



Security Council

MAR 8 1988

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.2793
3 March 1988

ENGLISH

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

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Thursday, 3 March 1988, at 4.30 p.m.

President: Mr. PEJIC (Yugoslavia)

<u>Members:</u>	Algeria	Mr. DJOUDI
	Argentina	Mr. DELPECH
	Brazil	Mr. NOGUEIRA-BATISTA
	China	Mr. YU Mengjia
	France	Mr. BROCHAND
	Germany, Federal Republic of	Count YORK von WARTENBURG
	Italy	Mr. BUCCI
	Japan	Mr. KAGAMI
	Nepal	Mr. JOSSE
	Senegal	Mr. SARRE
	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Mr. BELONOGOV
	United Kingdom	Mr. BIRCH
	United States of America	Mr. OKUN
	Zambia	Mr. CHABALA

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

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

The meeting was called to order at 4.35 p.m.

EXPRESSION OF THANKS TO THE RETIRING PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT: As this is the first meeting of the Security Council for the month of March, I should like to take this opportunity to pay a tribute, on behalf of the Council, to His Excellency Mr. Vernon A. Walters, Permanent Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations, for his service as President of the Security Council for the month of February 1988. I am sure I speak for all members of the Council when I express deep appreciation to Ambassador Walters for the great diplomatic skill, versatility and unfailing courtesy with which he conducted the business of the Council last month. I would ask Ambassador Okun to convey those remarks to Ambassador Walters.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

THE QUESTION OF SOUTH AFRICA

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

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

The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Guyana, Sierra Leone and South Africa, in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Insanally (Guyana), Mr. Kargbo (Sierra Leone) and Mr. Manley (South Africa) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

The PRESIDENT: I should also like to inform the Council that I have received a letter dated 2 March 1988 from the representatives of Algeria, Senegal and Zambia, which reads as follows:

"We, the undersigned, members of the Security Council, have the honour to request that during its meetings devoted to consideration of the item entitled 'The question of South Africa', the Security Council, under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure, extend an invitation to Mr. Neo Mnumzana, Chief Representative of the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC) to the United Nations."

That letter has been published as a document of the Security Council (S/19569). If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Security Council decides to extend an invitation to Mr. Mnumzana in accordance with rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

(The President)

I have received another letter dated 2 March 1988 from the representatives of Algeria, Senegal and Zambia, which reads as follows:

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

That letter has been published as a document of the Security Council (S/19570).

If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Security Council decides to extend an invitation to Mr. Makhanda under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

I have received a further letter dated 2 March 1988 from the representatives of Algeria, Senegal and Zambia, which reads as follows:

"We, the undersigned, members of the Security Council, have the honour to request that during its meetings devoted to consideration of the item entitled 'The question of South Africa', the Security Council, under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure, extend an invitation to Mr. Helmut Angula, Permanent Observer of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) to the United Nations."

That letter has been published as a document of the Security Council (S/19571).

If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Security Council decides to extend an invitation to Mr. Angula under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

(The President)

The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The Security Council is meeting today in response to requests contained in letters dated 2 March 1988 from the Chargé d'affaires ad interim of the Permanent Mission of Sierra Leone to the United Nations and the Permanent Representative of Zambia to the United Nations, documents S/19567 and S/19568 respectively.

I should like to draw the attention of members of the Council to the following other documents:

S/19543: Letter dated 25 February 1988 from the Permanent Representative of the Federal Republic of Germany to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General;

S/19544: Letter dated 25 February 1988 from the Permanent Representative of Japan to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General; and

S/19561: Letter dated 1 March 1988 from the Permanent Representative of Canada to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General.

The first speaker is the representative of Sierra Leone, who wishes to make a statement in his capacity as Chairman of the Group of African States for the month of March. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. KARGBO (Sierra Leone): I have the honour, Sir, to convey the sincere congratulations of my delegation and the African Group to the delegation of your friendly country, Yugoslavia, and your good self on your assumption of the noble office of President of the Security Council for this month. We are assured that the Council's business will be efficiently managed under your presidency. I also take this opportunity to extend warm sentiments to your predecessor, Ambassador Vernon Walters of the United States, for the very successful manner in which he conducted the Council's affairs last month.

(Mr. Kargbo, Sierra Leone)

The situation in South Africa has become an unending nightmare that continues to torment the international community with its inherent violence and contradictions. Apartheid, the central characteristic of that situation, has had the singular, yet unenviable, honour to be described as a crime against humanity. Over the years the cost, in both material and human terms, of maintaining such a base and morally indefensible State policy has been enormous, and every year, as the world watches, the misery and pain inflicted by the agents of this policy increase.

Today the Security Council is again convened to consider the situation in that country in the light of recent developments. On 29 February the apartheid régime, in keeping with its notoriety, yet again incarcerated peaceful individuals, this time clergymen, whose sufferings continually motivate conscientious protests. This came in the wake of the proscription of a number of anti-apartheid organizations five days earlier.

In the South African context the banning of organizations such as the United Democratic Front and the Congress of South African Trade Unions (COSATU) and even individuals such as Archbishop Desmond Tutu, a renowned Nobel Peace Prize laureate, sends another clear message to the world that the régime is not committed to peaceful change. When such voices are silenced, what hope is there that the apartheid régime can still be accommodated or, as some continue to think, be granted a gradual reprieve?

These actions by the régime demonstrate its well-known lack of intention to come to terms with the problem of apartheid. Surely it should be obvious to even the Afrikaner mind that one cannot talk peace to people whom one denies the right to speak.

(Mr. Kargbo, Sierra Leone)

The implications of the South African Government's recent actions should not be lost on the international community. First, there is no assurance now that the glimmer of progress towards the dismantling of apartheid that some had detected is still flickering. Secondly, in the light of the 20-month-old nation-wide state of emergency in the country, the general situation has further deteriorated, raising considerably the spectre of prolonged bloody violence.

We believe the international community continues to share the conviction of the African countries that a bloody conflict within South Africa should be averted. The consequences of such an outcome for the whole of southern Africa are chilling to contemplate. That is why we are convinced that every means and every available possibility should be explored to halt this dangerous progression.

For as long as the situation in South Africa has been considered by both the Council and the General Assembly, the reaction from the apartheid régime has been one of irrational intransigence and contempt for the United Nations.

(Mr. Kargbo, Sierra Leone)

In all these years countless lives have been lost, citizens deprived of their nationality, brutalized and condemned to a life of humiliating dehumanization - this in the face of repeated condemnations and calls by the Organization to end apartheid. Surely the time has come for the collective conscience of the international community to dictate a clearer, firmer and unambiguous course of action to put an end to this prolonged aberration.

Today we are once again seizing the Council of what portends a pressing danger for South Africa and its neighbours. The world cannot continue to hold its breath and hope that the situation will improve. If improvement must come, then the Security Council, as the organ with primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, must act in accordance with the conscience of humanity. That is why the request which will be presented to the Council later in its deliberations will make specific recommendations.

It is our hope that the unfolding tragedy in South Africa will impel a concerted response by the entire membership of the Council.

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

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

Mr. MANLEY (South Africa): On behalf of my delegation, I wish to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of March.

Once again the Security Council is meeting at a time when few, if any, of the major problems of the world are attended to. In particular, Africa is increasingly engulfed by almost insurmountable problems.

(Mr. Manley, South Africa)

We have seen hysterical and hypocritical posturing and heard familiar condemnations of recent steps taken by my Government to counter revolutionary forces in South Africa. These forces have as their clearly defined objective the overthrow of order and stability in our country. The regulations promulgated, in terms of which certain restrictions were placed on the activities of 17 organizations, are specifically directed at the maintenance of internal order and at neutralizing, in a non-violent way, those forces actively involved in undermining authority and stability. It is ridiculous to call this a threat to peace. In fact, the action taken was directed at promoting peace and ensuring legal order in South Africa.

The regulations are neither arbitrary nor repressive, nor was it the intention, as has been suggested, to suppress legitimate opposition in South Africa by this means. Everyone who can read will be able, if he or she is honest, to have this confirmed by paging through the many opposition papers of South Africa. Important strides have been made regarding constitutional development and renewal and in the socio-economic advancement of all the peoples of our country. There has been little or no recognition by this body of these developments, simply because the truth is anathema to it. In order to ensure that progress, so essential in a developing country, should continue, it is necessary that a climate conducive to such change is maintained. And that, nothing more, is the reason for the restrictions placed on the organizations concerned.

The nature of the regulations have, expectedly, also been grossly exaggerated. For example, the United Democratic Front has 750 affiliate organizations, of which precisely 10 are affected by the regulations.

Bona fide labour-union activities are not affected by the regulations; any organization or individual affected by the regulations may appeal against the

(Mr. Manley, South Africa)

restrictions as they might affect them; the regulations are only in force as long as the limited state of emergency continues in South Africa. The action taken was hardly, therefore, a global, irrevocable banning of black political opposition.

I should like to state clearly that it is not the intention of my Government to curtail all of the activities of the organizations concerned. The restrictions affect only those activities that endanger the safety of the public and undermine the maintenance of law and order.

Peace and tranquility in South Africa do not serve the purposes of certain organizations, notably the African National Congress (ANC). Revolutionary forces have realized that they cannot make the country ungovernable through a policy of violence and the use of necklaces.

The leader of the ANC, addressing his association with the United Democratic Front (UDF), embraced the UDF by declaring:

"We salute all (UDF) leaders and its affiliated organizations, its members and its followers. The National Liberation Alliance, headed by the ANC, shall be able to guide the UDF only if we have our own underground structures within the UDF. These structures must be skilfully used to give the correct guidance to the UDF and, above all raise the task of the Front."

The ANC, and all the organizations which are its allies, has thereby passed judgement on itself.

My Government will simply not allow revolutionary forces and radical activists to disrupt the lives of moderate South Africans. South Africans of goodwill are at the moment preparing to negotiate a new constitutional dispensation which will seek to serve all South Africans fairly. Surely it is a responsible Government that does everything in its power to ensure that this process is given the chance it deserves. The internecine warfare that has typified the so-called political

(Mr. Manley, South Africa)

actions of the groups that oppose reform could not be tolerated any longer. Academic argument about the merits of their philosophies is a luxury which South Africans can ill afford; we live in a sub-continent that has been ravaged by ill-fitting ideologies and exploited by outside political Powers for their own ends.

A specific case is that of the "Detainees Parents Support Committee", which has discredited itself by making defamatory statements alleging abuse of power by the South African police in the townships. When the charges were investigated, they were found to be unsubstantiated and devoid of truth. Ironically, the international community chose to focus only on the unsubstantiated allegations and we never hear acknowledgement or correction once the truth becomes known.

That is just one end of the scale of the activities of this particular group. At the other end of the scale, the organization has been involved in activities of sedition and subversion that certainly would not be tolerated in any democratic society. Why should South Africa act any differently? Or is this yet another demonstration of the double standards applied so freely when it comes to matters affecting South Africa?

The international community is being misled about the true priorities and goals of the organizations which are committed to bloodshed. Who in the Council can deny that millions of human beings are at this moment starving or suffering from diseases which will plague them for the rest of their lives, with little or no hope of assistance? There is a growing gap between the industrialized nations of the world and the lesser-developed nations of the world.

Famine, disease, ignorance, unemployment - these are the issues which ought to exercise the minds of Member States of the United Nations. Of course, political rights and the right to express opinions which differ from the Government's are important. My Government - like the Governments of members assembled around the

(Mr. Manley, South Africa)

table - is not unaware of the total lack of the right to express dissident views prevalent in such a large number of Member States of the United Nations, including some represented here today.

The hypocrisy which permeates this very discussion is almost comic. We in South Africa do not lay claim to perfection. We acknowledge the complexity of our problems but we have moved a long way to extend and broaden democracy. Our sin is that we are removing discrimination and extending democracy.

Elements within the United Nations do not want us to succeed in coming to an agreement with each other which will ensure participation by all without domination by any group.

(Mr. Manley, South Africa)

This meeting is part of this vindictive vendetta, and therefore my Government wishes me to make it clear to you that we will not bow to your threats or demands; and we reject your accusations with contempt and invite you to do your damndest. We will continue to strive to attain a negotiated settlement for the problems facing all South Africans. And we will do so while maintaining law and order and vigorously opposing the forces of destruction and violence. Neither will we tolerate outside interference in our domestic affairs. South Africans of goodwill will find peaceful solutions to their constitutional and economic problems themselves through negotiation.

A debate such as this one is not only devoid of any sense of realism; it is irrelevant.

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

Mr. MNUMZANA: On behalf of the African National Congress (ANC) and the struggling people of South Africa, we should like to thank the Security Council for allowing us to speak to the burning issue now under consideration.

We should also like to congratulate you, Mr. President, on your accession to the helm of this august body. We are certain that under your stewardship the work and deliberations of the Security Council cannot but move forward. We should also like to thank your predecessor, Ambassador Vernon Walters, for a job well done.

But for the intervention of circumstances beyond our control this meeting ought to have taken place either on 24 February or very shortly thereafter. We well remember that 23 February was the day on which the Pretoria racist régime imposed severe restrictions on 17 mass democratic organizations and 18 individuals, including Archie Gumede and Albertina Sisulu. Those are organizations and

(Mr. Mnumzana)

individuals exclusively committed, as a matter of principle, to the use of peaceful methods in the struggle against apartheid and for a united, non-racial and democratic South Africa. This inevitable delay has conferred all the more urgency on the issue under consideration.

In the history of apartheid South Africa, the Pretoria racist régime's crackdown of 23 February represents the third generation of bannings of people's organizations and individuals opposed to apartheid. In 1960, when the African National Congress was banned, the international community responded with a condemnation of the Pretoria racist régime and demanded that the banning be lifted. Up to that time the ANC had been a movement committed exclusively to peaceful forms of struggle. The banning did not do away with the ANC. The reason for which the ANC had been formed - that is, to spearhead the struggle for South African freedom - remained as valid as ever. In fact, the banning, which represented a further escalation of repression, achieved the effect of making the existence of the ANC all the more necessary. The banning of the ANC introduced a qualitatively new element into the equation of the South African conflict. By compelling the ANC to go underground, where the possibilities of peaceful struggle were severely reduced, this banning effectively ushered in the era of armed struggle against apartheid.

The banning of 17 organizations of the people in 1977 further narrowed the options of peaceful struggle against apartheid. The Security Council acknowledged this alarming fact in its resolution 418 (1977), in which it condemned the bannings and demanded their lifting.

Last year the Pretoria racist régime renewed, reinforced and expanded its state of emergency to encompass and bottle up all of South Africa. It resulted in

(Mr. Mnumzana)

the imposition of virtual martial law in the black townships, the almost total muzzling of the press, the escalation of arbitrary mass arrests, detentions without trial, and torture and murder in detention of multitudes of South African patriots, including a rising number of children. This was done in the name of a so-called law and order which our people consider to be as illegitimate as the régime itself.

In day-to-day terms, through the third state of emergency in less than three years, apartheid repression attained an all-time high. The people's intolerance of apartheid had correspondingly increased as much, if not more. If there had ever been indifference to apartheid, which is doubtful, it was overwhelmed by a heightened determination to eradicate apartheid and to create a free South Africa conceived in the very ideals that inform the United Nations Charter. Yet the state of emergency had made it more difficult than ever before for our people to continue to struggle peacefully. Indeed those organizations and individuals subjected to tight restrictions on 23 February must be commended for exercising the extreme restraint reflected in their remaining committed to forms of peaceful struggle, however tenuous under the state of emergency.

By restricting these organizations and individuals beginning on 23 February, the racist régime radically undermined their ability to remain realistically committed to the avoidance of means of struggle other than peaceful. As Azzar Cachalia, Treasurer of the United Democratic Front, put it:

"The Government has declared war against peaceful opposition to its policies".

Archbishop Tutu has warned:

"If they" - that is, white South Africans - "don't stop this Government soon, and there's not much hope they will, we are heading for war".

(Mr. Mnumzana)

The Reverend Allen Boesak has pointed out that

"... every single peaceful action we can take has now been criminalized."

This is a development which, according to Frank Chikane, General Secretary of the South African Council of Churches, could lead the

"... majority of peace-loving South Africans to see force as the only way of ending apartheid".

This prospect grows daily more imminent. Apartheid South Africa has been condemned a countless number of times before for its infinite catalogue of transgressions against human life, dignity and the most fundamental rights and freedoms. It has simply ignored these condemnations and continued its inhuman criminal career. With equal intransigence and nonchalance it has ignored international demands that apartheid be dismantled. To the multi-faceted efforts of our people in struggle it has responded with ever-increasing violence and repression. In the midst of all this it has never stopped trying to market its so-called reforms, which are hoaxes calculated further to entrench apartheid and which our people have accordingly rejected.

The miracle is that even as the Pretoria racist régime continues to wage an escalating war against its opponents, even as it steps up its campaign to undermine the possibility of a peaceful solution to the South African conflict, for which it is solely responsible, there are still people who prefer to anchor their faith in the possibility of apartheid reforming itself, people who choose to make light of the ever-increasing agony of the victims of apartheid even as they ignore their voices.

But time has all but run out. The violence of apartheid has already spilled over into the neighbouring independent African States and Namibia. Its domestic

(Mr. Mnumzana)

repression has escalated into a reign of terror. If the current conflict escalates, as seems likely, into a conflagration, we shall witness an interracial bloodbath which will have tragic consequences beyond the frontiers of South Africa and which will profoundly destabilize international peace and security. That is an outcome which all of us must avert. We must reiterate our condemnation of apartheid and register our outrage at its latest round of repression.

(Mr. Mnumzana)

We must demand that apartheid revoke its latest restrictions even as we insist that the racist Pretoria régime remove all obstacles to the eradication of apartheid itself. To give credible force to this condemnation and to these demands, the Security Council should without delay impose selective mandatory sanctions on apartheid South Africa on the understanding that they will be replaced by comprehensive mandatory sanctions under chapter VII of the United Nations Charter in the event that the racist régime remains intransigent.

Finally we wish to reaffirm our principled solidarity with the struggle of the Palestinian people led by their sole, authentic representative the Palestine Liberation Organization, with the struggles of the people of Namibia led by the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) and the people of Western Sahara led by POLISARIO, as well as with the struggles of peoples everywhere striving against oppression and the exploitation of man by man and for a free, humane, peaceful, prosperous and abundant future for all mankind.

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

Mr. SARRE (Senegal) (interpretation from French): I should like first of all to extend sincere and warm congratulations to you, Sir, and to wish you every success in your term of office as President of the Council. Your country has always been distinguished by its dedication to the strengthening of international peace and security and thus to the strengthening of the role of the United Nations in international relations. Your country and mine have relations of mutual respect. Your talents as a seasoned diplomat and your wisdom assure us of success in our work this month.

Ambassador Vernon Walters is a warrior among diplomats whose experience, competence and dynamism well equip him to guide the deliberations of the Council, and he did so outstandingly last month.

(Mr. Sarré, Senegal)

The racist, segregationist South African régime has once again sent a negative signal to the international community.

In taking its decision of 24 February last to prohibit the activities of 17 organizations, black and white, that had peacefully opposed apartheid, the South African Government has gone beyond the bounds of incoherence and arbitrariness, and in thus deciding to fight peace itself to the last rampart, Pretoria has defied the international community and its various components in a manner that is quite unprecedented. The international community, in a unanimous outpouring, has condemned that decision, which flouts the most fundamental human rights. If a poor and defenceless woman is unable to make a timid, stifled appeal for the release of her husband or son who has been detained arbitrarily, what remains of the universal values of civilization South Africa claims to advocate?

There can be no doubt that the decision to prohibit all the political activities of 17 peaceful anti-apartheid organizations including - the United Democratic Front, the Congress of South African Trade Unions, the Azanian People's Organization, the DPSC and so on, and various movements of young persons and students and resident associations - indicates disarray among the Johannesburg authorities and is doomed to failure. Those authorities seem unable to understand or to learn from the recent history of their country.

In reviewing that history, we see that the 1960 ban on the African National Congress and the Pan Africanist Congress and the 1977 ban on 17 other movements in no way eliminated the resistance to the odious, inhuman apartheid régime. Quite the contrary: they brought about an upsurge in that resistance.

It is an admission of failure if, in spite of the state of emergency decreed in July 1985 and extended since then, the South African régime, having failed to maintain order, feels compelled to quiet the peaceful victims of its racist policy.

(Mr. Sarre, Senegal)

The state of emergency, which the Security Council condemned in timely fashion in its resolution 569 (1985), was reflected in widespread arbitrary acts, arrests, massive repression and murder, and led to a radicalization of the anti-apartheid forces within the country in the form of political parties, trade movements, religious and student movements, and, outside South Africa, international pressure for sanctions against Pretoria.

Refusing to learn from history and the irreversible course of events, President Botha continues to deny the existence of a black majority and to reaffirm the need for bantustans.

The most recent measures block the search for peaceful solutions within South Africa and the effort being made by blacks and whites who are courageous enough to join forces to reject the ideology and practice of the apartheid system and clear-thinking enough to look beyond their racial, political and social diversity in order to begin a non-racial democracy in South Africa. It is within the framework of the search for peaceful solutions of the kind I have just mentioned that my own country, Senegal, through its President, His Excellency Mr. Abdou Diouf, offered the capital of Senegal as the site for a historic event - the meeting last July of the delegation of 61 liberal white South Africans and a delegation of 17 persons members of the African National Congress.

Organized on the initiative of the Institute for a Democratic Alternative in South Africa with the collaboration of the France-Libertés Foundation presided over by the French First Lady and the Association of African Jurists, the gathering was presided over by President Abdou Diouf and Mrs. Mitterand.

Those gatherings were endorsed by a "Dakar Declaration" and their effect was felt the world over because of the high level of the participants and because they took place at a time when, in the words of President Abdou Diouf, "history was speeding up in South Africa, a country living at a crossroads, at a decisive moment

(Mr. Sarré, Senegal)

for its destiny and that of Africa". But the meeting also drew the attention of the international community because its objective was shared thinking as to ways and means of establishing in South Africa a democratic alternative to the odious system of apartheid. That can be seen from the topics of discussion: strategies for fundamental change in South Africa; the construction of national unity; prospects for government structures in a free South Africa; and prospects for economic structures in a free South Africa.

I believe that the representative of South Africa, who has just spoken in terms I would not repeat here, should, respectfully, have drawn inspiration from the Dakar meeting in order to advance the South African cause.

In opening the work of the Dakar symposium, the President of Senegal pointed out that

"with the Dakar meeting it might be possible to begin a process at the end of which South Africans inside and outside the country could present a plan for the future of their country, which would reveal Mr. Botha's game and negate the apocalyptic aims he attaches to the freedom fighters and the patriotic forces of South Africa."

If the participants did not produce a complete plan for such a society, they did broadly define what its terms might be, and they agreed that other such gatherings were necessary to dispel misunderstanding and fear and to strengthen the vast democratic movement.

(Mr. Sarré, Senegal)

It is precisely that fear, that misunderstanding that is nurtured and maintained by the apartheid régime. The participants to the Dakar seminar pointed out in paragraph 7 of their Declaration that:

"violence in South Africa is due to the fact that the use of force is inherent in the existence and the practice of racial domination".

When returning to their country some of the participants were criticized, gaoled and even killed. The South African Government is therefore bearing the heavy responsibility for a violent solution to the problem of apartheid in South Africa.

Those are the facts. In order to leave no doubt as to its intentions and its double-standard policy - to which the South African representative just made an anachronistic reference - Pretoria, whose law-and-order forces kindly observed a 6,000-strong demonstration of the Afrikaner white resistance of the extreme right, did not hesitate to order the detention of 150 churchmen, including the Nobel Peace Prize winner Desmond Tutu and the Reverend Allan Boesak, who were protesting peacefully against the arbitrary decision to ban the political activities of 17 peaceful anti-apartheid organizations.

Pursuing its course, the South African Government now seeks to have a ban adopted prohibiting the financing of anti-apartheid organizations from abroad, with the obvious aim of covering organizations not falling under its recent ban.

Following upon the anachronistic electoral farce of last May, which simply ignored the black South African majority, the repeated attacks and threats of attacks against the front-line States and the increased militarization of Namibia, these new repressive measures are reminders of the everyday distressing reality of apartheid and constitute a serious threat to international peace and security.

By applying mandatory economic sanctions today the Security Council would be fulfilling its main task under the United Nations Charter and opting for peace in

(Mr. Sarré, Senegal)

southern Africa at a time when it is still possible to avoid ultimate chaos; it would thus be advancing the cause of human rights and peace in the world, the fundamental objectives of our universal Organization.

While awaiting these measures we have sought for so long, our Council should immediately, given the urgency of the situation, take appropriate measures to prompt South Africa to eliminate without delay all these obstacles to the free activities of these movements that are struggling for a democratic, egalitarian and multiracial society in South Africa.

The international community's unanimous condemnation of South Africa for these recent measures should be followed by a consensus in our Council to send to Pretoria a responsible message reflecting the expectations of our continent and of the South African population and responding to the suffering of the black South African majority.

In the final analysis, that is the only way for the peaceful establishment of a non-racial, egalitarian and democratic society in South Africa guaranteeing freedom for all.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Senegal for his recognition of the policies of my country and for his kind but probably undeserved words addressed to me.

I should like to inform the Council that I have received a letter dated 3 March 1988 from the Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid which reads as follows:

"I have the honour to request the United Nations Security Council to permit me to participate in my capacity as Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid, under the provisions of rule 39 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure, in the Council's consideration of the item entitled 'The question of South Africa'."

(The President)

On previous occasions, the Security Council has extended invitations to representatives of other United Nations bodies in connection with the consideration of matters on its agenda. In accordance with past practice in this matter, I propose that the Council extend an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure to the Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

The next speaker inscribed on my list is His Excellency Major-General Joseph Garba, Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. GARBA (Nigeria), Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid: Mr. President, let me say how pleased I am to see you presiding over the Security Council for the month of March. On behalf of the Special Committee against Apartheid and on my own behalf I want to thank you, Sir, for inviting me to address the Council.

The Special Committee has addressed the Security Council on numerous occasions. It has repeatedly explained that the situation was deteriorating in South Africa and in the region because of the Pretoria régime's persistence in maintaining the criminal system of apartheid and in defying the relevant resolutions of the United Nations. Now we have reached the stage where even the most elementary rights of the oppressed people in South Africa to peaceful protest and freedom of expression are being denied them.

The most recent ban imposed on organizations and individuals, on 24 February, has closed virtually all avenues for a peaceful change in South Africa. This ban prevents the 17 organizations and the largest black trade union federation, the Congress of South African Trade Unions, as well as the 18 black leaders from "carrying on or performing any activities or acts whatsoever". They will barely

(Mr. Garba, Chairman, Special
Committee against Apartheid)

exist, confined merely to keeping their books. They cannot indulge in any activity deemed political and cannot even call for sanctions.

This ban is no doubt going to polarize further the society and lead to more violence. These organizations were peaceful. They were never charged with violence - or, indeed, any crime. Clearly, the régime is attempting to end all non-violent resistance to apartheid, such as strikes, boycotts and demonstrations. The apartheid régime's latest repressive action has therefore brought about world-wide condemnation.

On 29 February, while peacefully protesting the latest ban, Archbishop Desmond Tutu and two dozen other religious leaders from all denominations were arrested for a short time. The rest of the approximately 150 peaceful protestors, mostly clergymen, were exposed to a barrage of water cannons aimed at dispersing them. The marching clergymen merely intended to deliver a petition to racist President Botha demanding the lifting of the ban and the release of political detainees. Nevertheless, these extremely repressive measures have now forced the clergymen to announce that they are going to embark on a course of civil disobedience and take up the restricted activities of the anti-apartheid organizations, even if it means breaking the law. The sharp contrast between the treatment meted out to the clergymen and the non-interference in the racist demonstration by the white right-wing extremists, who carried an emblem resembling a Swastika, elicited an outcry both inside and outside South Africa.

For the purpose of maintaining apartheid, the apartheid régime is bent on crushing every form of opposition to that evil system, even the most peaceful and mildest. It seems determined to force its so-called reforms on the oppressed people by coercively co-opting some and silencing those who resist at any cost. It

(Mr. Garba, Chairman, Special
Committee against Apartheid)

has given up all pretensions for an interest in meaningful talks with the black majority on the future of the country.

Some political analysts have speculated that the régime intended to show toughness and impress the white voters in by-elections in order not to lose further ground to the far-right conservatives. Others have said that the régime aims at silencing moderate opposition before the forthcoming municipal elections in October when, as we are told, it expects all races to vote for their own councils. Yet another scenario has concluded that the régime's speculation that organizations, such as the United Democratic Front, may decide to run in the forthcoming municipal elections and thus assume some degree of legal protection has led the régime to ban them. Whatever the régime's misguided reasoning, it has certainly closed the door on peaceful democratic protest and expression in South Africa, with implications that cannot bode well for the future.

(Mr. Garba, Chairman, Special
Committee against Apartheid)

The Organization of African Unity, the European Community, the Commonwealth, the Secretary-General of the United Nations, several Governments, and other organizations and individuals, such as United States presidential candidate the Reverend Jesse Jackson, have already deplored Pretoria's recent crackdown and urged it to rescind these measures. For its part, the Special Committee against Apartheid has strongly denounced the latest wave of repression and has called for the adoption of concrete and co-ordinated sanctions against the South African régime.

In addition to the latest repressive measures, the continuing state of emergency and the heavy press restrictions, the régime is now considering further legislative measures totally to silence opponents of apartheid from all quarters, be they black or white. The racist Parliament is currently considering the "Promotion of Orderly Internal Politics Bill" to restrict organizations and individuals who receive foreign funds for activities which, in the racist régime's opinion, may endanger public safety. These measures seem to be aimed at such groups as the Institute for a Democratic Alternative for South Africa. It is the height of hypocrisy euphemistically to use the word "orderly" in the title of a bill that is aimed at totally destroying all political opposition, however mild and peaceful. Moreover, the régime is poised to control the staff of embassies that promote activities it deems undesirable and to exercise stricter control over the passports of those who, in its words, have "collaborated with the enemy".

The Special Committee against Apartheid has consistently maintained that comprehensive mandatory sanctions, universally applied, constitute the most effective means for peaceful change in South Africa, especially in view of the fact that the racist minority régime has no intention of entering into any form of

(Mr. Garba, Chairman, Special
Committee against Apartheid)

meaningful negotiations. That view has been reaffirmed by a number of international conferences and seminars on apartheid. Under the present circumstances, therefore, sanctions seem to be the only language Pretoria understands. The often-heard argument that sanctions would hurt blacks has come mainly from those quarters which have never been genuinely concerned with the welfare of the blacks. Such arguments do not reflect the views of the majority of black leaders in South Africa and serve only to spread butter on the bread of the racist régime. Nor is it true that the régime does not care about sanctions. It does care, and it is, indeed, vulnerable.

The Special Committee has therefore repeatedly requested the adoption of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa. So has the overwhelming majority of the General Assembly membership. It is deeply regrettable that the Security Council has been repeatedly prevented from imposing further mandatory sanctions against South Africa by the veto of some of its Western permanent members. Such action on the part of those States only encourages the minority régime to continue to defy the principles and decisions of our Organization, of which South Africa is a Member. It only gives that régime aid and comfort. The international demand for sanctions against South Africa is today stronger than ever before. Most recently, on 29 February 1988, the Commission on Human Rights demanded, among other things, the immediate and unconditional release of all political prisoners and children in detention in South Africa and called on the Security Council to impose mandatory sanctions against the South African régime, in discharge of the Council's responsibilities under the Charter.

(Mr. Garba, Chairman, Special
Committee against Apartheid)

No Member State should be allowed to have defied the United Nations for 40 years - indeed almost from the inception of the Organization. Those Member States which use their veto power to prolong the life of apartheid will, I believe, be accountable to history. The problem of apartheid is not only a moral question; it is also a legal and political one. Indeed, it has philosophical ramifications for the entire human race.

On behalf of the Special Committee against Apartheid, I therefore once more request the Security Council urgently to adopt comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the South African régime in the name of liberty, equality and justice. There is no alternative in this case, where the South African régime has consistently defied United Nations resolutions, including those of this Council, particularly its resolution 569 (1985), which called for the unconditional and immediate release of Nelson Mandela and all other political prisoners and detainees, the elimination of apartheid and the establishment of a free, united and democratic society based on universal suffrage. The racist minority régime's response to that resolution has been conspicuous by its defiance, negativism and further repression, to an amazing extent.

Peace and apartheid are antithetical and cannot coexist. The evil of apartheid has to go, and the international community is looking to the Security Council for effective action. There is no justification for further delay.

The PRESIDENT: We have heard the last speaker for this meeting. The next meeting of the Security Council to continue consideration of the item on the agenda will take place tomorrow, 4 March 1988, at 11 a.m.

The meeting rose at 5.35 p.m.