



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-SECOND YEAR

1988th MEETING: 21 MARCH 1977

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1988)	1
Statement by the President	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The question of South Africa: Letter dated 9 March 1977 from the Permanent Representative of Nigeria to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/12295) .	1

NOTE

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

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

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

1988TH MEETING

Held in New York on Monday, 21 March 1977, at 4 p.m.

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

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

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1988)

1. Adoption of the agenda

2. The question of South Africa:

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

The meeting was called to order at 4.20 p.m.

Statement by the President

1. The PRESIDENT: Before proceeding with the business before the Security Council at this first meeting during the month of March, I should like to take this opportunity to thank my colleagues for the many words of friendship and appreciation they have expressed with regard to my predecessor, Ambassador William Scranton, and to assure you all that I look forward to fruitful and comradely relationships as we work together in the coming months to pursue the goals contained in the Charter for the maintenance of international peace and security.

2. I wish, as President of the Security Council, to express to Ambassador Dateu of Romania and to his Government the sympathy we all feel because of the devastating earthquake that recently occurred in his country and that resulted in an enormous and regrettable loss of life and caused extensive damage. It is indeed heartening to know that offers of assistance have been made by so many countries.

3. I should also like to express to Ambassador Jaipal, and through him to the Government of India, our condolences on the recent death of the President of that great nation, Mr. Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed.

4. As a final word, may I express appreciation on behalf of the Council to Ambassador James Murray of the United Kingdom for his services as President of the Security Council for the month of February. I regret that it was not

possible for me to be present in person during that month, when he took over the onerous duties that would otherwise have fallen to my friend, Ambassador Ivor Richard. Nevertheless, my colleagues have assured me that Ambassador Murray presided with great distinction at both the formal meetings of the Council and at the informal consultations which the Council held during the month, and I wish to thank him on behalf of all of us for his efforts and his patience.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The question of South Africa

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

5. The PRESIDENT: Letters have been addressed to the President of the Security Council by the representatives of Egypt, Indonesia, Liberia, Nigeria, Sri Lanka, the Syrian Arab Republic and Yugoslavia, in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the question on the agenda. In accordance with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite the representatives of the States I have just mentioned to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in conformity with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

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

At the invitation of the President, Mr. A. E. Abdel Meguid (Egypt), Mr. A. Marpaung (Indonesia), Mrs. A. Brooks-Randolph (Liberia), Mr. L. O. Harriman (Nigeria), Mr. I. B. Fonseka (Sri Lanka), Mr. M. Allaf (Syrian Arab Republic) and Mr. J. Petrić (Yugoslavia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

7. The PRESIDENT: I should also like to inform the members of the Council that I have received a letter dated 21 March 1977 from the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, which reads as follows:

“The Security Council is about to consider the question of South Africa, which will include, *inter alia*, the racial

and repressive policies of that régime and the threat to international peace and security created by those policies. Those same policies affect Namibia, where they are applied by the illegal South African administration.

"I wish therefore to convey to you the desire of the Council for Namibia to participate in this debate, without the right to vote, and to be represented by a delegation headed by myself as President of the Council for Namibia and including the representatives of Burundi, Indonesia, Mexico and Poland."

8. On previous occasions, the Security Council has extended invitations to representatives of other appropriate United Nations bodies in connexion with the consideration of matters on its agenda. It seems appropriate, accordingly, for me to proceed, if there is no objection, to extend an invitation, pursuant to rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure, to the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia and his delegation.

9. In view of the limited number of places available at the Council table, I invite the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia and his delegation to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber, on the usual understanding that they will be invited to take places at the Council table whenever they wish to address the Council.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. D. W. Kamana (Zambia), President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, and the other members of the delegation took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

10. The PRESIDENT: I wish to inform members of the Security Council that I have received two letters of today's date from the representatives of Benin, the Libyan Arab Republic and Mauritius. The first reads as follows:

"We, the undersigned members of the the Security Council, have the honour to request that during its current meetings devoted to consideration of 'The Question of South Africa', the Council extend an invitation, under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure, to Mr. Mfanafuthi Johnstone Makatini of the African National Congress and to Mr. Potlako Leballo of the Pan Africanist Congress." [S/12299]

The second reads as follows:

"We, the undersigned members of the Security Council, have the honour to request that during its current meetings devoted to consideration of 'The Question of South Africa', the Council extend an invitation, under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure, to Mr. Olof Palme and Mr. Abdul S. Minty." [S/12300]

11. Since there are no objections, I shall take it that the Council agrees to meet these requests that it extend invitations, under rule 39, to Mr. Makatini, Mr. Leballo, Mr. Palme and Mr. Minty. I shall therefore invite them to make their statements at the appropriate moment.

12. The Security Council has inscribed on its agenda for this meeting the item entitled "The question of South Africa". That decision was taken in response to the request made on behalf of the African Group at the United Nations in a letter dated 9 March 1977 from the Permanent Representative of Nigeria to the United Nations, acting in his capacity as Chairman of the African Group for the month of March [S/12295]. Reference is made in that letter to the relevant resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council, in particular to Assembly resolution 31/6, adopted on 26 October and 9 November 1976 in connexion with the item entitled "Policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa", and to Council resolution 392 (1976), adopted on 19 June 1976, in connexion with the discussion of the item entitled "Situation in South Africa: killings and violence by the *apartheid* régime in Soweto and other areas".

13. On 16 November 1976, the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council a letter [S/12232] transmitting the text of resolutions 31/6 A to K and drawing the Council's attention to paragraphs 1 and 2 of resolution 31/6 D and to the operative part of resolution 31/6 K.

14. The Security Council will now commence its consideration of the question of South Africa. The first speaker is the representative of Mauritius, representative of the Chairman of the Organization of African Unity.

15. Mr. RAMPHUL (Mauritius): Mr. President, my delegation joins you in your expression of sympathy to the delegations of Romania and India.

16. I feel compelled today to draw the attention of the Council to the imminent danger of a general war in southern Africa. We are no longer confronted with an abstract possibility of a threat to the peace in that region. It is no longer a question of a war which might develop at some time in the future. Southern Africa is already at war, and this fact demands of us that we take rapid and effective action to deal with the real causes of a conflict which has been allowed to fester too long. If we do not, that conflict will inevitably grow more serious and may spread to other parts of Africa. Indeed, it could produce the most serious international crisis of this generation.

17. I am aware that some members of the Council will think that I exaggerate. Some Members have only recently, in the last debate on Namibia, said that they did not see any sign of a threat to the peace in southern Africa. I do not know how anyone could substantiate statements which are patently inconsistent with the facts as we know them.

18. In 1974, the brave peoples of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea-Bissau won their struggle for independence and ended the centuries-long era of Portuguese colonialism. One would have thought that the remaining minority régimes in Africa would have got the message conveyed by that victory and would have moved towards real negotiations with the organizations representing the majority in South Africa, Namibia and Zimbabwe. Instead, they were unfortunately thrown on the defensive. They chose to try to

crush the liberation movements and to thwart the demands of the people for freedom and independence. The result has been a deepening crisis. South Africa has sent more than 50,000 troops and police to Namibia in an effort to impose a puppet government and to preserve *apartheid* in that Territory. The Smith régime has stretched its manpower and economic resources to the limit in a futile attempt to perpetuate colonial rule in Zimbabwe. South Africa is mobilizing intensively to contain the internal rebellion which began last June. Can it truly be said, in these circumstances, that there is no crisis? Is it not obvious that we are not approaching a war but are in the middle of one?

19. The question we confront today is what to do about that situation. African representatives at the United Nations, including myself, have in the past repeatedly demanded action against South Africa. We have proposed a mandatory arms embargo and we have proposed consultations. We have proposed talks, conferences, economic sanctions and a hundred other measures. It must, however, be said that relatively little has been done or that relatively little proved possible in the face of objections to African demands. We now find ourselves in a worse situation than ever before, confronted with an escalating crisis which may soon be out of control.

20. I wish to confine my statement at this stage to a plea for the adoption of a draft resolution which will call upon Member States to halt further investment in and loans to South Africa. I realize that this proposal runs counter to what some Members seem to regard as a hopeful possibility for a peaceful evolution towards majority rule. They argue that continued investment speeds up economic change in South Africa and that this change is beneficial to the African population. Expanded foreign investment, we are told, will encourage social change and provide the leverage for forcing changes which the South African Government might, if left to its own devices, be reluctant to undertake.

21. I respect this argument—an argument about which we have heard a great deal—but I regret I cannot accept it because it seems to me to be remarkably academic and unreal. Indeed, if I may say so with respect, it seems like a somewhat naïve kind of wishful thinking. There is no need for me to go here into its technical deficiencies as an economic argument. These have been revealed in a number of scholarly publications, as well as in some United Nations documents. Rather I shall try to show that this argument is practically and concretely wrong. It fails to take account of what is actually going on in South Africa at the moment.

22. Our discussion must start from the fact that South Africa now possesses an awesome military power and that it is continuing to develop its military capabilities at a rapid rate. In 1972, the South African defence budget was a little more than 450 million Rand. By last year, total military expenditure in the budget had risen to some 1,348 million Rand. The next military budget is estimated to be in the range of 1,700 million to 2,000 million Rand. Thus it would appear that defence expenditures have increased fourfold in the space of four years. Something of the order of 20 per cent of total Government expenditure now goes for military purposes. This is an exceptionally high figure by

any standard. It indicates that South Africa is now giving first priority to military matters.

23. The effort of the last few years has enabled South Africa to build the most powerful military machine in Africa south of the Sahara. Four years ago South Africa had some 70,000 men on active peace-time duty. Today there are over 100,000 men in the South African Defence Forces. There are well over 35,000 police and as many police reservists. It is estimated that South Africa could mobilize some 200,000 men within two days in an emergency.

24. The equipment of the Defence Forces is modern and plentiful. The army possesses some 200 modern tanks, more than a thousand armoured cars and hundreds of armoured personnel carriers. It possesses the most modern electronic and communications equipment. The South African Air Force has nearly 500 combat aircraft, including squadrons of Mirage III and Mirage F-1 aircraft, Aermacchi-Atlas Impala strike aircraft and some 200 helicopters. The army and the police are equipped with the most modern small arms, as well as special equipment for the suppression of so-called civil disturbances. Almost all this equipment is imported or built under foreign licence in South Africa. A great deal of it has been imported in the last few years.

25. South Africa has made the purpose of this military expansion quite clear. It has recently demonstrated a certain diplomatic flexibility, especially in its apparent encouragement of attempts to assist so-called negotiated settlements in Namibia and Zimbabwe. Its basic aim, however, remains what it has always been. South Africa intends to maintain and protect the so-called South African way of life—that is, the system of minority rule which exploits and oppresses the African peoples of the subcontinent. As one observer wrote recently:

“Despite a significant change of style, South Africa’s foreign policy will continue to rely on a combination of the same three components on which it has been based for a number of years: military preparedness, some form of ‘outward policy’ toward the black States and a continuing attempt to achieve informal security arrangements with Western Powers.”

26. Thus South Africa intends to ensure “stability” through the development of overwhelming military power. The South African Government, furthermore, has taken the view that in order to achieve “stability”, it must be prepared to use its power throughout southern Africa. Southern Africa is a system of interdependent States, and the Government believes that it must help to maintain “friendly” Governments in neighbouring States. South Africa is thus assuming the mantle of a regional Power. It now seeks to dominate the whole southern African region. In the context of the present crisis, its military power therefore constitutes a standing threat to neighbouring States and others even further afield. South Africa has already shown that it can and will strike out against others when it believes that there is a “threat” to its security. It has mounted a full-scale invasion of Angola. It has imposed an occupying army on Namibia. It has attacked Zambia. And it has given, and is giving, military assistance to the Smith régime.

27. South Africa's actions do not suggest a policy of "exploring the possibilities of peaceful change". Its policy has in reality been inflexible and aggressive. It has created a garrison State not to promote change but to prevent it. And the scope of its military effort can only mean that South Africa intends to "defend itself", to maintain the *status quo*, no matter what the cost in human and economic terms may be. Consequently, there will be no real change in South Africa, or perhaps in southern Africa, until South Africa has been forced or persuaded to change its posture. And there will be no peace in southern Africa until a way has been found to bring this about.

28. Obviously South Africa's military expansion has an important implication for our purposes today. The rapid military expansion of recent years has required a major economic effort. It has been necessary to mobilize manpower, raw materials, capital, foreign exchange and technical information in order to ensure that the targets of the country's military can be met. The scope of the military programmes, moreover, has been very large, and the demands upon economic resources have therefore been very heavy. The South African Government has had a dominant role in the economy in order to ensure that resources are properly allocated. Thus, programmes to sustain the defence effort have now been given first priority in the country's economic policy.

29. South Africa is now pursuing a so-called "strategic growth programme". That programme has two objectives: to expand and develop South Africa's military capabilities and to improve its strategic position. Over the last three years, spending has been directed increasingly towards projects which contribute to the achievement of those objectives. The Government itself is spending large sums on armaments, strategic research, transportation and communications. Public corporations are also playing an important role. Substantial sums have been spent on oil exploration, colliery expansion and the production of industrial minerals. Even the manufacturing sector, which is dominated by private enterprise, has been mobilized. The Standard Bank described the situation recently in its monthly *Review*:

"In the manufacturing field, semi-public sector projects were intended primarily to strengthen South Africa's strategic position by concentrating on oil technology, steel production, aluminium and uranium reserves, petrol refining and developing electricity, gas and water utilities."

30. The South African Government is thus forcing the pace of economic growth in the country. The so-called "strategic growth programme" has consequently created a very serious foreign problem. South Africa's economy is still in part a dependent one. The country has an industrial base which is only partially developed. It cannot yet develop its own modern technology, especially in the fields of electronics, avionics, machine tools, heavy equipment, computers, telecommunications, automotive equipment and advanced weapons. A programme of growth of the kind now being pursued entails the importation of very large quantities of sophisticated technology and equipment. It is therefore exceedingly costly in terms of foreign exchange.

31. It is a well known fact that, in recent years, South Africa has been confronted with a serious and persistent balance-of-payments problem. Its imports have continuously outpaced its exports over the years and there have been mounting current-account deficits for some time. In recent years, the deficit on the current account has become quite sizeable. In 1975, South Africa had a current deficit of \$2.4 billion. The provisional estimate for the 1976 deficit is \$2 billion and this despite vigorous efforts in the last year to reduce imports and expand exports.

32. These particularly large recent deficits are due in part to the dramatic fall in the price of gold in recent years and to the impact of the world recession on the rate of expansion of South African exports. The main reason, though, for the large deficits has clearly been the cost of the military effort which South Africa has undertaken to ensure the so-called security of *apartheid*. Government spending has expanded considerably and resources have been shifted to sectors where production demands large quantities of foreign exchange. The South African Reserve Bank recently noted that government spending had pushed gross domestic expenditure to very high levels, and had been concentrated:

"particularly on defence equipment, stockpiling of strategic material, the initial outlay on television sets during 1975-76 and the continued high level of expenditure on large capital projects of public authorities and public corporations, all of which have a high import content".

33. I come now to the question of foreign investment in and loans to South Africa. It is common knowledge that South Africa has never overcome its dependence upon foreign capital. For many years foreign corporations and banks have played an important role in financing South African capital formation. South Africa has had a continuing net capital inflow. In recent years, capital has moved to South Africa in very large, indeed astounding, amounts. Between 1974 and 1975, for instance, total direct investment in South Africa rose by nearly 800 million Rand. Long-term loans to the private sector rose by more than 1 billion Rand. Long-term loans to the central government and banking sector rose by nearly 1,300 million Rand. All in all, South Africa's total foreign liabilities increased by approximately 3,700 million Rand between 1974 and 1975.

34. The figures for 1976 are not yet available. The indications are, however, that there is a massive flow of foreign capital into South Africa even now. The net capital inflow of 1976 is at present estimated at some \$1.1 billion. Those funds are being used, first of all, to cover the deficit which South Africa has incurred on its current account. They are therefore assisting the Government of South Africa to pursue an economic policy which is designed to support the current military expansion. Those foreign funds allow South Africa to avoid the problems which large deficits normally entail. They provide the means which enable it to live beyond its resources. In this case, however, South Africa's propensity to spend more than it earns abroad has nothing to do with idle consumption. It is the result of a deliberate policy of military expansion.

35. It is sometimes argued that all this proves very little. Spokesmen for foreign banks, for instance, often say that they are merely lending money to South African corporations or public authorities and that they cannot be held responsible for what is done with that money. This argument seems at first to have a certain plausibility. It breaks down completely, however, when one looks at the facts more closely. In the first place, one must keep in mind that loans and investments are being made in a context. They are being made to a country whose Government is in violation of the Charter of the United Nations and has denied the most elementary human rights to the vast majority of its citizens. That country and that Government are mobilizing economically to ensure the perpetuation of *apartheid* and colonial rule in southern Africa. Economic and financial assistance in such a situation is more than "business as usual". It is assistance to a lawless and militarist State.

36. Furthermore, it is important to recognize that money is very rarely invested in or lent for castles in the air. It is invested in specific projects. It is clear that the money which is now flowing into South Africa is going for the most part directly into projects which are basic to the country's "strategic growth programme". It is obvious that, in the present situation, the Government will use a great deal of the foreign exchange available to it for the purchase of arms and related technology.

37. The Government now appears to be spending in excess of 200 million Rand per year on arms alone. Moreover, many loans are being made to South African government corporations such as ESCOM, ISCOR and SASOL. It is precisely those public corporations which have assumed a major responsibility for carrying out the Government's economic policy. Foreign funds, therefore, are going to those sectors, such as transport, communications, oil technology, uranium and electronics, which are the mainstay of South Africa's military expansion. Indeed, although detailed figures are not yet available, it seems clear that the great bulk of foreign lending, and perhaps even foreign investment, is going to such sectors.

38. Beneath the surface, therefore, things are not at all what they seem to be. We have recently heard a torrent of words to the effect that foreign investment will help to ease the situation for the vast majority of people in South Africa and in the rest of the subcontinent. It has even been suggested that foreign investment and loans may actually lead to the elimination of *apartheid*. We have perhaps been too much influenced by these words, since the argument has rarely been subjected to careful scrutiny. I hope that by looking a little more closely at the matter, I have now shed some light on what is really happening.

39. It is crystal clear that foreign investment is not geared to improving the situation in southern Africa at present. Foreign funds are not directed to agricultural development in the rural areas or to social programmes which would better the life of Africans. The South African Government is certainly not using those funds, or any other resources for that matter, to dismantle *apartheid* in some absent-minded way. On the contrary, thanks to foreign investment and foreign loans, it has been able to build and maintain a

garrison State. Those resources are directly and concretely helping to perpetuate the repugnant policies of *apartheid* and colonialism. And for that reason they must be stopped.

40. Our Organization has now been seized of the problems of South Africa, and in particular the question of *apartheid*, for 31 years. Various commissions and working groups have been set up to deal with that question and their work over the years has cost the world community untold burdens in financial terms alone.

41. I have requested the Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management to provide a cumulative estimate of expenses incurred by the United Nations on the questions relating to *apartheid*. I am advised that the necessary historical data permitting the computation of total expenses for a particular activity such as this from 1946 to 1973 are practically non-existent. Only from 1974 onward could one compile meaningful estimates.

42. A partial accounting for some of the Secretariat units concerned, which consisted of the Centre against *Apartheid* from January 1967 to December 1976, the Special Committee against *Apartheid* from January 1963 to December 1976, the United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa from its creation to December 1976 and the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa also from its inception to December 1976, amounted to a figure of \$15.5 million. Those data relate only to direct costs and do not include indirect expenditures, such as the cost of conference services or public information.

43. What have we to show in concrete results for that investment? We certainly have not conquered *apartheid* or weakened its bastions. A positive contribution has perhaps been made in alerting world public opinion to the problem and its dangers.

44. The time has therefore come for more bold and decisive action against South Africa, which we should take without further delay.

45. At this stage I should like to give advance notice to the members of the Council that four draft resolutions, which will be sponsored by non-aligned and other members of the Council and which are still the subject of consultation and negotiation, will be introduced during this debate. They will be simple and non-controversial. Their terms will be consistent with the Charter and the powers of the Council. They are intended to strengthen the previous resolutions adopted by the Council to dissuade South Africa from pursuing its abhorrent policy of *apartheid*. The submission of those draft resolutions should be regarded as the very minimum that we could do in the present circumstances, considering the gravity of the situation in South Africa. In our view, those circumstances demand sterner measures. We realize, however, the importance of obtaining the unanimity of the Council on this serious matter. We have opted, therefore, for the achievement of an unusually modest but clear objective, through peaceful means within the provisions of the Charter, and we hope that these draft resolutions will be adopted without objection at the appropriate time. We feel confident that our decisions will, when approved by the Council and implemented by

Member States, hasten the collapse of the forces of evil in South Africa and enhance the prospects of peace in the world.

46. Mr. President, as this is the first time I have spoken in the Council this month, it gives me great personal pleasure to extend to you, on my own behalf and on that of my delegation, a warm welcome to the presidency. I wish also to avail myself of this opportunity to pledge the full co-operation of my delegation, which is pleased to have guiding the debate in the Council a distinguished brother whom we have known over the years as a staunch proponent of civil liberties and an ardent defender of human rights. We feel confident that our efforts will be highly inspired and well directed by your mature wisdom and true sense of justice. We are heartened already by the refreshing change we have sensed over the past few weeks in the approach taken by your Government, in Washington and in these halls, in respect of substance and style in international relations. We are indeed happy to note the new emphasis placed on morality and openness, qualities which we value very highly and which we know are deeply rooted in your own spirit, convictions and vocation. We think that the change augurs well for the Organization and we shall therefore spare no effort to ensure that it produces the desired results.

47. I should like to conclude by quoting the wise words of President James Carter—who, I understand, prefers to be called Jimmy Carter, just as you, Sir, prefer to be called Andy—on the occasion of his historic visit to the United Nations last Saint Patrick's Day:

“In southern Africa we will work to help attain majority rule through peaceful means. We believe that such fundamental transformation can be achieved, to the advantage of both blacks and whites. Anything less than that may bring a protracted racial war, with devastating consequences for all.”

48. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Nigeria, Chairman of the African Group for the month of March and Chairman of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

49. Mr. HARRIMAN (Nigeria): This is the first occasion I have had to appear before the Security Council as the chief complainant, in my capacity as Chairman of the African Group for the month of March and as Chairman of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*. I reserve the position of my Government which, with the gracious consent of the Council and the President, will be well articulated by the Commissioner for External Affairs of Nigeria some time tomorrow. However, on the question of South Africa, I feel certain that all of us here are complainants, and I believe that my statement will cover the general spectrum of views of even the most reactionary and hesitant among us. It is also my first opportunity to speak before the Council directly on the general question of South Africa. I wish to express my gratitude to the President and the members of the Council for granting me and the Group which I represent, as well as the Special Committee against *Apartheid*, of which I have the honour to be Chairman, this singular privilege.

50. I should also like to congratulate the President of the Council, Ambassador Andrew Young, a great person and a great leader of a great country. I had occasion to express my views on Ambassador Young through the media of the United States. I believe that most of us have read the *curriculum vitae* of this great young man who, I am sure, has an even greater future before him. His life has been dedicated to the civil rights of minorities in this country. Judging from his pronouncements during the few months since he took office, I see every indication that his work at the United Nations will continue in that humanist tradition.

51. We are happy to note that when President Carter honoured States Members of the United Nations a few evenings ago by addressing them, his policy values reflected the same dedication to equity and justice for all mankind. It is our hope that, you, Mr. President, will bring your experience and knowledge of the values connected with fundamental human rights and basic freedoms in the United States to bear on the international scene.

52. Having spoken to you on a number of occasions and having listened to your views, I find it fitting to pronounce my personal admiration of the great qualities which I find in you. You are debonair, frank and, moreover, warm and humble, even though a few days ago you described yourself as “inherently arrogant”; I would also add that you are firm, judging by your activities and bearing in private discussions in your office. Those are qualities that have not only impressed many of us at the United Nations but also brought you, over the years, close to several leaders of Africa. May I go further and say that in many of our countries your personality and prestige have had some bearing on our view of the new Administration which you represent here. This has gone some way towards changing the image of the United States in several of the countries in Africa, even before we became faintly aware of the policies of the new United States Administration. In this same spirit we have developed tremendous hope and I am pleased to say that, so far, our hopes have not been forlorn. We are inspired to work with you in your capacity not only as President of the Security Council but also as Permanent Representative of your great country.

53. The United States has great power and privilege in the Security Council. *Ipsa facto*, your country has great responsibilities and obligations which, I feel certain, you and your Government are prepared to take on with conviction and dedication. I hope that, as a result of co-operation with and from the international community traversing the barriers of history, geography, communications, race, nationalism and ideology, a new era will be born in which we can boast that we have moved away from preoccupations of war and strife, ideological rivalries and continuing struggle between the polarized North and South and that our concerns will then be focused on how to build up peace based on stability, equity and justice for all peoples of the globe.

54. We wish you well in your assignment and I would say that Africa, the Special Committee against *Apartheid*—members of which you have graciously met informally—and the Government and people of Nigeria give you

their blessings for your career in the United Nations and for the contribution which is expected of you, on behalf of your Government, in moving forward in all aspects of our endeavours at the United Nations.

55. That hope is, I believe, also shared by the struggling people of southern Africa as a whole. To them it is their forlorn hope, the type of hope which inspires the drowning to attempt to snatch at every straw, to try to take hold of the intangible waves and even of ripples. The situation of the black man in Africa is, to say the least, very bleak. To him the future has always been a mirage—hope and frustration. For after Sharpeville in 1960 they, like we, hoped for concerted international pressure against the oppressive régime of South Africa. Very little transpired; rather, a lot did happen, but only in the escalation of Western vested interests. Again, after Soweto, we anticipated more uncompromising action from those who could influence the racist régime towards change. To our knowledge, so far, very few Western representatives are looking beyond their parochial vested interests in South Africa.

56. Today in South Africa we have continuing cross-currents of the evils of colonialism, slavery, racial supremacy, human frailty and lust for profit and greed. We have atavism that is born of crass materialism and barbarism that surfaces in the crunch of fear. There is, on the other hand, the reaction that all those factors generate among the underprivileged and downtrodden. This is a syndrome of fear. It is a lack of serenity to permit acceptance of the fact that ultimately power is of the majority and that this fact cannot be changed. All this is at the basis of the problem of southern Africa.

57. In South Africa, those who have lived in fear of the majority have continued to increase their insurance against the majority by building up, in an ever more formidable manner, barriers of hatred and oppressive curtains against that majority. In that vicious circle, hatred escalates and oppression is perfected, resulting in even greater insecurity for the rich as well as for the downtrodden. Polarization, in turn, escalates. In effect, with the entrenchment of racial barriers, interracial bitterness and conflict become more inveterate. The advantaged race acquires more instruments of torture and oppression as the weak and the underprivileged become more and more desperate.

58. Those with a sense of history can easily discern the inexorable rising tide of change that flows with the tide of time. The feudal lords of the Middle Ages, the imperial autocratic kings and barons, the master-serf era of slavery and colonialism have all been swept away in time. This is another epoch in the history of mankind when racism will be confounded by that inexorable tide of time.

59. All those phenomena in human history have invariably resulted in bitterness, uprisings and war, and in history time has always been on the side of the oppressed. It is only when the oppressed have taken the initiative directly, often with external support, that change has been effected. Such support may frequently be attracted by external conflict of interests or the conflict of value systems. The embers of the burning bitterness of generations of a people are difficult to suppress or to extinguish—much to the consternation of

some. Very often, the scions of such systems have precipitated revolutions which have led to permanent changes in the history of man.

60. The ingredients for such change are all there in southern Africa. Those who have helped and continue to assist the liberation process in Africa are automatically friends of Africa. The corollary is also valid: those who do not are not. Ideology becomes relevant in the circumstances only when it is a useful vehicle to carry one towards one's objectives.

61. The position of the South African racist régime, as well as the policies of its supporters, have been based on a number of fallacies. The first is ideological and concerns the threat of communism. The second concerns the security of the Cape route in the context of Western global strategy. The third relates to the protection of Western civilization and Christian values. The fourth relates to the risk to the vested interests of the West in a change of the system. Any credence given to such hypocrisy amounts to self-deception, if not naïvety.

62. My simple reaction is in the form of pointed questions which I shall ask the Council. First, how does one articulate one's policy options in bondage? Have the liberation movements of southern Africa had the opportunity to exercise any options on the basis of the will of their people? Secondly, why should the Cape route be white? Is the so-called white race the only custodian of liberal ethics, or are black people the anti-Western factors in the world? Thirdly, how can Vorster and his ilk talk about Western civilization and Christian nationalism while they articulate values of un-Christian racial chauvinism? Fourthly, as vested interests of the West grow, will their commitment in South Africa not become greater? Are the Western Powers not likely to get involved even more tomorrow than today in protecting their interests in South Africa?

63. We are moving away from the power that money can buy. We are groping for principles and policies to be applied in southern Africa which would fully reflect the value systems which we cherish within our own borders and at the United Nations. The paradox is that, even in the most advanced of countries, there appears to be some conflict between foreign policy and national value systems. This is basically a conflict of values. Governments deceive their people by making a mockery of their national values in the interest of a few profiteers.

64. The great leaders in history have been those who have taken a hard look at the realities of the times and situations, not those who have begged the question. They are those who have had the courage to change what ought to be changed, in the language of a wise black slave of this continent. Short-term advantages should not outweigh long-term interests, principles must never be sacrificed to expediency. A great leader of our time, General de Gaulle, faced the issues in Algeria, even at the risk of military and political rebellion and frequent assassination attempts and, in effect, threw down the gauntlet to political suicide. He laid his neck on the block. At the risk of a civil war and the collapse of the Fourth Republic of his country, he took a stand. With courage he cast his lot on the side of justice

and equity. We cannot say the same for several leaders of the world today. He did not cling to the quixotic fantasies of empire; his calculations were not based on profit and loss or on the exclusive interests of the *pieds-noirs*—the French settlers.

65. The problem of southern Africa can be seen against that background. Sharpeville was 17 years ago to the day. Sharpeville led to protestations by the Security Council. Between Sharpeville and Soweto, on 16 June last year, there was not much action by most of the world Powers, except for more sales of arms and more investments, loans and trade.

66. Let us recall the action we have taken to curb, if not confound, the atrocities of racial colonial settler oppression and continuing usurpation of power by a minority in South Africa. How has the worsening situation been checked by those who claim the rights and privileges of power but fail to act under the Charter to bring down this obnoxious system, the crime of *apartheid*, the crime against the most basic and elementary form of humanism—wanton killings, increasing measures for oppression and repression on the basis of racial supremacy, the dehumanization of the black people of South Africa to keep them perpetually in bondage, and the expropriation of their country?

67. During the debates on *apartheid* in the General Assembly last year, the representative of a member State of the European Economic Community, a State whose leaders have traditionally been in the vanguard of the anti-*apartheid* movement in Western Europe, made the following statement:

“As the legislative measures to give effect to *apartheid* were introduced in South Africa through the legislative process, the best way to remove *apartheid* would likewise be through a process of peaceful change.”

I could not ascertain whether this was cynicism. It could not be an uninformed approach to the whole question of the *apartheid* system.

68. Others tend to lean towards a circumscribed approach to *apartheid* in the context of their own experience of human and civil rights movements in their respective environments. However, because such statements and approaches emanate from leaders and Governments which should be even more concerned than those with more inveterate interests in South Africa, I intend briefly to go into the substance of the question of *apartheid*.

69. Let us not confuse the *apartheid* system with the violations of fundamental human rights. As I said earlier today, *apartheid* does not come within the ambit of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. It is moulded on baser values. *Apartheid* is a unique innovation as a socio-economic and political philosophy. It has a parallel only in the context of historical experience of barbarism. In that system, a self-imposed minority régime of whites arrogated unto itself the right to institute laws based on the principle of racial supremacy. It is the very abyss of human values where, in contemporary human relations today in South Africa, a white minority régime unilaterally promul-

gates different sets of laws to regulate the lives of the people within a nation-State on the basis of the colour of their skin and the texture of their hair, in order specifically to maintain their minority privileged interests. By an even cleverer distorted manipulation of logic, they relegate blacks to the status of foreigners, natives of so-called homelands or bantustans. However, they have yet to perfect their fraud and find an answer to the question of how to dispose of the Asians and so-called Coloureds in the process of rendering every non-white a foreign body in the “white man’s country” of South Africa.

70. The facts are as follows and we must face them.

71. First, the Dutch arrived in southern Africa after the Portuguese colonialists, who have since been ousted from that part of African soil. The fact that those minority settlers were granted self-government by the British without the process of self-determination and the application of the principle of majority rule, brings this problem and situation in South Africa further into focus and relegates the régime of that country to the status of a white racist settler colonialist régime. Yet the protagonists of equality are not those settler colonialists but the blacks. Those denying the majority are not the owners of the land but the descendants of alien settlers. The oppressors, repressors, torturers and killers are not the majority, but an alien minority.

72. Africans, however, in their traditionally stoical mildness and tolerance, have the Lusaka Manifesto, the Dar-es-Salaam Declaration, the Freedom Charter of the African National Congress of South Africa and the pronouncements of the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania to show for their magnanimity. We recognize that, for the 4 million white settlers, South Africa has become their home. We only call for majority rule based on equal rights for all the racial groups of South Africa.

73. Secondly, through this legislative process, the black people of South Africa have been subjected to dysfunctional labour ethics that relegate the black man to the status of a serf, reducing and tying the white and black to the relationship of slave-master and slave.

74. Thirdly, by means of bantustanization, the blacks in South Africa are being forcibly herded and cramped into so-called homelands which are unviable, non-contiguous tracts of empty veldt. They are reduced to such poverty, misery and dependence in order to keep them *ad infinitum* as reserves of cheap “migrant” labour for the farms, the factories and the kitchens of the white man. As Vorster very succinctly put it:

“It is true that there are blacks working for us. They will continue to work for us for generations in spite of the ideal that we have to separate them completely. The fact of the matter is this. We need them because they work for us, but the fact that they work for us can never entitle them to claim political rights—not now, not in the future, under no circumstances.”

That was said by Mr. Vorster, in the House of Assembly. I quote him again, from the report of the South African Governmental Commission:

"The native should only be allowed to enter the urban areas which are essentially the white man's creation when he is willing to enter and to minister to the needs of the white man, and should depart therefrom when he ceases to minister."

75. By the system of bantustanization, the black man in South Africa is automatically denied citizenship in his own country and becomes a temporary sojourner if he works anywhere outside the 200 enclaves that are to make up nine or ten bantustans occupying non-contiguous tracts that amount to only 13 per cent of the whole land area of South Africa. The result, in effect, is that 20 million blacks have to dwell in that 13 per cent of the country away from the mines and the cities, with 87 per cent of the area comprising the richest agricultural and mineral areas reserved for whites. "If the farmer and the oxen till the land", said Mr. Verwoerd, the predecessor of Vorster, "there is no integration". That is the cynical level to which the relations between the blacks and the whites are relegated in the context of South Africa. On that basis and in accordance with those principles, the Bantu education system has been developed, on the premise that the African cannot be allowed to aspire beyond certain forms of labour and, as was well said, "the role of the oxen".

76. Fourthly, the peaceful opposition to the *apartheid* system manifested by blacks has invariably led to wanton killings, bannings, widespread violence, torture, life prison sentences and the murder of black prisoners in gaol. All they have asked for is equity and justice. They have never been armed. South African blacks have never been armed, except for the children who pick up sticks and stones, as we can see from the films that are shown everywhere at the United Nations.

77. Fifthly, the cultural education of the blacks is modelled and designed to fit them into a stratum of perpetual servitude. In his exposure to culture, the black man is oriented away from liberal values and knowledge and experience of the outside world. This is a continuing process of dehumanization.

78. Sixthly, economic power is exclusively in the hands of the whites. Foreign investments and loans and active trading relations with South Africa enable it to extend the exploitation of cheap labour for sheer shameful profit. Western companies and banks, and to some extent Western Governments, continue to exploit the helplessness of the black workers who have no bargaining rights on conditions for offering their labour. They earn, with no option, below-subsistence stipends.

79. Seventhly, in the military field, a few Western countries refuse to apply a voluntary arms embargo and continue to arm the Fascist groups at Pretoria for profit. The application of mandatory sanctions to pressure the régime into change has been subject to the triple veto more than once because of those very vested interests in the continuing and growing repression of the black people.

80. Let us now take a look at the initiatives of South Africa in southern Africa. The régime's military systems are being built up with Western assistance and participation,

both through direct deliveries and through the sale of licences. The South African authorities freely obtain so-called spare parts and components for their military hardware. This has enabled the South African racist régime not only to continue its oppression but to defy the authority of the United Nations and the Security Council in Namibia and to continue to hold the Organization to ransom. Through that assistance, South Africa continues to relegate the United Nations Council for Namibia and the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia to the status of phantom institutions, despite unanimous resolutions of the Council and all the declarations of the United Nations concerning the exercise of its sacred responsibility for the people and Territory of Namibia.

81. Some Western States connive at the defiance of sanctions against Rhodesia by South Africa and in the same breath extol the allegedly creditable role South Africa is playing in the solution of the problem of the Rhodesian white-minority rebellion. The Security Council continues to adopt resolutions on mandatory sanctions against Rhodesia but will not apply any sanctions against South Africa, which provides the main loophole in those sanctions. The value judgement made with regard to Rhodesia appears to me to differ from that on South Africa, in spite of the more obvious state of belligerency of the South African racist régime against the United Nations and against neighbouring African States, as has been made clear in Angola, Zambia and Lesotho.

82. Despite all altruism, those selective actions lead one to believe that it was easy for the Security Council to apply Chapter VII of the Charter against Rhodesia, because Western vested interests in that country were limited at the time of the illegal unilateral declaration of independence by Ian Smith, gaps being left open to thwart those sanctions by dealing through South Africa and because Rhodesia was no major source of raw materials and was of little so-called strategic importance, since it had a limited market, and probably because Britain's *amour-propre* was involved in that case of a rebellion against its sovereign power.

83. The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) last year wrote about "the risks of a steep escalation of the conflict in South Africa which may grow into the next major international battlefield". As was stated recently by Olof Palme of Sweden, to whose appearance before the Council during this debate we look forward:

"the continuing oppression by the *apartheid* régime of South Africa and its illegal occupation of Namibia are already a potential threat to world peace. *Apartheid* is by its nature a system of violence which can only be maintained by force".

And, I would add personally, it can only be brought down by force. Even the Zulu Chief Gatsha Buthelezi, who chose to work within the constraints of *apartheid*, last year said that the racist régime's intransigence amounted to white "commitment to a bloody revolution". Again, interviewed soon after the Soweto massacre, talking about *apartheid*, he said: "What is required is not just a readjustment of the details of the problem but a change in the system. Separate development is not a policy. It is a problem." The Honourable Olof Palme stated recently also:

"The right type of foreign intervention is that which will support the liberation struggle and reduce the stubborn resistance of the forces which still cling to the ideas of maintaining white supremacy. The wrong kind of intervention is the continued introduction of major-Power rivalries in the region."

84. Every day that goes by sees the Western community more and more involved in the destiny of South Africa, on the negative side. Every day that goes by sees the military budget of South Africa soaring. Every day that goes by gives the South African racist régime some more breathing space to get over incidents like Sharpeville and Soweto, and to improve its momentum towards building itself into one of the world's important military and economic Powers—and all this with the assistance of Western States.

85. In 1960, at the time of Sharpeville, the military budget of South Africa was only 44 million Rand; at the time of Soweto, last year, it had risen to 1,350 million Rand. Foreign loans for support of the South African budget—loans that come mainly from Western banks and the World Bank, which is an intergovernmental organization—have essentially gone to offset the cost of these extra military acquisitions, almost to the dollar.

86. Foreign investment in South Africa in 1960—that is, at the time of Sharpeville—was 3 billion Rand. At the time of Soweto it was over 10 billion Rand. United States investment alone, in 1960, was \$286 million. Today—almost one year after Soweto—it is over \$1.6 billion. In 1960, at the time of Sharpeville, the Federal Republic of Germany had hardly any investments in South Africa; at the time of Soweto, the value of its investments was over \$1 billion. France's investment between Sharpeville and Soweto rose from less than \$200 million to almost \$1 billion.

87. There is the problem. It is a vicious problem. Action, swift action to ensure that the basic value systems professed by the Western countries were imposed in South Africa after Sharpeville—after the articulation of bantustanization and the implementation of the slave-master relations of the *apartheid* system—was not to be undertaken, because of the investments of those Western countries. As can be seen from the statistics I have quoted, these investments have more than trebled since Sharpeville in 1960. Tomorrow they will continue to increase, *ad infinitum*.

88. Peaceful change becomes impossible as the arsenals of the racist régime of South Africa develop into the formidable machinery of both military and economic power for internal oppression and external aggression. It is obvious to most of us in Africa that only concerted and maximum pressure on the racist régime can effect change. Alternatively, as President Carter rightly discerned a few days ago: "A gathering racial conflict threatens southern Africa". He rightly stressed the need for a "fundamental transformation" towards majority rule, adding that anything less than that may bring "a protracted racial war, with devastating consequences for all".

89. That is the scenario that has built up since Sharpeville and Soweto. No African, no member of the non-aligned movement, no friend of Africa can fail to subscribe to

action in which pressure is applied on the racist régime in South Africa in the spirit of the draft resolution that we have presented to the members of the Council. A mandatory arms embargo is not a violent approach. Economic sanctions are not warfare. These are the minimum pressures required to bring about change in South Africa.

90. The General Assembly, at its last session, considered the situation thoroughly and adopted a series of resolutions for international action against *apartheid*. By overwhelming majorities, it requested the Security Council to take action within its responsibilities under the Charter. In resolution 31/6 I, it declared that

"the situation in South Africa, resulting from the policies and actions of the racist régime, constitutes a grave threat to the peace, requiring action under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations".

In resolution 31/6 D, it once again requested the Security Council

"to take urgent action, under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, to ensure the complete cessation by all States of the supply of arms, ammunition, military vehicles and spare parts thereof, and any other military equipment to South Africa, as well as any co-operation to enable the building-up of military and police forces in South Africa".

It further requested the Council to call upon all Governments in particular: (a) to implement fully the arms embargo against South Africa, without any exception; (b) to refrain from importing any military supplies manufactured by, or in collaboration with, South Africa; (c) to terminate any existing military arrangements; (d) to prohibit any institutions, agencies or companies, within their national jurisdiction, from delivering to South Africa or placing at its disposal any equipment or fissionable material or technology that will enable the racist régime of South Africa to acquire nuclear-weapon capability. In resolution 31/6 K, the Assembly urged the Council,

"when studying the problem of the continued struggle against the *apartheid* policies of South Africa, to consider steps to achieve the cessation of further foreign investments in South Africa".

91. The Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity, meeting in Mauritius in July 1976, and the Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, meeting at Colombo in August 1976, called for effective sanctions against the South African régime under Chapter VII of the Charter. So have numerous non-governmental organizations and a great number of Governments, representing wide segments of public opinion all over the world.

92. I should like to draw particular attention to the special appeals made by the General Assembly to the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America to desist from using their veto power to protect the *apartheid* régime, and to facilitate the adoption of

effective measures, under Chapter VII of the Charter, to deal with the grave situation in South Africa. I hope that those Powers, which have in the past vetoed even mandatory arms embargoes against South Africa, will heed the appeals from the overwhelming majority of Member States.

93. I believe that the scenario is clear. Those who consider their vested interests and investments in South Africa will find it even more difficult tomorrow to apply these pressures.

94. It is with such a clear recognition of this imminent and grave danger to peace, and of the need for fundamental transformations, that the international community must address itself to the question of South Africa today.

95. We do not see a conflict of interests, but a concert of interests. That is why we crave the adoption of resolutions that do not allow day-to-day problems to become insurmountable and that avert the danger that the chance for peaceful solution through action under Chapter VII of the Charter may slip away. With the understanding and support of all the member of the Council, which is endowed under Chapter VII with great responsibility, I again reiterate my earnest expectation that our hopes are not forlorn and that they will be justified. Otherwise, let us be aware of the options. We all know what those options are.

96. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Sri Lanka, whom I now invite to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

97. Mr. FONSEKA (Sri Lanka): Mr. President, while thanking the Security Council for giving me this opportunity to speak, I should like very much to offer my congratulations to you on your assumption of the office of President of the Council for the month of March. I have no doubt that your wide experience and the high principles that you have consistently espoused will greatly facilitate and assist the debate before us.

98. I am speaking today both on behalf of my Government and as the representative of the current Chairman of the 86 countries members of the non-aligned group, which constitute nearly two thirds of the membership of the United Nations.

99. In reconvening for consideration of the question of South Africa, the Security Council is again focusing attention on the South African Government's policies of *apartheid*, which continue to be a threat to peace. At this series of meetings the Council will hear many more speakers and some of us may be inclined to regard much that is said as the same old refrain, or even dismiss it as just "old hat". But we must ask them to bear with us because, while talk of *apartheid* is indeed an old refrain, the continued application of the policies of *apartheid* by the South African Government, with all the oppression, violence and depravity it entails for the black people of South Africa, is not at all "old hat". We all know why today, 21 March, has been chosen for the reconvening of this meeting of the Council. In another place at the Headquarters of the United Nations this morning we observed the International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, because on this

day, 17 years ago, the world community was made aware of the brutal massacre that took place at Sharpeville, a small town in South Africa. Ever since, this tragic anniversary has been observed as a reminder of the inhumanity that man can perpetrate against his own kind merely because people happen to be born into a different racial group, because their skin is not white.

100. Since then, there have been other Sharpevilles inflicted on the people of South Africa, some of which received the attention of the international community in some measure, while others, by virtue of their frequency, have perhaps passed unnoticed, and the victims of that violence died unsung. But for the black people of South Africa, Sharpeville and all that it connotes is an every-day experience in one form or other. Just last year, on 16 June, the South African Government made a further demonstration of another aspect of the meaning of *apartheid* by wreaking vengeance on a group of children who asked no more than that they be allowed to be taught in their own language instead of the language of the oppressing minority. I do not need to repeat what we all know of the perpetration of that savagery in Soweto, that ghetto on the outskirts of Johannesburg.

101. The General Assembly gave much of its time during its session last year to a debate on that very subject, and a resolution, containing several parts and bearing the number 31/6, was adopted under agenda item 52. Some parts of that resolution were adopted without a vote. Others were adopted with numerically small, but not insignificant, abstentions or votes against. Nevertheless, all who addressed their minds to that resolution were agreed in their condemnation of the legalized racist policies which pass as *apartheid* and are pursued by the Government of South Africa. Dissent, where expressed, was in regard to the measures for implementing a reversal of those policies.

102. But what purpose have those condemnations served? Have they had any discernible impact on the attitude of the régime in South Africa? We are told from time to time that conditions are improving and that, given time, changes will take place. But the record of the South African Government, whether before or since those resolutions, shows little evidence of a change of heart. World opinion, if it has touched it at all, has made no more than a dent on the conscience of South Africa's rulers. We are told that measures are being taken to eliminate what is described as petty *apartheid*, but that in reality comprises minor irritants; and we know that even those are grudgingly conceded, making little difference to the day-to-day lives of the black people of South Africa who constitute the vast majority.

103. On the other hand, the more tangible measures and those of consequence taken by the South African régime are clear enough evidence of its determination to safeguard and perpetuate the hard core of *apartheid*. The policy of bantustans, which they have pursued so vigorously, is intended to emasculate the territory of South Africa with a view to preserving all that is best of its land and its resources within the boundaries of *apartheid* South Africa, with the impoverished and isolated shells earmarked for bantustans. Unfortunately for South Africa, the world was

too wide awake to fall for this deception and the General Assembly, in its resolution 31/6 A, called upon all Governments to deny any form of recognition to the Transkei, the first of those bantustans, or to any others that would follow. But we may ask, will that resolution and the denial of international recognition deter the South African Government from pursuing its perverse scheme? We think not. Whatever their short-comings, the rulers of South Africa are not lacking in a certain tenacity which has enabled them to survive with their policies of *apartheid* intact, as they have done so far.

104. An examination of the voting pattern on resolution 31/6 does give some indication of the reasons that have deflected the world community's resolve to banish the evil of *apartheid*. It is not for us today to inquire into or comment upon why and how this has come about. But let us agree that among us, at the United Nations, there is a hard core of representatives who, while reaffirming their condemnation of *apartheid*, find the observance and implementation of that resolution inconvenient, to say the least.

105. *Apartheid*, they agree, is a manifest evil, but their political, economic and strategic interests must in the immediate present and, we fear, in the foreseeable future take priority over the dictates of their conscience. And if, until the day of deliverance from *apartheid* comes, there are some floggings, some little torture and some killings, these must be borne as the small price payable for a peaceful transition, but also, may we truthfully add, because their victims happen to be just black people. If these remarks are construed as uncalled-for cynicism, one must plead guilty. But let me ask: what other meaning can one attach to the conduct and protestations of powerful States which recognize evil and yet do so little to hasten its removal?

106. If we are to evaluate the real prospects of an end to *apartheid* and evaluate all the forces that uphold it and the strength of those forces, we must go outside the borders of South Africa to Zimbabwe. In the weeks coinciding with the commencement of the last session of the General Assembly, there was a stir, a last-minute effort to apply pressure on the illegal Smith régime. What result did it bring about? Not all the efforts of two great Powers could move Ian Smith anywhere near really sharing political power, which has hitherto been and continues to remain the monopoly of the white minority in Zimbabwe. During and after a brief encounter at Geneva, Smith again demonstrated a capacity to argue, procrastinate and immobilize—a capacity which has been his forte ever since he unilaterally seized power in November 1965. The Geneva encounter and what followed was not entirely unrewarding for him. He used that opportunity to try to divide the ranks of the nationalist forces within and outside Zimbabwe. We might be asked why this diversion from South Africa to Zimbabwe. I have referred to it only as an indication of the stubbornness and tenacity of the white minority régimes in southern Africa, where Smith's Rhodesia is still in a position to thumb its nose not merely at the world community but at those who are in a position to exercise their power with a view to influencing events. If that is the outcome in Zimbabwe, what is the future for the people of South Africa, whose Government is militarily more formidable and regards *apartheid* as an article of faith?

107. Many more speakers are to address the Council during this series of meetings and I should not take up more of the Council's time in putting forth arguments and sentiments which they can more competently and eloquently express. However, before concluding, I wish to say that the picture is not entirely bleak. During these last six weeks our attention has repeatedly been drawn to the vexed subject of human rights and, of course, the persistent violations all around us. My delegation, for one, fully endorses this concern for human rights—attachment to which we have all professed by our acceptance of the Charter of the United Nations. We do know that not only are there different interpretations of human rights and their violation but also that concern varies according to the violator and the place where the rights happen to have been violated. Whatever differences we may have on the infringement of human rights elsewhere, my delegation would like to think that, in so far as South Africa is concerned, there is no dispute at all, because the régime there incorporates a violation of human rights into its Constitution and laws.

108. I have stated that I do not see the picture as wholly bleak because, if a real concern for upholding human rights is manifest, we should begin, after having subscribed to resolutions, by taking some tangible action to ensure and hasten the observance of human rights in South Africa, which does not even pretend that its black population has any rights. And here my delegation's contribution to the Council's proceedings would be incomplete if we did not add that all of us were well aware of where that capacity for action lay. Without recrimination, my delegation asks that those who have the capacity should use the power at their disposal not merely to remind the South African Government of its obligations but also to take such measures as would compel that Government to give its black people, who comprise the vast majority of its population, even a modicum of the human rights which we have seen being espoused so vocally during the last six weeks.

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

110. Mr. ABDEL MEGUID (Egypt): Mr. President, allow me first to convey to you my delegation's warm congratulations on your assumption of the high office of President of the Security Council for this month. I am convinced that your vast experience and parliamentary skill, together with your dedication to the freedom of man and respect for human rights, will be instrumental in guiding the deliberations of the Council towards a satisfactory conclusion. As the delegation of an African country, we are particularly happy that this debate on the question of South Africa is being held under your presidency.

111. I should like to begin by reaffirming the full support of the people and Government of Egypt for the people of South Africa and their solidarity with the heroic struggle of that people to regain its inalienable right to self-determination and self-government and to put an end to the inhuman and hateful crimes which are being committed by the white minority régimes in the southern part of our African continent. We should like also to welcome and hail

the struggle of national liberation movements acting on behalf of all the peoples of southern Africa to free their peoples from the yoke and arrogance of racist régimes.

112. While we express our pride in the struggle of the people of South Africa today, the great sacrifices made by them during their long and arduous struggle and their firm resolve to continue along the path leading to national liberation serve to confirm what we have repeatedly maintained, namely, our firm conviction that the will of the people cannot be conquered and that their continued struggle for their freedom has become a historical inevitability and a well acknowledged right borne out by international documents and by the facts, and upheld by all peace-loving forces in the world that are supporters of freedom, justice and human rights.

113. Certainly the central problem in southern Africa is the immutability of South Africa's racial policies on which all other problems ultimately turn. Since the Sharpeville massacre of March 1960, international public opinion has become increasingly aware of the urgent need to put an end to the tragedy of the non-white population of South Africa.

114. For more than 15 years, and at all levels, our Organization has been discussing ways and means of putting an end to the impossible and inhuman situation in South Africa. During this period it has become clear to the international community that, in the face of South Africa's intransigence and procrastination, it is necessary to impose diplomatic and economic sanctions against the Government of that minority régime as the only effective method of forcing that régime to abandon its intolerable policy.

115. Proceeding from that premise, the Security Council, in 1963, adopted resolution 181 (1963), in which it called upon all States to cease forthwith the sale and shipment of arms, ammunition of all types and military vehicles to South Africa. Since then numerous resolutions have been adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council reaffirming the gravity of the situation and condemning the continuation of the inhuman policy of *apartheid*. In spite of that, the arrogant racist régime has persisted in its inhuman and barbaric behaviour through cold-blooded and indiscriminate massacres of school children, students, women and many innocent people at Soweto, Langa and other townships in South Africa.

116. The Soweto massacres of June 1976 and the many others which have followed since demonstrate beyond all doubt that the racist régime of South Africa is determined to perpetuate *apartheid* by all coercive means. It will not hesitate to intimidate and ruthlessly repress those who oppose it. As recently as last October, Mr. Vorster, Prime Minister of the South African régime, in reply to a query from a correspondent of *The New York Times* as to whether he could foresee the possibility of white rule eventually being replaced by black rule in his country, said: "I cannot foresee such a day at all, and I repeat that it is our right to be here on the land we occupy. We did not take away from black people anything whatsoever." One could ask Mr. Vorster what his régime has left to the black people of South Africa, having deprived them of their own land, their liberty, their honour and their dignity.

117. Moreover, South Africa still continues its illegal occupation of Namibia in flagrant defiance of resolutions of the Security Council and refuses to hold a dialogue with the genuine representatives of Azania and Namibia, namely, the African National Congress of South Africa, the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania and the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO). Gradualism has been proposed, without any concern for the urgency which the oppressed peoples attach to their rights. Yet the latest criminal invasion carried out by Pretoria against Angola, reports of which were confirmed by the Defence Headquarters at Pretoria on 3 February 1977, shows intensified bad faith on the part of the Pretoria régime.

118. The attempts made by the régime to maintain its domination have taken the form of the so-called policy of bantustans, which has borne fruit in the declaration of the so-called independence of the Transkei—denounced by the international community as a manoeuvre aimed at consolidating the usurpation carried out by the racist régime of South Africa and forcing millions of people of that country to become aliens in their own homeland. General Assembly resolution 31/A of 26 October 1976 is seen to be the best reply to all those attempts.

119. The question, then, is for how long can we afford to let South Africa go from defiance to defiance, and, furthermore, as an Organization entrusted with safeguarding the interests of peoples subjected to foreign domination and oppression and, above all, entrusted with maintaining international peace and security, whether we will be able to live up to our responsibilities and moral obligations. International public opinion looks to our Organization to ensure that the rules of international morality and the principles set out in the Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights prevail in that country.

120. Admittedly, racial discrimination is still practised in many parts of the world, but everywhere it is recognized as an evil which has to be fought vigorously. South Africa, however, stands out in stark defiance of the purposes and principles of the Charter and the morals of the world community. As far back as 1948, in the early days of the United Nations, elementary manifestations of respect for human rights were consistently trampled underfoot by South Africa. South Africa proceeded to promulgate one law after another to entrench and put into practice a weird philosophy based on the treatment of its nationals on the basis of colour. In South Africa, each person is classified as either white or non-white. If a person is white, he governs and has a licence to live off the exploitation of the non-whites. In every sphere of national life, the non-whites are discriminated against and reduced to the status of slaves.

121. The African people of South Africa are tired of the verbal condemnation of *apartheid*. They need practical and effective support for their cause. We cannot deny them that support if we are committed to the search for peace and stability in South Africa.

122. It should be clear to us that the struggle for freedom, racial equality and human dignity in South Africa has reached the crossroads. One road leads to the total

liquidation of *apartheid* with a minimum of human suffering. The other leads to a bloody racial holocaust. If the situation in South Africa is allowed to persist, it may well lead to a war whose proportions we may not have envisaged. Any analysis of recent developments assures us that in the near future the international community will have to choose between two clear possible courses: either to work seriously and decisively to establish the necessary conditions for the realization of the will of the people and consequently to maintain international peace, which would give our world tranquillity and time to confront the challenge of creating a better future for mankind, or to be faced with a wide-ranging liberation war that would entail changing the present state of affairs by force and violence. We believe, however, that we can minimize the bloodshed, restore the dignity and worth of man in that country and avoid another catastrophe by taking the necessary and long overdue decisions immediately.

123. Whether or not *apartheid* will be liquidated with a minimum of human suffering will depend largely upon the exercise of our collective will and the readiness of certain Members of our Organization to desist from collaborating with the racist régime in the political, economic, military as well as nuclear fields. It is through such collaboration that the South African régime has been able to acquire some of the most sophisticated weapons in use today, weapons which it has already actually used for both internal repression of the African people and external aggression against independent African States.

124. In this connexion, Egypt has always drawn attention to the danger of the ever-increasing ties between the racist régime in South Africa and its counterpart in Israel. Our realization of that danger is based on purely objective considerations, the primary one being the fact that both régimes have become fully-fledged arsenals of the most advanced and sophisticated destructive weapons situated in the south and to the north of our African continent.

125. The military relationship between Israel and South Africa dates back to 1948 when South African Zionist volunteers fought on the side of the Zionist settlers in Palestine. To quote Israeli sources, the small Jewish community in South Africa "contributed more to the Israeli war effort, in terms of skilled volunteers, than any other country in the world". The same holds true for the 1956 and 1967 wars, during which many South Africans volunteered, and a number of them actually did fight with the Israeli forces. The 1973 war witnessed even wider co-operation—1,500 Jews of South African descent took part in actual combat. At least one jet fighter of South African origin was shot down over the Suez Canal.

126. During his visit to Israel, on a tour which the Ambassador to South Africa tried to pass off as mere sightseeing, Prime Minister Vorster inspected Israeli aircraft factories, naval facilities and an air force base. The Israeli army, navy and air force, according to the Israeli Ambassador, were viewed by Mr. Vorster as more or less tourist attractions—"like the Western Wall and Mount Zion".

127. Further details of the Israeli-South African military collaboration were contained in a report broadcast on Kol

Israel. On 9 August 1976, the Israeli radio disclosed that Israel was building long-range gunboats for South Africa. The vessels are to be armed with sea-to-sea missiles. Some reports put the number at two, others put it at six.

128. As noted earlier, South African volunteers fought on the Israeli side in Israel's numerous wars. As the black national liberation movement gains strength in Africa, a situation may arise where Israel will find itself forced to repay the favour by sending Israeli "volunteers" to fight alongside South African troops. It may also find itself obliged to put its know-how and expertise at the disposal of its South African benefactors. Additionally, unconfirmed reports from Africa indicate that there may even be some direct collaboration between Israeli and South African soldiers in actual combat situations. According to representatives of SWAPO who were on a mission to Angola, Israeli soldiers are now actively involved in the fight against their forces.

129. More ominous is the rumour that South Africa is preparing to supply Israel with uranium. If that rumour is confirmed, the threat presented by this dangerous development would be incalculable, given the desperate situation of those two States and the fact that neither is a signatory of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. A nuclear deterrent might appear to both as the only alternative to their complete dependence on the West. With such a state of military self-sufficiency, they could pursue their policies unhampered by world public opinion or by any pressures from their Western supporters.

130. Very recent reports have revealed the real dimensions and objectives of the rapidly growing area of military co-operation between Israel and South Africa. The *Frankfurter Rundschau*, published in West Germany, reported, in its issue of 9 December 1976, that:

"The Israeli company Tardiran Israel Electronic Industries, which specializes in armament production, has, together with the South African Calan Group, founded a subsidiary in Rosslyn near Pretoria. This was announced in Johannesburg on Wednesday. In the Rosslyn works a broad programme of electrical and electronic devices will be produced. Moreover the branch will occupy itself with the sale of very modern Tardiran products, which cannot be manufactured in Rosslyn."

131. Just last week, in its issue of 15 March 1977, *The Christian Science Monitor* published a report in which it gave a good account of the areas of co-operation between the two countries. One of the facts provided in that report is that South Africa has long been purchasing arms from Israel, supplying it with diamonds and other raw materials and sharing technology in areas such as railroads, the development of gas energy from coal and arms manufacture. And now Israeli newspapers and other published sources report that South Africa operates, with Israel, a large plant to manufacture electronic devices for counter-insurgency and other sensitive fields denied to South Africa by Western Governments.

132. In our evaluation, the power of the huge stockpiles of destructive weapons in both the south and north of our

African continent will no doubt be directed against our African peoples and consequently will continue to represent a threat to the security of our continent and the security of our peoples. And certainly all this has a great impact on peace and security in the world.

133. The real danger in co-operation between Israel and South Africa, however, is evidenced by the fact that both régimes continue to usurp the lands and rights of peoples by force and to impose a fait accompli on the international community as a whole. In the light of the fact that Pretoria and Israel have both continued to refuse to implement resolutions of the United Nations and to participate in the search for peaceful and just solutions, and with the growing feeling among the Palestinian people and the people of South Africa that their patience has been exhausted as regards the arrival of a just solution, revolution among these peoples has become inevitable.

134. When the fifth Summit Conference of Non-Aligned Countries was held at Colombo in August 1976, it was clear that there was a growing consciousness of the serious danger of co-operation between the two régimes, which has entered a new phase that called for the adoption of effective and corrective measures. This was expressed in political resolution No. 1¹ adopted by the Conference, which was attended by 86 States members of the non-aligned movement. That resolution concerning South Africa

“Strongly deplores the continued political, economic, military and other collaboration by a number of Western Powers, as well as some other States, particularly Israel, with the South African régime.”

135. Just a few days ago the first Afro-Arab Summit Conference held at Cairo from 7-9 March 1977, stated in its Political Declaration that:

“The African and Arab Heads of State and Government condemn the constant military aggressions as well as other political and economic manoeuvres carried out by imperialism through the racist régimes of South Africa and Rhodesia and their allies, against the sovereign States of Angola, Botswana, Lesotho, Mozambique and Zambia, with the aim of politically destabilizing the Governments of these countries and of sabotaging their efforts for economic development. The Conference regards such aggressions as directed against the Afro-Arab world and as a threat against world peace. The Conference also condemns similar activities carried out by Israel against Egypt, Jordan, Lebanon, Syria and the people of Palestine.” [S/12298, annex, para. 7.]

136. Egypt is one of the countries which have repeatedly drawn attention to the danger of the continuation of unjust conditions in South Africa and we have never failed on any occasion to underline the grave situation created when such conditions are allowed to exist. We have therefore extended all possible aid and assistance to the representatives of that brotherly people and to their national liberation movement. In all international forums we have stressed the need to speed up the adoption of effective measures to enable that

people to recover its full inalienable rights. That was Egypt's position and objective at the first Afro-Arab Summit Conference Meeting.

137. The Political Declaration of that Conference, among other commitments, contained the following:

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

138. In the light of its national experience, Egypt believes that time is pressing for an adoption of all necessary international measures, including the application of the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter, so that the racist régimes may return to their senses, give up their policies and try to understand events before they are overtaken by them.

139. We are convinced that the violence and repression by the South African racist régime have greatly aggravated the situation in South Africa and will certainly lead to violent conflict and racial conflagration, with serious international repercussions.

140. The Security Council, in our view, is under the legal obligation to assume its responsibilities, under the Charter, for the maintenance of international peace and security. Accordingly, the Council should condemn the South African racist régime for its resort to massive violence and repression against the black people, who constitute the great majority of the country. The Council should declare that the South African racist régime has flagrantly and persistently violated the principles of the Charter, and that, consequently, the policies and actions of this racist régime have seriously disturbed peace in the region and, if continued, would constitute a grave threat to international peace and security.

141. Certainly, such a declaration is a mere obligation on the part of the Council. Yet the Council should adopt further effective measures by demanding that the racist régime of South Africa: first, end the violence and repression against the black people and all other opponents of *apartheid*; secondly, release all persons imprisoned under arbitrary security laws and all those detained for their opposition to *apartheid*; thirdly, cease forthwith indiscriminate violence against peaceful demonstrators against *apartheid*, as well as the murder in detention and torture of political prisoners; fourthly, abolish all measures of *apartheid* and racial discrimination; and fifthly, abolish the policy of bantustanization, abandon the policy of *apartheid* and ensure majority rule based on justice and equality.

¹ See A/31/197, annex IV.

142. Furthermore, the Council must find effective ways to ensure implementation by the South African régime of the provisions of its resolutions 387 (1976) and 393 (1976) and its resolutions regarding Southern Rhodesia.

143. The Council should call on all States to take all appropriate measures to secure the implementation of those resolutions. Thus, the Council should call on all States to cease forthwith the sale and shipment to South Africa of arms, ammunition of all types and military equipment, and to refrain from any co-operation with the South African régime in the nuclear field. All Member States of the United Nations have the obligation to implement fully the provisions of paragraph 4 of resolution 282 (1970), adopted by the Council on 23 July 1970, for the strengthening of the arms embargo.

144. The Council should address itself to the importance of the cessation of foreign investment in South Africa, as well as of other measures to discourage economic co-operation with that racist régime. Thus, the Council should request all Governments and all specialized agencies of the United Nations to refrain from any investment in or loans to the South African racist régime or companies registered in South Africa.

145. To ensure the effectiveness of those measures, it is incumbent upon the Council to call on the South African régime to take steps to comply with its obligations under the Charter and the provisions of the relevant resolutions of the Council and to report within a specific time-limit on the steps it has taken. If that régime fails to comply with such resolutions, the Council should consider immediate action under all the appropriate provisions of the Charter, including those of Articles 5 and 6 and Chapter VII.

146. In order to reflect the conscience of the world community, the Council should express its support for and solidarity with all those struggling for the elimination of *apartheid* and racial discrimination and all the victims of violence and repression by the South African racist régime.

147. For its part, Egypt has clearly expressed its position in the statement made by Mr. Ismaïl Fahmy, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Egypt, on the International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination. In that statement he declared, *inter alia*, that

“The Arab Republic of Egypt strongly condemns the crimes perpetrated by the racist colonialist régime of Vorster against the brotherly African people in the south of the continent, through the bloody massacres it is organizing in order to maintain its domination and impose racial discrimination. We in Egypt would like to renew our pledges to our brothers who are struggling against racist and colonial régimes; we promise to grant them moral and material assistance and would like to hail the martyrs and all those struggling for freedom and against colonialism and racism in all its forms.”

Our promise has been fulfilled by what President Sadat declared in his keynote address to the first Afro-Arab Summit Conference Meeting at Cairo, on 7 March 1977.

148. Now we should like to express our strong conviction that the problem before our Organization is the choice between action and inaction, between reluctance to adopt certain resolute but effective methods and the need to respond without hesitation to Vorster's defiance. The triumph of justice and equality can be effected only through a coherent approach, including specific measures. The responsibility of the Security Council is, in our view, clearly defined: it is to proceed urgently to assemble the measures proposed during this debate in order to ensure their acceptance and implementation by the entire international community.

149. The PRESIDENT: The last speaker today is Mr. Leballo, to whom the Council has agreed to extend 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.

150. Mr. LEBALLO: Mr. President, I wish to thank you and the members of the Security Council for giving me the opportunity to address you at the opening of your important debate on the situation in Azania.

151. For us in the Azanian national liberation movement there is great significance in the fact that this debate has opened on an auspicious date in the calendar of our protracted struggle for freedom and independence: 21 March, which this year marks the seventeenth anniversary of the historic Positive Action Campaign and the 1960 Sharpeville and Langa massacres.

152. The Council will recall that the earth-shaking events which followed the campaign lifted our struggle to new heights and filled our people with great hopes. It was only through the use of wanton violence that the South African *apartheid* régime managed to contain the situation and halt the emergence of the democratic State.

153. Three years later, a noted Azanian writer, Lewis Nkosi, observed that Mangaliso Sobukwe, the national leader of the Azanian people and President of the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania, who personally launched and led the Positive Action Campaign, had “helped to orchestrate a crisis that panicked the South African Government and nearly brought about the kind of political anarchy which all too often makes possible the transfer of power overnight”.

154. Today, our sad remembrance of those who fell at Sharpeville, Langa, Vanderbijl Park, Nyanga and other African townships, as well as memories of those recently massacred in the wake of the national uprising which broke out at Soweto on 16 June, are gravely compounded with the assassination of yet another outstanding hero of the African revolution, President Marien Ngouabi of the People's Republic of the Congo.

155. As one who stood and worked closely with a dynamic black leader who is always in our minds, Martin Luther King, you, Mr. President, can appreciate even more intimately the loss Africa has suffered through the foul assassination of an esteemed leader. Our deep-felt con-

dolences go to the brotherly people of the Congo and the family of President Ngouabi.

156. As you know, Mr. President, there has been more than a mere abundance of euphoria over the selection of yourself to head your country's delegation to this august Organization. Therefore, the significance of your presiding over this debate is great, particularly so soon after your assumption of this responsibility. If we have not shared in that euphoria, this is no reflection on your person. On the contrary we, like you, are only too well aware of the many great obstacles that must be overcome before the powers that be ever side with the overwhelming majority of United Nations Member States in implementing resolutions that run counter to the vested interests of the powerful minority in this world body.

157. This debate is held as a sequel to resolution 392 (1976) of 19 June 1976, which unanimously condemned the South African *apartheid* régime for the massacre of school children and other Azanian patriots at Soweto on 16 June. It was then decided that the Security Council would remain seized of the matter.

158. As we are all aware, the situation, namely the reckless blood-letting by South African police, has deteriorated more than a hundredfold. The atmosphere in Azania reeks with the blood of fallen martyrs. Men, women and children, some of as little as four years of age, have been pitilessly mowed down all over South Africa, in large cities like Johannesburg, Cape Town, Pretoria, Port Elizabeth, Pietermaritzburg, Bloemfontein and Durban, and in small villages like Ngoye, Turfloop, Thaba Nchu and Qwaqwa, as well as in small bantustan towns like Umtata and Mafeking.

159. Those atrocities are *apartheid* South Africa's customary contemptuous answer to the world community's exhortations, such as resolution 392 (1976). Yet, on the very eve of this debate, leading opinion makers in this city, the seat of the Headquarters of the United Nations, complain that the mild calls for African majority rule in Azania will only serve to harden the whites in South Africa.

160. As before, it is the selfish sensitivities of the oppressor that are paramount for those elements and not the gross injustices suffered by the oppressed in our country. This hypocritical pontification is nothing more than an elaborate smoke-screen puffed out to cover up the real reasons for preserving the *status quo* in Azania: the lucrative incomes which flow from the oppression and exploitation of the indigenous majority and our natural wealth.

161. Seventeen years after first taking up the question of *apartheid* colonialism, and subsequently recognizing the fact that that obnoxious system poses a danger to peace, the Security Council cannot afford to remain trapped in a revolving-door type of paralysis, a situation in which its vast membership recognizes that the United Nations has to act in support of the oppressed in Azania, and where an inordinately powerful minority deliberately sabotages such support.

162. Whether *apartheid* South Africa's traditional supporters wish to acknowledge it or not, the whites in that country are confronted by a tempestuous tide of black anger and have their backs against the open seas. Those who are temporizing must bear the full consequences of the inevitable catastrophe that is impending for the whites in South Africa.

163. To a number of perceptive whites, the coming dangers have crystallized. Although shut out of the centres of rebellion by para-military police, they saw enough of the black anger in the newspapers when black militants broke out of the encirclements at Soweto, Guguletu or Athlone, taking the fight to the downtown areas of Johannesburg and Cape Town after June of last year. The raw courage and iron determination of our youth, as with stones and sticks they took on para-military police armed to the teeth with modern weapons, has aroused great fear amongst the whites.

164. For us in the liberation movement this has no significant meaning other than that the unprecedented victory of the mildly anti-*apartheid* and white Progressive Reform Party during the recent Johannesburg municipal elections must be seen in the context of panic amongst those whites. And so too must be judged the desperate plots to dump Vorster, hatched by some of the leaders of his security forces. These half-hearted moves away from *apartheid*, while they are insignificant in view of the fundamental demands for unfettered self-determination for all of the people of Azania, are also doomed, because Vorster can always point out to the white minority that supports him the fact that the leading Western countries, with their actions in the United Nations, support the *status quo* in South Africa.

165. In the next round of the unfolding struggle, it must not be expected that Azanian freedom fighters will be relying exclusively on stones, sticks and other primitive weapons. The courageous young men and women who shook South Africa to its foundations after 16 June are resolved to equip themselves with guerrilla warfare skills and are preparing to wage a people's war with modern weapons. History is heavy with evidence that people waging a revolutionary war eventually overcome any enemy, no matter how powerful. For our inspiration in Azania we have only to look across the border to the People's Republic of Mozambique, and recall the similar victories over Portuguese colonialism of our brothers and sisters in Angola, where the *apartheid* South Africa army was humiliated, and in Guinea-Bissau. Indeed, who can forget the triumph of the heroic peoples of Cambodia, Laos and Viet Nam over American aggressors?

166. During a recent interview with a black American journalist, winner of the Pulitzer Prize, our respected leader, Mangaliso Sobukwe, described the prevailing situation in Azania as follows:

"In Sharpeville we overcame the fear of the consequences of disobeying the law . . . It became respectable to go to gaol and emerge as what Kwame Nkrumah called 'a prison graduate'. We stripped the white man of that weapon against us.

"The white man now, in Soweto, had to fall back on his ultimate weapon, the gun . . . Soweto has been a lesson in overcoming the fear of the gun. And now that he relies on the gun and we too can get the gun, confrontation is inevitable."

167. There are those who excel in the dubious exercise of portraying African liberation movements as mere pawns of other Powers. This crass nonsense is an unmitigated insult to the dignity of the men, women and children who have risen to restore their birthright in their own lands. I bring this up because it is frequently the red herring the opinion makers, to whom I referred earlier, draw out to rationalize support for the white minority régimes in southern Africa.

168. The main forces spearheading the struggle in Azania, those who have made their mark at Sharpeville and Soweto and are resolved to wage a self-reliant people's war against *apartheid*, colonialism and imperialism, owe their allegiance to none other than the struggling masses and our fatherland. Our objective is a non-racial and democratic Azania. We have opted for the creation of an egalitarian society because it is the inalienable right of every nation on earth to chart its own course. We make no apologies for this, just as we make no apologies for opting for the noble policy of non-alignment in our relations with the rest of the world. We are definitely not struggling in order to become a sphere of influence for any foreign Power.

169. I wish now to turn to the question which Africa is requesting should be the object of the debate on this occasion. Four reasonable draft resolutions are being prepared. Given the fact that *apartheid* South Africa has conclusively been proved to be heavily addicted to violating the sacred principles of the Charter of the United Nations and those enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, we are hoping that, on this occasion, we shall not receive negative votes from the leaders of the Western

countries. Also, given the fact that the martyrs of our national liberation struggle, our incarcerated leaders and the freedom fighters of Azania are true champions of those same United Nations principles, negative votes by the Western countries will show that Western sermons about respect for human rights are selective and, therefore, hypocritical.

170. The peoples of the world have their attention glued to this debate, and it needs to be demonstrated in practical ways that the neo-fascist régime at Pretoria stands isolated. After all, less than two weeks ago even the opposition in the white Parliament itself denounced the Vorster régime as a Nazi régime during the introduction of yet another Draconian law, a press censorship bill. Hitler's disciples at Pretoria are a confirmed affront to the rest of mankind.

171. The four draft resolutions coming before this Council are but a small step in the right direction. If they are not adopted as they stand, *apartheid* South Africa will be encouraged in its sanguinary oppression of the African majority, as well as in its bolstering of the white minority régime in Zimbabwe and in its maintenance of a state of war against the United Nations in its Trust Territory of Namibia.

172. A mandatory ban on the sale of arms to the pathological child killers at Pretoria is, after all, a peaceful way of combating *apartheid* colonialism. Those who advocate the peaceful way are challenged by their own professed stand. To be convincing, they must support a mandatory arms embargo against South Africa as well as the other peaceful calls for economic sanctions, a ban on investments in South Africa and a resolute condemnation of the *apartheid* régime.

The meeting rose at 7.10 p.m.