiar refrain on so-called constitutional dispensations. But he even had the audacity to challenge the authority of the Council to deal with the grave situation brought about by the evils of apartheid. This lame and diversionary attempt at questioning the jurisdiction and authority of the Council over the matter at hand should be rejected with all the contempt it deserves.

The Security Council has considered and adopted many resolutions on South Africa. On those occasions, the racist régime and its allies have urged restraint by asserting that international pressure would inhibit rather than promote progress towards peaceful changes resulting into the evolution of a united, non-racial and democratic South Africa. As a result, all actions by this Council to date have been limited to only the barest minimum of voluntary measures against the racist régime.

Regrettably, not only has the expectation of the international community been bitterly disappointed but also the aspirations and hopes of the vast majority of South Africans have been cruelly dashed. Instead of progress towards democracy and respect for human dignity, the world continues to witness abuse of human rights on an unprecedented scale. Moreover, the dangerous and vicious manifestations of apartheid have not only been felt within South Africa and Namibia, which the régime continues to occupy illegally, but also the neighbouring black African States have not been spared the multi-faceted devastating consequences of the evil that apartheid is.

(Mr. Kiilu, Kenya)

According to the latest information dished out of that tormented country since the clamp-down on the press, 13,500 persons have been placed under detention, including 281 children, of whom three are under 12 years, 18 under 13 years, and 91 under 14 years. Since the declaration of the state of emergency over 2,000 persons have been killed by the racist minority régime and its agents. At the same time, the Pretoria régime has persisted in its illegal armed attacks and violations of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of its neighbours, with intolerable loss of life and considerable damage to property.

The Council cannot and should not remain indifferent to the loss of innocent human life on such a horrifying scale and perpetrated with impunity in the name of so-called democracy. By its own conduct the racist régime has forfeited any claim to acting in good faith. Moreover, the régime seems to operate on a manifestly false premise when it claims that it needs more time and understanding from the international community to effect change. It has received and squandered both, while it continues to proceed on the fundamentally and irreconcilably flawed premise that apartheid can be reformed. Hence the régime has engaged in so-called cosmetic reforms whose objective is to sugar-coat apartheid in the eyes of the international community while it reinforces the evil system of apartheid within South Africa and Namibia.

Kenya, like the rest of the African States and many other States, would have very much preferred to see this Council impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII against the racist régime, as we have repeatedly called for in the past. However, in view of the prevailing circumstances, Kenya would go along with the selective mandatory sanctions similar to those approved last year by the United States Congress. The European Economic Community and other nations have also supported selective mandatory measures. All those measures are consistent

(Mr. Kiilu, Kenya)

with those already endorsed by the summit conferences of the Organization of African Unity and the Non-Aligned Movement. We consider that to be the least the Council can do for the oppressed and suffering people of South Africa. It would be a step in the right direction and a timely message to South Africa at this crucial time.

We have often and repeatedly heard self-serving assertions by the racist régime and its allies that mandatory sanctions will hurt the black populations within South Africa and neighbouring States. The front-line States and the majority of black people in South Africa have categorically rejected that premise. They have clearly told the international community to go ahead and impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions; they are prepared to suffer the consequences for the birth of a just and democratic society in South Africa. My delegation therefore cannot accept the contention that the atrocities committed by the racist régime against the black populations within South Africa or neighbouring States can be justified on the pretext of the preservation of law and order.

Accordingly, my delegation earnestly urges the Council to determine that the situation in South Africa, the régime's continued illegal occupation of Namibia, repeated armed attacks and acts of destabilization of independent States constitute acts of aggression and are a violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of those States, and that all those acts together constitute a serious threat to international peace and security. The Council should therefore proceed to take the necessary action in accordance with the Charter to compel the racist régime to abandon the evil policy of apartheid as a first and indispensable step towards the creation of a united, non-racial, democratic South Africa.

Kenya's commitment to the support of the peoples of southern Africa is firm and unequivocal. I can do no better than reiterate the following words of my own

(Mr. Kiilu, Kenya)

President, His Excellency the Honourable Daniel arap Moi, who, when bidding farewell to a departing envoy from one of the independent black States of southern Africa, said:

"Kenya closely follows the manoeuvres of the racist régime of South Africa to destabilize States in the region. Kenya is therefore fully aware of the difficulties that those countries, like Botswana and other neighbouring countries, are experiencing because of Pretoria's apartheid system."

The President went on to pledge Kenya's continued full support in the struggle to dismantle apartheid.

Equally, Kenya is fully committed to supporting liberation movements in southern Africa until Namibia achieves its independence and until a united, non-racial society is realized in South Africa itself.

We urge the Council to play its rightful role in bringing the aspirations and hopes of the peoples of southern Africa to reality, without further suffering and loss of human life.

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

Mr. ADOUKI (Congo) (interpretation from French): Bearing in mind the cordial and close relations between our two countries - the Congo and Zambia - and the deep friendship, admiration and mutual respect between our two Heads of State, allow me to take this opportunity to say how gratified I am to see you, Sir, presiding over the Security Council during this month of February. My delegation and I assure you, Mr. President, of our fullest co-operation.

At the same time I cannot fail to express our gratitude to your predecessor, our friend and colleague Ambassador Andres Aguilar of Venezuela, for the personal

(Mr. Adouki, Congo)

abilities and experience he so ably brought to bear in guiding the Security Council's work last month.

The steadily worsening situation in South Africa once again brings the Security Council to exercise its primary responsibilities as the principal organ for the system of collective security established by the United Nations Charter.

The delegation of the Congo wholeheartedly shares the grave concerns voiced here in clear and politically powerful analyses firmly refuting the assertions of Pretoria's spokesman claiming that democracy existed in South Africa, that racial discrimination measures were being eliminated and, lastly, that:

"Power in South Africa reside[d] in the hands of the moderate majority. That moderate majority includes blacks, whites, Asians and Coloureds." (S/PV.2732, p. 23)

(Mr. Adouki, Congo)

We shall therefore not revert to the latest developments in the hysteria of the South African Government, its continuing acts of domestic genocide and its practice outside its frontiers of State-sponsored terrorism, destabilization and aggression against neighbouring independent States.

Others who have spoken before us whom we support have neatly disposed of the spurious arguments of Pretoria invoked to enlist the aid of allies and partners in the West in order to save apartheid, which is like a ghost vessel taking on water heavily. I refer to the spurious arguments according to which the countries bordering on South Africa would be the ones most likely to suffer as a result of punitive actions decided on by the United Nations. A little lucidity is all that is needed to see that such base manoeuvring might at most save a little time for Pretoria but that eventually the blacks of South Africa will triumph over apartheid anyway.

For some years it has been a constant factor that all United Nations bodies that debate South African apartheid condemn it, just as they condemn the colonial régime artificially maintained in Namibia and the repeated acts of aggression of the Botha régime against independent neighbouring States.

The mobilization of public opinion in this regard has played a crucial role. Here we should pay tribute to the work of the Special Committee against Apartheid and the work done by the Secretary-General, Mr. Javier Perez de Cuellar, regarding that subregion of southern Africa.

We are pleased to note that in many regards indisputable progress has been made towards the triumph of the spirit of struggle and liberation that now invigorates the militant people of South Africa, as it has invigorated those in chains. In this regard Africa is steadily improving its organization and riposte

(Mr. Adouki, Congo)

against apartheid. The recent initiative of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), now endorsed by the Eighth Non-Aligned Summit, setting up an Africa Fund, is very promising indeed. Europe, individually or collectively, has embarked on a process that deserves respect, though its pace and substance could, we feel, usefully be improved.

The moral decision on sanctions against Pretoria taken last October by the United States Congress - a well-informed body - clearly shows increased confidence in the inescapable triumph of the blacks over apartheid. Notwithstanding certain official sympathies, a well-informed people does not go ahead and allocate such vast amounts of money to a nation it believes to be condemned.

Another step - timid but in the right direction - was the recent visit to Washington of the President of the African National Congress of South Africa, Mr. Oliver Tambo. Once branded a terrorist leader, Mr. Tambo is now regarded as a worthy interlocutor. It would be more decisive for everyone concerned if all these outright condemnations of apartheid were matched by all the increasing capabilities to intervene at the disposal of Member Governments. Comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter constitute the only true response to apartheid. We favour such sanctions because we believe in them and because of solemn commitments we have entered into in the OAU and the Non-Aligned Movement, of which we are a member.

However, sanctions are but one of the means of putting pressure on apartheid. My country would therefore have no difficulty in subscribing to sanctions such as those adopted by the United States Congress. But is the Security Council prepared to proceed along this path?

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

Mr. LAUTENSCHLAGER (Federal Republic of Germany): Permit me first of all, Sir, to congratulate you sincerely on your having assumed the high office of President of the Security Council for the month of February. I have no doubt that the deliberations of the Security Council will profit from your vast experience and your diplomatic skill.

By the same token I should like to express the appreciation of my delegation to the Permanent Representative of Venezuela, Ambassador Aguilar, who during the month of January guided the work of the Security Council so judiciously.

The deplorable situation in South Africa, well known to all of us, has not become less tense. Its causes have not been removed; promising steps towards meaningful solutions are not visible. Emergency law continues to reign. Repression and counterforce are keynotes of the domestic-policy climate. Those who bear political responsibility in South Africa still have not recognized that apartheid and racial discrimination will destroy the very foundations of government and society. They are purblind to the fact that this policy will lead into a political and human catastrophe.

(Mr. Lautenschlager, Federal
Republic of Germany)

The injustice of apartheid in South Africa engenders new injustice every day, resulting in increased persecution and harsher repression. The growing number of political detainees, which even includes children, and the ban on wide segments of the extraparliamentary opposition are plainly visible features of the emergency law. Those in South Africa who are censoring the press and suspending the freedom to express opinions with the alleged aim of guaranteeing law and order must know that to all the world such measures signify nothing but the deathly silence of a totalitarian order forced upon all.

In his inaugural address to the Parliament on 30 January 1987 President Botha announced new elections to take place in May. Indications of any fundamentally new thinking and any rejection of apartheid were lacking in that address and during the subsequent parliamentary debate. Nevertheless, we still maintain the hope that the Government to be elected will at long last realize that South Africa is at the crossroads of its history: it can either choose between racial discrimination, force and bloodshed, on the one hand, or, the realization of human rights for all its citizens, on the other. That means that blacks and whites will be able to live together peacefully in their own country only if they have equal rights. Today's events in South Africa mark a historical process. The development the South African Government is continuing to attempt to stem cannot in the long term be prevented. Indeed, South Africa can only decide whether it wishes to secure the future and the fate of its black and white populations through a just political, economic and social order shared by all, or whether it wishes to destroy government and society for good by clinging to the abhorrent system of apartheid.

The Federal Government's position on South Africa and the system of apartheid still enforced there remains unchanged. That system violates elementary human

(Mr. Lautenschlager, Federal
Republic of Germany)

rights. It is not amenable to reform; it must be abolished. The protection of human dignity is the paramount precept of our own Constitution. From that flows the commitment for us to champion human rights worldwide. With regard to apartheid and racial discrimination, we therefore can only state categorically that those who discriminate against human beings on account of the colour of their skin and deny them all rights of democratic participation, those who by force and repression stifle the liberty of expression of opinion, those who throw into gaol labour-union leaders and leaders of the churches and those who persecute the representatives of the majority and force them underground instead of negotiating with them on peace and pacification in South Africa - any Government pursuing such a policy excludes itself from the family of free nations because it tramples underfoot the basic tenets of the free world. Those in South Africa who still cling to apartheid should not be under any illusion: to us, any form of racial discrimination is and remains unacceptable. We unequivocally side with those in South Africa who are being denied their most elementary human rights.

We continue to advocate peaceful change in South Africa. Together with our partners and with the overwhelming majority of States Members of the United Nations, we urge South Africa to put an end to the state of emergency, to free Nelson Mandela and the other political detainees, to lift the ban on the African National Congress of South Africa and the other banned opposition parties and to enter into a national dialogue between black and white aimed at a peaceful settlement of all problems. We wish South Africa to regain its internal peace; we wish South Africa not to imperil external peace in the southern African region.

During the past year there have been thorough discussions on the usefulness of and necessity for economic sanctions. Today, this topic again figures on our

(Mr. Lautenschlager, Federal
Republic of Germany)

agenda. First, permit me to state the following: to those who in full sincerity call for such measures because they regard them as the ultimate means for effecting peaceful change in South Africa we do not deny either respect for their opinion or attention to their arguments. We have also followed the debate here in in the Security Council during the past few days with great earnestness. We are in full agreement with all members of the community of nations on the objective of immediately abolishing apartheid. Differences of opinion exist on how that objective can best be reached.

Like others, we take a sceptical attitude towards economic sanctions against South Africa. It is hard to imagine that increased economic pressure can succeed in effectively altering the rigid mentality of apartheid, that such a way will and can promote peaceful change or that that way can ultimately lead to the abolition of the apartheid system. The Governments of the twelve member States of the European Community too have repeatedly and intensively dealt with the question of the best and most promising way to ensure a speedy end to the apartheid system.

In June 1986 the Heads of State or Government of the countries members of the European Community decided that positive measures should continue to be the mainstay of joint European policy. This implies tangible assistance for the victims of apartheid as well as solidarity with those in South Africa who, because of the colour of their skin, are being discriminated against in their occupations, on the job, in their training or otherwise. However, at their June meeting the European Heads of State or Government also clearly stated that they would no longer exclude economic pressure against Pretoria if progress in the dismantling of apartheid were not forthcoming. The South African Government must know that our patience is not inexhaustible.

(Mr. Lautenschlager, Federal
Republic of Germany)

On 16 September 1986 the Foreign Ministers of the Twelve translated into reality the political objectives formulated by the Heads of State or Government. The Foreign Ministers imposed a ban on the importation of iron and steel as well as gold coins and decreed a ban on new investments. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany joined in those measures, despite of the scepticism it still feels. Together with its partners, the Federal Government intended to give the South African Government an unambiguous signal.

We must take seriously the threats voiced by the South African Government that it will impose counter-sanctions against the States in the southern African region. Given present economic, transportation and geographical conditions, such countermeasures might entail serious consequences. In recent years we have done much to assist the afflicted States of southern Africa in their economic plight. For some time now, Africa - and in particular southern Africa - has been one of the regions on which we have concentrated the resources of our economic co-operation. To a large extent, those resources serve to strengthen the infrastructure of African countries, above all those countries members of the Southern African Development Co-ordination Conference (SADCC). In the future we shall continue to endeavour to give effective assistance, to the best of our ability. It is an open question, however, whether all of us - jointly or individually - will be able to counter a further deterioration of an economic situation this is now already precarious. It is against that background that we call upon the South African Government to adhere to international law and to desist from its destructive and destabilizing policy towards its neighbouring States.

Permit me to stress once again that we wish a speedy end to apartheid. The oppressed people of South Africa have a claim on our solidarity. In this context,

(Mr. Lautenschlager, Federal
Republic of Germany)

however, our policy does not wish to resort to means that are likely to destroy the vital foundations of the South African population and jeopardize the economic fate of an entire region. However, the South African Government should not draw any wrong conclusions from the fact that for that reason we cannot agree to measures farin excess of those adopted by the European Community. Together with our partners, we shall resolutely live up to our convictions, and we shall never put up with the injustice of apartheid. We shall work with all our strength for the realization of human rights in South Africa.

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

Mr. GARVALOV (Bulgaria): May I congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of February. The Bulgarian delegation is convinced that under your able and wise guidance the Council will discharge its responsibilities in a most exemplary manner. We are most pleased to see an eminent son of Africa, a worthy representative of Zambia - with which my country, Bulgaria, maintains the best of relations - presiding over the Council during its debate on this important issue.

Allow me also to extend our deep gratitude to your predecessor, Ambassador Aguilar, Permanent Representative of Venezuela, who conducted the Council's work last month with outstanding skill and wisdom, which we appreciate.

I should like also to congratulate the new members of the Security Council - Argentina, the Federal Republic of Germany, Japan, Italy and Zambia - and to wish them well in their work.

The question of South Africa is once again on the agenda of the Council. Having been considered time and again by both the Security Council and the General Assembly, this question is today once again a source of renewed concern. And why is this so? Because apartheid is not only an anachronism in our times; apartheid is South Africa's system of institutionalized oppression and terrorism; South Africa's internal policies and practices are predicated on oppression and its foreign policy on aggression and aggrandizement of territory.

In recent months South Africa has stepped up its massive repression of the majority of the people in a desperate attempt to suppress intensified popular resistance and to perpetuate racist domination. Rejecting a just, peaceful, negotiated settlement of the conflict with the legitimate representatives of the

(Mr. Garvalov, Bulgaria)

vast majority of the people, the régime of South Africa has resorted to brutal force and violence in order to stifle the will of the hundreds of thousands of persons involved in the struggle against apartheid. Only last month we learned that in the course of one and a half years alone the racists of Pretoria detained over 30,000 people without trial or conviction and killed more than 2,500 innocent civilians, including women and children.

The state of emergency declared in June 1986 and the resultant mass terror are a desperate attempt by Pretoria to shore up by any means its shaky foundations. The state of emergency is yet another defiance of the international community. Once again, it unmasked the true face of apartheid. It underscored once again the urgent necessity of eliminating once and for all the system of apartheid.

South Africa continues to pursue a policy of aggression and destabilization against the neighbouring independent African States on the pretext that they provide refuge for South African national liberation movements. The latter are, however, recognized by the Organization of African Unity, the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and the United Nations as the legitimate representatives of the people of South Africa.

The policies and actions of the racist régime constitute a clear danger to the region of southern Africa and a manifest breach of international peace and security, with unpredictable consequences foreboding bloodshed and destruction of life and property.

We agree with the views stated here in the Council by various speakers and emphasized in the Final Declaration of the World Conference on Sanctions against Racist South Africa, held at Paris last year: that the racist régime of South Africa poses a grave threat to international peace and security by pursuing policies of increased internal repression and brutality in the perpetuation of

(Mr. Garvalov, Bulgaria)

apartheid, by continuing its illegal occupation of Namibia and by its acts of aggression, destabilization and State terrorism against neighbouring independent African States.

The Security Council, which has repeatedly condemned the policies and acts of aggression of South Africa, bears a special responsibility in this respect. The World Conference on Sanctions against Racist South Africa emphasized the need to adopt a comprehensive programme of action, the centre-piece of which would be the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

The overwhelming majority of Member States, as well as parliaments, political parties and movements all over the world, have called for the imposition of such sanctions. The Eighth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Harare last September, had this to say on the subject:

"the imposition of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations remains the only peaceful option to compel the racist Pretoria régime to abandon apartheid". (S/18392, p. 147)

Unfortunately, the Security Council has been unable thus far to take the requisite mandatory action, because of the opposition of certain members of the Council.

It is no secret - actually, it is common knowledge - that the apartheid régime continues to exist because of the political, economic, military and moral support of certain Western States and of the transnational corporations, which continue their plunder of the natural and human resources of South Africa and Namibia. Time has shown beyond any doubt that the policy of so-called constructive engagement has not contributed to the elimination of the system of apartheid. Even some of those

(Mr. Garvalov, Bulgaria)

opposing the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the racist Pretoria régime have come to the same conclusion. For example, The Christian Science Monitor wrote on 12 February 1987 that the panel appointed by the United States Administration to recommend future courses for United States policy towards South Africa had recommended that the United States press its allies to join in wide-ranging international sanctions against South Africa and concluded that the Administration's policy of so-called constructive engagement with Pretoria had "failed to achieve its objectives".

It is worthwhile recalling that international action against South Africa, which includes only moral censure in the form of appeals and recommendations, has failed to bring about the result intended by the international community. Limited economic sanctions against Pretoria enacted by some countries have, equally, failed. This, of course, is because the limited character of those economic and cultural sanctions has in fact left open the channels for effective economic co-operation and collaboration between the transnational corporations and the racist régime, which in the final analysis helps maintain and perpetuate apartheid.

(Mr. Garvalov, Bulgaria)

In view of those facts, no one should be surprised by the deep conviction of the international community, as reflected in the eighth preambular paragraph of General Assembly resolution 41/35 B, that the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations would be the most effective and appropriate peaceful means by which the international community could assist the legitimate struggle of the oppressed people of South Africa.

There are those who, while maintaining the closest of political and economic links with South Africa and profiting from them, declare that the adoption of comprehensive mandatory sanctions would most adversely affect the indigenous population of South Africa. This "concern" for the well-being of the people of South Africa, and for the front-line States as well, is contrary to the conclusions and decisions which the Organization of African Unity (OAU) adopted in 1986.

As to the position of the people of South Africa regarding the scope of sanctions, it was clearly stated by the representative of the African National Congress (ANC) during the meeting of the Special Committee against Apartheid on 8 January 1987. In her statement the representative of the ANC said that limited sanctions would only facilitate the plans of the racist régime to circumvent the sanctions and to impose its own sanctions against neighbouring countries.

The current discussion of the Council has also shown that the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter will undoubtedly help the common efforts to dismantle the system of apartheid.

The record of the struggle of the international community against the policy of apartheid tells of similar situations in the recent past. The similarity between the present case of South Africa and that of the former Southern Rhodesia over a decade ago readily comes to mind.

(Mr. Garvalov, Bulgaria)

Developments in South Africa have shown that today it is not enough to condemn apartheid and its policy of aggression: the time has come for concrete and independent action to isolate the racist régime and to erase from the face of earth the shameful phenomenon of apartheid, which has been rightly described by the United Nations and the international community as a crime against humanity.

In this connection, allow me to express the firm conviction of the Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria that any palliative measures in this respect would only serve the interests of South Africa and those who support it. Half-measures would only delay the eradication of that crime against the peace and security of mankind.

The Bulgarian delegation is proceeding in the Security Council on the basis of those very same premises in insisting upon the complete isolation of the apartheid régime and the application of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa. Nevertheless, aware of the fact that, at this particular moment, the draft resolution before the Security Council is precisely what the African States and the non-aligned States deem necessary, the Bulgarian delegation will support it.

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

Mr. DELPECH (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): Ambassador Zuze, may I first tell you how pleased our delegation is to see a representative of Zambia, and particularly you, presiding over the work of the Security Council. We are certain that your knowledge of the issues before us, as well as the skill that you have already demonstrated, will ensure the success of our work.

We wish also to congratulate the representative of Venezuela, Ambassador Andres Aguilar, on the outstanding work he did last month. In conducting our deliberations, he demonstrated his experience and diplomatic ability.

(Mr. Delpech, Argentina)

We wish also to thank the representative of Bulgaria for his very kind words of welcome to Argentina as a member of the Security Council.

The international community has taken an unequivocal position against apartheid. That position has been clearly reflected in many resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and the Council. None the less, South Africa has not heeded those appeals. The international press informs us daily of the systematic and violent persecution suffered by the South African nationalist leaders and sympathizers - indeed, the entire non-white population of South Africa - which has given rise to a growing and legitimate active resistance by the oppressed people of that country.

In fact, the Pretoria régime, far from recognizing its obligations to put an immediate end to its heinous and totally inadmissible policy of racial discrimination, has opted for the adoption of measures aimed at perpetuating apartheid.

The policy of apartheid, in addition to its serious consequences within South Africa, gravely disturbs the peace and security of southern Africa, as was indicated unanimously by the Security Council itself in its resolution 473 (1980) - to cite just one example. It is that same policy that is behind the periodic acts of aggression by the Pretoria régime against neighbouring countries and that underlies the constant refusal of the Government of South Africa to put an end to its unlawful occupation of Namibia and implement, without delay and unconditionally, Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which contains the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia.

My country has repeatedly and most energetically condemned apartheid as a crime against humanity, and has unequivocally affirmed its solidarity with the victims of apartheid. Aware, none the less, that words were not enough, my

(Mr. Delpech, Argentina)

Government promptly took important concrete measures, culminating in the breaking of diplomatic relations with the Government of South Africa. That action is clear evidence of the unswerving resolve of the Government of Argentina to do everything in its power to put an immediate end to racial discrimination in South Africa, and to make that abundantly clear to the Pretoria Government. That is why we have promptly and strictly implemented the measures adopted by the Security Council against South Africa, in particular the arms embargo.

Complementing that position, the Government of Argentina recently adopted other measures, including ratification of the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid. Furthermore, we are members of the Action Fund for Resisting Invasion, Colonialism and Apartheid, established at the Eighth Summit Conference of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, held in Harare last year.

We know that we are not alone in those efforts. We were pleased to see that in 1986 a number of Governments, including some with a recognized ability to influence Pretoria, adopted effective measures to increase pressure on the Government of South Africa to bring about the change in its policy that we have all encouraged.

Those measures, unfortunately, have not achieved the desired result. We are convinced that so long as apartheid is not eradicated, once and for all, it will continue to be urgently necessary for the Security Council to meet to consider the situation in South Africa. Argentina believes that this body has already clearly pointed out to the Government of South Africa the path it must follow. Its intransigent refusal to implement the relevant resolutions of the Security Council

(Mr. Delpech, Argentina)

and the General Assembly require that the international community oblige the Pretoria régime to comply. The way to do that is to widen the mandatory sanctions provided for in resolution 418 (1977).

(Mr. Delpech, Argentina)

In that connection, I recall that Argentina firmly supports the initiatives stemming from the Eighth Summit of the Non-Aligned Movement aimed at obtaining the application of mandatory sanctions against the Government of South Africa. We are convinced that that is the most appropriate, effective and peaceful way to bring about the elimination of the policy of apartheid by the South African Government.

The draft resolution contains a list of important, concrete sanctions to be applied. We do not believe that it covers all the measures that could be implemented. However, we know that various interests are involved, and we consider that the list is an acceptable compromise. That is why we are a sponsor of the draft resolution (S/18705), and we urge the other members of the Council to vote for it.

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

Mr. BELONOGOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation is extremely pleased that you, Sir, are presiding over the Security Council during the discussion of such an important question as the elimination of the system of apartheid in racist South Africa, important to the whole international community and primarily the African countries. You are one of the most experienced diplomats of Zambia, a country that is in the very front rank of those fighting to eliminate colonialism and racism in southern Africa and other parts of the world.

We also wish to express our gratitude to your predecessor, the Permanent Representative of Venezuela, Ambassador Aguilar, for his competent and successful handling of the Council's work last month.

(Mr. Belonogov, USSR)

At the request of the Group of African States, the Security Council has convened again to discuss the continuing worsening and exacerbation of the situation in South Africa. The Council has before it a draft resolution whose main thrust is the introduction of mandatory sanctions against the racist régime of South Africa. The demand for such a decision is prompted primarily by the alarming developments within South Africa. Confronting an ever-growing struggle by the black population against the system of apartheid, the Pretoria racists have set in motion mass terror and bloody repression and have reintroduced a state of emergency, thus turning the country in essence into one huge concentration camp.

The demands for sanctions also result from the fact that the racist régime, notwithstanding the decisions of the Security Council and the General Assembly, is continuing to commit and even to step up its acts of aggression and State-sponsored terrorism against the neighbouring sovereign African States: Angola, Zambia, Zimbabwe, Mozambique, Botswana and Lesotho.

Finally, disregarding other United Nations decisions just as brazenly, Pretoria continues to keep occupied Namibia under its rule.

The brute force of the racist régime, its anti-popular repressive domestic policy and its policy of aggression and State terrorism against independent neighbouring States have for long prompted the international community to demand, as a countermeasure, the application of the full weight of the norms of international law and the collective enforcement action based on it. Experience shows that exhortation and persuasion and trifling with the racist régime, which is what certain Western countries have been doing, have not yielded results, and cannot do so. Far from it: such steps make the régime certain of its own impunity, thereby encouraging the racists to engage in further arbitrary behaviour

(Mr. Belonogov, USSR)

and violence against the black population and to carry out new acts of aggression against neighbouring States.

As the Soviet Foreign Minister, Mr. Shevardnadze, said during the general debate at the forty-first session of the General Assembly:

"Every regional conflict is a difficult test for the United Nations.

This is particularly true with regard to those territories where the emblem of the United Nations symbolizes special responsibility. Unfortunately, it is all too often darkened by the shadow of unfulfilled hopes.

"The time has long since come to put to effective use all the powers of this Organization, to exercise all its rights." (A/41/PV.6, p. 56)

Those remarks apply fully to the situation in southern Africa.

It is well known that the underlying reason for the conflict in southern Africa is the policy and practice of apartheid pursued by Pretoria. Were it not for the racist white minority régime, the population of that country - black, white and Coloured - would long ago have come to agreement and reached racial peace. The dividing line there is drawn not by ethnic differences but by the cruel practice and policy of apartheid. We in the Soviet Union resolutely condemn the repression and terror carried out by the racist régime against the dark-skinned majority of the population of South Africa and its national liberation movement, at whose head for the past 75 years the African National Congress has resolutely struggled against apartheid. Our country fully supports the insistent demands of the world community that Pretoria immediately repeal the state of emergency and put an end to repression, immediately release all political detainees, including the outstanding fighter against apartheid, Nelson Mandela, and end the ban on the activities of political organizations.

(Mr. Belonogov, USSR)

We are firmly convinced that the time for debates about the nature of sanctions that should be applied against the racist régime is now long past. Events call for urgent action. Delays in this matter would be fraught with the danger of new acts of aggression by South Africa, with the destabilization of the neighbouring independent States and a mounting threat to international peace.

Only mandatory sanctions and the force of resolute joint pressure by the international community can have a sobering influence on the Pretoria régime. Practice has shown that limited optional sanctions, particularly if they are not complied with by everyone, are incapable of compelling the racist régime to renounce the system of apartheid.

The propaganda machines of South Africa and of those circles in the West that support South Africa have been trying to undermine a long overdue decision by the Security Council for the application of sanctions against the Pretoria régime under Chapter VII of the Charter. In doing so, they proclaim what they call the positive shifts which have occurred in South Africa, although in fact no shifts have really occurred. They talk about the possibility of reforming the system of apartheid and say that through the policy of so-called constructive engagement and a dialogue with South Africa it supposedly would be possible to bring about a voluntary transformation of apartheid into something else. However, one is entitled to ask the sponsors and the supporters of such a policy: Where have they succeeded and in what have they succeeded? Where do they see an improvement in the situation in southern Africa? What are the real fruits of the policy of constructive engagement?

For us and for the overwhelming majority of States Members of the United

(Mr. Belonogov, USSR)

Nations it has long been evident that the practical result of that policy is that it objectively helps to prolong the existence of the obsolete system of apartheid. Moreover, Washington's policy of "constructive engagement" with Pretoria has led to a further destabilization of the situation in southern Africa. The ruling circles of South Africa see that the Security Council - to our deep regret - has proved to be incapable of using the authority and powers conferred upon it by the Charter. Pretoria is taking advantage of that paralysis of the Council's will, just as, by using the open and covert support through which South Africa is circumventing the United Nations embargo, it has been receiving modern armaments and continues to obtain Western credits and access to the latest technology.

Of course, one cannot fail to see that in a certain number of Western countries public opinion, realizing that the South African wolf cannot be re-educated through preaching, is now revising its attitude to sanctions against the Pretoria régime. There has also been a shift in that direction here in the United States and, in particular, in the United States Congress.

At the same time, we are all witness to the fact that in governmental circles of various Western countries, they continue to make much play of the question of the possible negative consequences of mandatory sanctions for the populations of South Africa and neighbouring African States. They object to sanctions on the ground that they may have an impact on the material situation of the black African populations. A situation arises which can only be labelled as paradoxical. The African countries demand the introduction of sanctions; yet they are being told, "We are against sanctions because we are concerned about you". It is difficult to say what there is more of in raising this question - whether there is more of an

(Mr. Belonogov, USSR)

assumption of African naivety or of an outright disdain for the will of the African peoples.

No one is trying to deny that the introduction of sanctions would have an impact on the situation of the population of South Africa. Indeed, the brave position of the South African people and its readiness to accept additional sacrifices in order to bring about the prompt liquidation of the hateful apartheid régime is all the more worthy of praise. The self-sacrificing position of the front-line States is also worthy of every possible support as they are also ready to make certain sacrifices in order to bring about the definitive elimination of apartheid.

The world community urgently demands the introduction by the Security Council of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the apartheid régime pursuant to Chapter VII of the Charter. This was precisely the demand made by the Paris World Conference on Sanctions, the International Conference in Vienna for the Immediate Granting of Independence to Namibia, the Eighth Conference of Heads of State and Government of the Non-Aligned Countries in Harare, the special session of the General Assembly on Namibia and, lastly, the forty-first session of the General Assembly. The peoples of the world expect resolute action from the Security Council in order to eliminate the dangerous focal point of international tension in southern Africa and to eliminate the apartheid system there. The Security Council must exercise its powers under the Charter and introduce sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter against racist South Africa. The General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Mikhail S. Gorbachev, in his message dated 8 January 1987 addressed to the Secretary-General, Mr. Javier Perez de Cuellar, again emphasized:

(Mr. Belonogov, USSR)

"The Soviet Union favours the swiftest possible implementation of the decision by the United Nations to grant genuine independence to the people of Namibia and abolish the racist system of apartheid in southern Africa. We express our solidarity with the struggle by the front-line States against the aggressive actions of the Pretoria régime and wholly support the demand that the Security Council should impose full-scale sanctions against the Republic of South Africa." (S/18571, p. 5)

(Mr. Belonogov, USSR)

The Soviet delegation will support the draft resolution submitted by the non-aligned countries, although it fails to reflect fully the demands of international forums for the imposition by the Security Council against racist South Africa of comprehensive mandatory sanctions pursuant to Chapter VII of our Organization's Charter.

We express the hope that to the question asked by the representative of the Congo at the end of his statement here, namely, "... is the Security Council prepared to proceed along this path?" (supra, p. 12) - in other words, Will the Security Council say "yes" to the proposed list of mandatory sanctions? - the Council will give precisely such an answer and thereby show that the words of its members - and all those who have spoken so far have called for the elimination of the apartheid régime - will concur with their deeds.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics for the kind words he addressed to me.

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

Mr. NYAMDOO (Mongolia) (interpretation from Russian): First of all, I wish to thank the members of the Council for giving the Mongolian delegation an opportunity to speak on this question.

I extend to you, Sir, our sincere congratulations on your assumption of the office of President of the Council. It is highly symbolic that these meetings of the Council to consider the situation in South Africa are being conducted by a representative of Africa and, moreover, the representative of a front-line State. We are quite sure that your rich personal experience and thorough knowledge of the substance of the problem - in which you have been involved as President of the

(Mr. Nyamdoo, Mongolia)

United Nations Council for Namibia - will be of great benefit to our discussion of this matter.

We also wish to pay tribute to your predecessor, the Permanent Representative of Venezuela, Ambassador Andres Aguilar, for his skilled handling of the Council's work last month.

Southern Africa has now become one of the most dangerous crisis areas in the world. It is generally acknowledged that the stubborn pursuit by the South Africa régime of the inhumane policy and practice of apartheid is the prime reason for that situation. Pretoria's intensification of terror and repression within the country, its continuation of the unlawful occupation of Namibia, and the escalation of acts of aggression against neighbouring independent African States are ever more seriously aggravating the situation in southern Africa and posing a grave threat to peace and security not only in that region but also throughout the world.

Faced with this dangerous situation, the United Nations - in particular the Security Council, which bears special responsibility for the maintenance of international peace - must adopt resolute measures; and, as we understand it, it is precisely for that purpose that the Security Council is considering this question yet again. The time has come for resolute and effective actions. That is the demand of the international community, the overwhelming majority of the States of the world whose representatives met last year in Paris at the World Conference on Sanctions against Racist South Africa. Such is the objective also of the numerous resolutions and decisions of this Organization, in particular General Assembly resolution 41/35 B. We are obliged to take such resolute, effective action in response to the desperate cries for help from the ever-increasing number of victims of the bloody apartheid régime. Moreover, our human conscience demands it of us.

(Mr. Nyamdoo, Mongolia)

With each passing day we learn of ever more new facts of cruel repression and atrocities committed by the South African authorities against the indigenous population of the country - ever more frequent acts of aggression and subversion against neighbouring States. The state of emergency which has again been imposed makes it possible for them to behave lawlessly and inflict terror on the population. Mass killings, torture, arrests, detention without trial, shooting of demonstrators and harsh censorship - that is the general picture of South Africa today. But the picture would be incomplete if we failed to mention the South African people's growing opposition; their struggle against the inhuman, ignominious system of apartheid is intensifying. For 75 years now that struggle has been led by the African National Congress of South Africa, the sole legitimate representative of the South African people.

The racist régime, faced with the mounting opposition of the popular masses, has been resorting to acts of terror and repression in the country so as to allow the white minority to cling to power. That régime still hopes to survive, as in the past, with the support and help of certain Western States. It is precisely their co-operation with the racist régime of South Africa in the political, economic, financial, military, nuclear and other fields which not only enabled it to survive but indeed made possible its brazen defiance of the international community and its total disregard for world public opinion.

(Mr. Nyamdoo, Mongolia)

Under pressure from the world community and public opinion in their own countries, several States have begun to limit that co-operation. They have increasingly come to recognize that apartheid cannot be reformed, that it must be eradicated once and for all. The policy of so-called constructive engagement is now seen as a failure even by those who sponsored it. Whether or not those States are prepared to show the necessary political will and associate themselves with other States in their efforts to put an end to apartheid will be shown by their deeds.

The Mongolian delegation associates itself with others that have called upon those countries to take such a decisive step. For the sake of international peace and security, the Security Council must take a decision under Chapter VII of the Charter for the immediate application of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the racist régime of South Africa. The Mongolian delegation therefore wholeheartedly supports the proposal to that effect.

My delegation is deeply convinced that only by adopting such resolute measures can we, through our combined efforts, prove able to achieve our goal - the full eradication of the ignominious system of apartheid. The time will come when we will be able proudly to say that the United Nations made a decisive contribution to that cause, thereby doing its duty to the long-suffering people of South Africa.

In conclusion I wish to express the ardent solidarity of the Mongolian people with the heroic struggle of the people of South Africa for freedom, equality of rights and human dignity against the racist and colonial yoke.

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

In view of the lateness of the hour I intend to adjourn the meeting now. The next meeting of the Security Council to continue the consideration of the item on the agenda will take place this afternoon at 3 o'clock. I appeal to all members to be prompt so that the meeting may start at that time.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.