



**Security Council**

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.2795  
7 March 1968

ENGLISH

**PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND  
SEVEN HUNDRED AND FORTY-NINTH MEETING**

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Monday, 7 March 1968, at 11 a.m.

<u>President:</u>	Mr. PEJIC	(Yugoslavia)
<u>Members:</u>	Algeria Argentina Brazil China France Germany, Federal Republic of Italy Japan Nepal Senegal Union of Soviet Socialist Republics United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland United States of America Zambia	Mr. DJOUDI Mr. FÜRTER Mr. NOGUEIRA-SATISTA Mr. YU Mengjia Mr. BROCHAND Count YORK von WARTENBURG Mr. BUCCI Mr. KAGAMI Mr. RANA Mr. SARRE  Mr. BELONOGOV  Sir Crispin TICKELL Mr. OKUN Mr. ZUZE

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

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

The meeting was called to order at 11.35 a.m.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

THE QUESTION OF SOUTH AFRICA

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

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

The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decisions taken at the previous meetings on this item, I invite the representatives of Bulgaria, Guyana, Sierra Leone, South Africa and Tunisia to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

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

The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Botswana, India, Kuwait and Zimbabwe in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure. There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Lagwaila (Botswana), Mr. Dasgupta (India), Mr. Abulhasan (Kuwait) and Mr. Mudenge (Zimbabwe) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform the Council that I have received a letter dated 4 March 1988 from the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, which reads as follows:

"On behalf of the United Nations Council for Namibia, I have the honour, under rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council, to request an invitation to the delegation of the United Nations Council for Namibia, headed by myself, to participate in the Security Council's consideration of the item entitled 'The question of South Africa', which began on 3 March 1988."

(The President)

On previous occasions, the Security Council has extended invitations to representatives of other United Nations bodies in connection with the consideration of matters on its agenda. In conformity with past practice in this matter, I propose that the Council extend an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure to the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia and the delegation of that Council.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

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

Mr. ZUZE (Zambia): At the outset, Sir, let me extend to you my delegation's congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of March. Our two countries and our peoples have enjoyed special relations since the birth of Zambia. We are therefore rightly confident that you will use your immense diplomatic skills to guide the work of the Council.

May I also extend similar sentiments to your predecessor, the Permanent Representative of the United States of America, His Excellency Ambassador Vernon Walters, and convey to him our appreciation for the competent manner in which he guided the proceedings of the Council during the month of February. Despite his other important commitments in Washington and elsewhere, he was able to see us through last month with remarkable presence of mind.

The Security Council is meeting once again to consider the question of South Africa. The Council was prompted to resort to this action by the grave and deteriorating situation in that troubled country. The squeeze on the forces of freedom has again been tightened in South Africa, resulting in the imposition on 24 February 1988 of the de facto ban on the activities of 17 peaceful anti-apartheid organizations and the restriction of 18 individuals. The numerous persons arrested and detained as a result of recent developments include prominent

(Mr. Zuse, Zambia)

church leaders, notably Nobel Peace Prize winner Archbishop Desmond Tutu and the Reverend Allan Boesak, a co-founder of the United Democratic Front (UDF). These are merely the latest in the series of events which have revealed a consistent pattern of the repression and suppression of all forms of free expression by the black majority and other non-white segments of the population.

With an iron curtain now drawn against the free press and other mass media, the régime has embarked on an intensive propaganda and disinformation campaign designed to discredit the national liberation movements in an effort to deceive public opinion on the sad events in that troubled land. By those actions, the régime is seeking to create the semblance of an atmosphere of stability and peace in which private investment can flourish.

Man is so made that any restriction on his freedom provokes the most vicious counter-reaction. Indeed, as we have witnessed in recent times, man is prepared to face any lethal weapon in search of freedom and liberty. No amount of muzzling by the South African régime can halt the long march to freedom. History and experience in that beleaguered country have demonstrated that such desperate Draconian measures as those in force have only aggravated the inherent violence and served, so to speak, to stabilize the instability in South Africa.

The majority black people of South Africa want nothing less than the elimination of apartheid and the establishment in its place of democratic structures in which all, without regard to skin pigmentation and religious belief, can exercise their birthright and live in peace and harmony. That remains their major goal and the objective of all progressive forces in the world, whatever it takes to achieve it, and however long the night may be. By shutting all avenues of peaceful change, the régime has unwittingly merely strengthened the resolve of the oppressed people of South Africa to carry out massive resistance and opened the opportunity to develop alternative forms of struggle.

(Mr. Zuze, Zambia)

His Excellency President Kenneth Kaunda, in his reaction to the recent measures taken by the racist régime, noted that "South Africa is at war with itself". That is so because apartheid is by its very nature violent. It spawns and survives on violence. Violence is thus inevitable so long as the inhuman system of apartheid continues to exist. It must now be very clear, and it should be accepted, that fundamental change can only be brought about through concerted and consistent international pressure against the apartheid régime, to supplement the determined efforts of the oppressed people of South Africa.

To that end, increased moral, material and diplomatic support should be rendered to the just struggle being waged by the gallant people of South Africa through their national liberation movements. Moreover, the racist régime must be hit where it hurts most, and effective measures must be taken to combat its propaganda campaign.

In that regard, my delegation would like to reaffirm its long-standing and firm conviction that comprehensive mandatory sanctions constitute the only effective peaceful means of dismantling the apartheid régime. South Africa must be made to feel the pain of the loneliness of solitude. We therefore wish to appeal to those countries which have thus far rejected repeated calls for the imposition of such sanctions against South Africa, notably certain influential Western countries, to reconsider their position. Recent developments in South Africa have undermined the rationale or justification for internal dialogue as a viable means of abolishing the apartheid system in South Africa.

Let me reiterate: The South African racist régime is neither willing to negotiate nor capable of negotiating in good faith with the genuine representatives of the oppressed people of South Africa. We again appeal to those Western countries which wield major influence over the racist régime to give prominence to the broader moral and political imperatives of the South African conflict.

(Mr. Zuse, Zambia)

Emphasis on narrow strategic interests and kith-and-kin considerations constitutes, in our view, a moral failure. We have seen enough of South Africa's arrogant view of the Security Council. The contempt and disrespect with which the Pretoria régime perceives the authority of the Council were vividly demonstrated by the statement made by the representative of the régime to this Council on Thursday afternoon. We witnessed a demonstration of how South Africa can engage in the "hot pursuit" of the Security Council. That was a typical reaction of one whose hands are stained with the blood of innocent people.

(Mr. Zuze, Zambia)

Let me conclude by reminding the Council that the world is tired of apartheid and sick of patronizing and convenient arguments against the adoption of effective measures. We are tired of listening to Governments which apparently condemn apartheid but befriend South Africa or apparently subscribe to United Nations resolutions but allow their investments in South Africa to continue and flourish. These Governments' explanations of their attitude are no more than a conspiracy of inertia to act, the hypocrisy of double-dealing and condemnation hand-in-hand with co-operation. The Council must assert itself, its image, its authority and its status by imposing mandatory sanctions against the racist régime.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Zambia for his very kind words about my country and me personally.

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

Mr. ABULHASAN (Kuwait) (interpretation from Arabic): I am pleased to speak on behalf of the members of the Organization of the Islamic Conference, of which my country, Kuwait, has the honour to be Chairman, and to convey to you, Sir, our warm congratulations and to wish you success in fulfilling your tasks as President of the Council during the current month. Your sisterly country has demonstrated its commitment to promoting international peace and security, thus enhancing the role of the United Nations in the field of international relations. The common denominator between my country and Yugoslavia is that our relations are based on mutual respect and common action in the service of man the peace-maker. We attach great importance to your skills, statesmanship and wisdom in ensuring the success of the Council's proceedings this month.

I should also like to take this opportunity to express our deep appreciation to your predecessor, Ambassador Vernon Walters, Permanent Representative of the

(Mr. Abulhasan, Kuwait)

United States of America, on the wisdom and efficiency he demonstrated in guiding the Council's proceedings during the past month.

Also, I should like to express my gratitude to all the members of the Council for the opportunity they have provided me to participate in the debate on the question of South Africa, an issue that has been under consideration for over 40 years and one that poses a humanitarian and moral challenge to the conscience of the international community as reflected in the United Nations, especially in the Security Council.

The inhumane methods of the South African régime, reflected in its decision adopted on 24 February 1988, under which peaceful clergymen were gaoled as a result of a peaceful march of protest against that arbitrary decision prohibiting peaceful activities by a number of national organizations that oppose apartheid, demonstrate the level of contempt by that obnoxious régime, which flouts all legitimate human rights enshrined in international laws and instruments. This is in itself a breach of all principles and standards on which our world Organization and its Charter are based.

This oppressive action is yet another link in a series of acts of oppression, brutality and murder which culminated in the state of emergency imposed in the summer of 1985. Under that state of emergency, the racist régime is opposing a peaceful and defenceless people that is seeking to bring about peaceful social change in South Africa and to regain its legitimate rights to freedom, self-determination and dignity on its national territory.

But that decision and the operative measures that preceded it also expose the racist Pretoria régime's persistence in blocking all avenues that might lead to a peaceful transition. This is in itself a flagrant challenge to the calls for justice and righteousness that abound in Security Council and General Assembly

(Mr. Abulhasan, Kuwait)

resolutions. Thus the racist régime has not stopped at the killing of hundreds of black citizens and incarcerating thousands of others, including children; that system has continued to track down political activists and to liquidate them even in neighbouring African States. It persists in launching destructive raids into neighbouring African countries, so as to intimidate them, stop them from harbouring the movements opposing the racist régime and teach them a lesson. In seeking to destabilize those States, the Pretoria régime poses a threat to peace and security in the region, the African continent and, indeed, the entire world.

The members of the Organization of the Islamic Conference join world public opinion in its strong condemnation of the racist régime's persistence in its reckless pursuit of its racist policies so as to tighten its control over the black majority; they have reiterated their rejection of this abhorrent social system at all their meetings, especially at the last Conference held last year in Kuwait, and renewed their condemnation of the racist policy and white minority rule, which are the root causes of the explosive situation prevailing in southern Africa and, furthermore, represent the two major obstacles to peace, security, stability and development in the region.

At their latest meeting the members of the Organization of the Islamic Conference declared that the only basis for a just and lasting solution of the situation in southern Africa was the total elimination of the system of apartheid in all its forms and manifestations and the establishment of majority rule, based on free elections in a united and non-fragmented South Africa. Faced with the intransigence of the Pretoria Government and its rejection of all peaceful means for the settlement of the question of South Africa, the States members of the Organization of the Islamic Conference, while expressing their support for the legitimate struggle of the peoples in southern Africa to establish a democratic

JVM/6

S/PV.2795

14-15

(Mr. Abulhasan, Kuwait)

society, maintain that the international community, especially the Security Council, is duty bound to take appropriate measures, including sanctions, in order to deter this vicious system and force it to abandon its inhumane practices, which are contrary to all norms of law and justice.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Kuwait for his recognition of the policies of my country and for the very kind words he addressed to me personally.

Mr. YU Mengjia (China) (interpretation from Chinese): I am pleased that you, Sir, the eminent representative of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, have assumed the presidency of the Security Council. I should like to express my sincere congratulations to you. I am convinced that, with your outstanding talent and rich experience in diplomacy, you will surely guide the Security Council to the successful completion of its heavy agenda for the month of March.

I should also like to take this opportunity to express my appreciation to your predecessor, His Excellency Ambassador Walters, for his remarkable performance in guiding the Council's work last month.

On 24 February the South African authorities brazenly announced a ban on all the political activities of the country's 17 anti-apartheid organisations, 18 individuals and the South African Trade Union Congress. Furthermore, on 29 February they temporarily detained Archbishop Tutu and other religious leaders who went on a protest march. Those abhorrent actions immediately met with strong condemnation by the South African people and all justice-upholding countries and peoples in the world. The Chinese Foreign Ministry spokesman pointed out in a statement that the ban was another crime committed by the South African authorities in suppressing the struggle of the South African people, and he added,

"The Chinese Government and people express their strong condemnation of and great indignation at the new crime. ... We will, as always, firmly support the South African people in their just struggle against racism and for racial equality."

The imposition of new restrictions by the Pretoria régime represents yet another round of escalation in its policy of internal suppression. In June 1986, in order to put down the struggle of the black people against racist rule, the South African authorities declared a state of emergency, used armed police and the

(Mr. Yu Mengjia, China)

army to wantonly detain, arrest and kill people who dared to oppose apartheid rule. Last year, the South African authorities imposed restrictions on funeral activities of black people, introduced tighter press censorship and stepped up other repressive measures. Now they have put a ban on all the political activities of organizations and individuals, as well as other democratic organizations, thus totally depriving the South African people of freedom to voice their opposition to apartheid in an attempt to stamp out their just struggle.

The perverse acts of the South African authorities can prove nothing but their own weakness. Confronted with the powerful resistance of the South African people, they find that the only means left to them to sustain the moribund racist rule is the use of brute force. However, as an old Chinese saying goes, "He who rules by morals will prosper, but he who rules by force will perish". If the South African racist rulers think they can put down the people's resistance with a ban, they are day-dreaming.

In 1960 the South African authorities banned the African National Congress and the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania. In 1977 they further banned 18 anti-apartheid organizations. Nevertheless the struggle of the South African people did not subside. On the contrary, under the leadership of the liberation organizations they have surged forward, sending reverberations around the globe. And this time, hardly was the ban announced when the South African liberation and anti-apartheid organizations made it clear that they would continue their resolute fight against the South African authorities. Rallies and demonstrations to protest the ban were organized and attended by church personages, professors and students. Their struggle has also received sympathy and support from enlightened white Members of Parliament. The international community reacted strongly. The 47th Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity issued a press release affirming their resolute solidarity with the South African people. Many countries

(Mr. Yu Mengjia, China)

and regional organizations have also issued statements condemning the reactionary acts of the South African authorities. All this has shown that the more the South African authorities intensify their acts of suppression, the stronger the people's resistance will be and the more isolated the Pretoria régime will find itself in the world.

The Chinese delegation is most indignant at the arrogant remarks made by the representative of the Pretoria régime on 3 March. He not only resorted to sophistry in trying to whitewash the criminal acts of the South African authorities but went so far as to viciously attack the Security Council and the countries that uphold justice. It was only natural that his impudence was rebuked by many representatives.

Faced with the ever intensified racist atrocities of the South African authorities, many representatives have in their statements requested that the Security Council make a strong response. The Chinese delegation supports this just position. We hold that the Security Council should promptly take vigorous measures, including effective sanctions, to compel the South African authorities to lift immediately the ban on anti-apartheid organizations and individuals and other democratic organizations and to lift the state of emergency. The Chinese delegation is convinced that the South African authorities are bound to fail in their attempt to perpetuate their reactionary rule and to block the march of history. The South African people, closing their ranks and persevering in their heroic struggle against racism, and with the support of all the justice-upholding countries and people the world over will triumph in the end.

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

Mr. DJOUDI (Algeria) (interpretation from French): Sir, I should like to express the great pleasure of my delegation on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council. Yugoslavia and Algeria are linked by many affinities and special relations of friendship and co-operation forged in our joint struggle to promote the ideals of non-alignment. You are an old personal friend, and quite rightly you enjoy the reputation of being competent and wise and an accomplished diplomat. Those qualities guarantee that you will wisely guide the business of the Security Council this month.

To your predecessor, Ambassador Walters, of the United States, I am pleased to say how highly we appreciated his ability and talent when he presided over the Council last month.

(Mr. Djoudi, Algeria)

On 23 February the racist Pretoria régime banned 17 peaceful anti-apartheid organizations from taking part in any political activities. Following the imposition of martial law and the proclamation of the state of emergency on 12 June 1986, the Pretoria régime now intends with this new measure to take an even harder line in stifling protest and reducing resistance to apartheid.

By its exemplary resistance and the scale of its sacrifices, the South African people has given ample proof to anyone who might still have doubts of its unshakeable determination to bring about the triumph of its just cause. Its determination was strengthened by the Soweto massacres. Its voice has become louder since the ban on 19 October 1977 of a total of 17 political groups belonging to the Black Consciousness Movement. That shows the pointlessness of the latest measure in its attempt to weaken the resolve of the South African people.

However, because of its nature the measure is certainly more than a symbol. Even in the eyes of those who wanted to believe that the apartheid system could be reformed the decision puts paid to the last myth of a "democracy" presented as admittedly defective but in the long term capable of being perfected.

Advocates of peaceful transition, despite the refusal of the champions of apartheid to make even the smallest concession unless it will preserve their privileges, cannot fail to realize today that there can be no peaceful alternative to the international determination to impose sanctions against Pretoria. The internal logic of apartheid makes it clear that affirming the rights of the South African people, in the face of the repression by the minority régime, is a contradiction that cannot be peacefully resolved, given the ideological impossibility of apartheid's envisaging the slightest change without in so doing opening the way to its own dismantling.

(Mr. Djoudi, Algeria)

That is why recourse to increased force and ferocious repression is apartheid's natural response, inherent in the system, to the struggle of the South African people for the recognition of its rights. In that repression the people finds legitimacy for its resistance by all means, pinning its hopes on finally seeing the United Nations assert its authority, to guarantee the full restoration of the rights laid down in the Charter and reaffirmed in relevant resolutions of the Council.

Dialogue is a value of culture and civilization. It is part of the same scale of values as recognition of and respect for other peoples' rights. It presupposes the existence of equal partners, whose good faith and good will may properly be taken for granted. In the case of South Africa, however, the dialectic of repression is the natural extension of the rejection of dialogue on an equal footing, and it opens the door to unrestricted escalation.

Therefore, the apartheid régime is not the perfectible model of democracy that the representatives of Pretoria have come to the Council to defend, without any shame.

A caricature of aggressive survival from a bygone age, the age of barbarism, the apartheid régime represents a throwback that humanity, having come to terms with itself, would like to relegate once and for all to pre-history.

Therefore, can the international community really conceive of a dialogue with Pretoria, when dialogue - a moral value and political means - has been rejected and indeed is fought against in South Africa itself? Can the Council any longer postpone facing up to the need to envisage the use of means open to it under the Charter to hasten the end of apartheid?

The régime of apartheid - apartheid, which the international community has condemned as a crime against humanity - represents the daily denial of human rights and the rights of peoples in its worst form. The non-white is considered as a

(Mr. Djoudi, Algeria)

non-person, without rights and without a voice, and the South African people is regarded as an anonymous mass to be repressed at will and with impunity. There is no law there that is not opposed to the ideals of the United Nations and no measure that is not an obstacle to promoting them.

Furthermore, as shown by the projection of its ideology of domination throughout southern Africa, apartheid elevates relationships of subjugation to the status of an exclusive way of dealing with neighbours. That is proved by the repeated acts of aggression against the front-line countries and the illegal occupation of Namibia. That rejection of international law, which was unacceptably introduced even here by the extreme, impudent tone adopted by the representative of apartheid, undermines the Council's inviolable dignity.

As the guardian of international authority, the Security Council cannot fail to condemn the latest steps taken by the Pretoria régime and to use every suitable means to ensure the final elimination of apartheid and the restoration of peace in South Africa and in southern Africa as a whole.

The Council, which has undertaken to restore its unanimous decision-making power and its ability to take joint action, now has a perfect opportunity to implement its new determination to restore international peace and security in one of the regions of the world where world peace is most openly endangered and the Council's authority is thus constantly defied.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Algeria for his very kind words of recognition of the policies of my country and for his kind words addressed to me.

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

Mr. DASGUPTA (India): You have begun your tenure as President of the Security Council, Sir, with an issue whose length and frequency of debate in this forum has not made it less topical or less painful. Your exceptional personal qualities and diplomatic experience are well known to all of us, and we look forward to your guidance in the efforts of the Council to address the problem before it.

May I also pay a tribute to Ambassador Vernon Walters for the leadership he provided to the Council during the past month.

The United Nations was founded with the determination to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war. However, aggression against front-line States and brutal repression at home continue to mark South Africa's policies. This Organization was founded to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights and the dignity and worth of the human being. Can the Council remain passive when a society crafted on colour is allowed to perpetuate itself with false promises offered to a subjugated people?

Given present developments, it should by now be clear to the international community that the South African régime is far from interested in a process of peaceful negotiation for the transfer of power to the majority, and is determined to maintain its illegal rule by crushing any and all opposition. We have seen over the years that the régime is willing to face the opprobrium of an overwhelming majority of countries on account of the support given to it by certain major allies and trading partners.

For us in India, freedom in Africa has a special significance. Moved by the plight of the people of South Africa, the father of our nation, Mahatma Gandhi, evolved the strategy of non-violent non-co-operation in that country.

(Mr. Dasgupta, India)

My country was also privileged to be the first to draw the attention of the United Nations to the problem of racism in South Africa, by bringing a complaint to the General Assembly in 1946. That very year we voluntarily imposed sanctions against South Africa, long before such action was recommended by the United Nations. The leaders of our freedom movement constantly reminded us that our own freedom would be incomplete without freedom for all peoples under the colonial yoke.

(Mr. Dasgupta, India)

The adoption on 24 February of a new series of measures by the racist Pretoria régime amounts to a major escalation in the policies of repression of any form of opposition to the apartheid régime. The banning of 17 organisations from exercising any functions other than the perfunctory ones of preserving their assets, keeping their books and performing their own administrative duties is a desperate attempt to turn back the clock of history. The restrictions imposed on the Congress of South African Trade Unions, the largest trade-union federation in South Africa, seek to limit it to "shop floor" activities only. In South Africa today all forms of political activity are prohibited. Any calls for sanctions, for boycotts or for any peaceful action are henceforth banned. Not even the clergy and the religious communities are exempted from the terror and repression of the police State. That was evident last month when the Nobel Prize winner Archbishop Desmond Tutu and others were detained for attempting to march peacefully to deliver a petition to Mr. Botha, a petition that only sought peace in that beleaguered nation. Given the régime's attitude, it is no surprise that ultra-rightist groups like AFB (Afrikaner Resistance Movement) are free to conduct their campaign of hate and terror throughout the country against opponents of the régime while a group of religious leaders are arrested in attempting a peaceful march.

The international community has a responsibility towards the oppressed people of South Africa. The longer the suffering, the stronger the possibility of violence and civil war. The recent banning of all forms of peaceful opposition leaves little choice for the opponents of the régime.

The United Nations, from its very inception, has played a significant role in the world-wide struggle against the abhorrent system of apartheid. Indeed, it has been an important factor in ensuring that the balance of forces steadily turned against the racist régime and in favour of the movement for freedom, as well as in

(Mr. Dasgupta, India)

enabling the latter to secure the widest international support from Governments and organizations. Even if it has not so far been able to bring about the eradication of apartheid, the United Nations has succeeded in sensitizing world opinion to that evil and in building up pressure in favour of its opponents. The United Nations has helped achieve unanimity on three aspects of the issue: condemnation of apartheid, the arms embargo against South Africa, and humanitarian assistance to the victims of apartheid. Overwhelming support has been given to the principle of sanctions against the apartheid régime and assistance to liberation movements. The legitimacy of armed struggle has been widely recognized. Though these are no mean achievements, much more is called for now.

My Government has consistently urged the international community to act effectively against the racist régime by adopting comprehensive and mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter. Universally applied, they are the only non-violent option left to end apartheid.

In conclusion, I recall a statement of our Prime Minister:

"Racial bigotry is the negation of our common humanity. There can be no acquiescence in racism or collaboration with racist régimes. Our opposition to apartheid is total and unflinching."

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

Mr. RANA (Nepal): Allow me to congratulate you most warmly, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of March. We are well aware of your diplomatic skill and wisdom and feel confident that you will guide the work of the Council with distinction. May I take this opportunity to recall - if only briefly - the affection and esteem we in Nepal have for the friendly Government and people of Yugoslavia, with which we share a common commitment to the cause of peace, justice and non-alignment.

(Mr. Rana (Nepal))

Permit me also to convey my delegation's deep appreciation to Ambassador Vernon A. Walters of the United States for the exemplary manner in which he conducted the business of the Council last month.

With regard to the agenda item now before us, I wish to underline from the very outset Nepal's deep concern and outrage at the recent decision of the racist Pretoria régime to impose a sweeping set of new repressive and arbitrary measures against the principles of free association and expression by 17 political, civic and human-rights organizations in South Africa. These associations have in effect been barred from any meaningful political activity, including appeals for sanctions or the release of political prisoners.

Coming as this does on the heels of a stifling, 21-month-long state of emergency in South Africa, it inevitably recalls the oppressive blanket-ban by the Pretoria racist régime of 1960 - when the African National Congress and the Pan Africanist Congress were banned; and of 1977, when 19 anti-apartheid organizations were banned after Steven Biko died while in police custody. I must also state right away that my delegation rejects the South African representative's absurd attempt in the Council last Thursday to describe such actions as being

"directed at promoting peace and ensuring legal order in South Africa".

(S/PV.2793, p. 12)

We were surprised neither by the offensive nature of his comments nor, indeed, by his open defiance of the authority and dignity of the Security Council. These attributes are, after all, the hallmarks of a racist régime that refuses to accept reality and reason.

Indeed, in South Africa we have a régime that is both delinquent and dangerous - delinquent in its open defiance of the Charter principles and countless resolutions of the General Assembly and of the Security Council; dangerous for its

(Mr. Rana (Nepal))

stubborn persistence in its policy of apartheid, repression and violence within the country, in its continued illegal occupation of Namibia and, above all, in its policy of destabilization and aggression against neighbouring States.

The imposition of the latest restrictions was thus neither new nor altogether unexpected. While it exposes the hollowness of the racist régime's claims to be a platform of political reform, it merely confirms what we have been saying all along: that the racist régime is least interested in peaceful change. It also calls to mind both the failure of similar repression in the past and the futility of endeavours to engage the apartheid régime in any constructive dialogue.

As acts of violence and repression attributable to the racist régime in Pretoria are well documented, I shall not attempt to catalogue them here today. Suffice it to point out that Pretoria's latest restrictions and bans have been directed against organizations that advocate opposition to the pernicious system of apartheid through peaceful means. That was underlined in a particularly vivid and shameless manner in the recent arrest in Cape Town of the Anglican Archbishop and Nobel Peace Laureate Desmond Tutu and scores of other clergymen for leading a peaceful protest march.

(Mr. Rana, Nepal)

The United Nations - particularly the Security Council - can and should reassert its role and responsibility in defusing the grave situation in South Africa. Effective measures should be adopted to compel the apartheid régime to come to grips with reality and to save South Africa from all avoidable suffering and loss, especially of human life.

Nepal remains convinced that the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions, as envisaged in Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter, represents the most effective peaceful means to bring about the demise of the apartheid régime. However, we fully support present moves to endorse, as a beginning, the imposition of limited sanctions against racist South Africa of the kind approved by the European Economic Community (EEC). Unanimity in the Council on this score, we believe, would send a clear and timely message to Pretoria as to which way the wind is blowing.

The Security Council, in any case, once again has an opportunity to restore some of its lost credibility on the question of South Africa. If such a moment were once again missed, it would send dangerous signals to the opposing sides of the apartheid divide. Given the necessary political will and wisdom, the Council's deliberations could, it is to be hoped, culminate in the endorsement of the draft resolution which is soon to be submitted.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Nepal for his recognition of my country's policies and for the kind words he addressed to me.

Mr. NOGUEIRA-BATISTA (Brazil): Please accept my warm congratulations, Sir, on your assumption of the office of President of the Council for the month of March. I wish to reiterate on this occasion my delegation's desire to give you full support in your endeavours in conducting our business. Your experience and wisdom are a guarantee that members of the Council will find in you the leadership required to guide us in the consideration of the difficult items on our agenda.

(Mr. Noqueira-Batista, Brazil)

I also wish to express to your predecessor, Ambassador Vernon Walters of the United States of America, our thanks and appreciation for the straightforward and businesslike manner in which he performed during the month of February.

The recent measures by the Government of South Africa banning or restricting the activities of 17 leading anti-apartheid organizations in that country represent a major setback for the international community's endeavours to end the policies of racial discrimination pursued by the Pretoria authorities. Such actions against those organizations will considerably exacerbate tensions within South Africa and make the abolition of apartheid even more remote. Those measures will certainly not suppress the legitimate aspirations of the majority of the South African population for an end to this hateful system of racial discrimination. They will only aggravate the situation and confirm that the Pretoria authorities have no interest in a peaceful solution to this tragic question.

The Brazilian Government, reflecting the strong feelings of its people against racial discrimination and apartheid, in a public statement issued on 26 February in Brasilia, expressed its deep concern at the decision taken by the South African régime. It is our belief that such repressive measures constitute a major additional obstacle to the peaceful development of the South African political process and may pose, by their implications for South Africa's relations with its neighbour countries, a grave threat to international peace in the area.

This delegation regretted that, in misusing the opportunity the Council offered him, the Permanent Representative of South Africa was not able to indicate his Government's willingness to heed rather than to defy world public opinion. I particularly regretted his resorting to a tone and choice of words which were both unfounded and disrespectful of the dignity and authority of the the body he was addressing.

(Mr. Nogueira-Batista, Brazil)

We believe that the international community should go beyond the expression of its unanimous condemnation of this regrettable reaffirmation by Pretoria of a widely rejected policy. We should translate our feelings into a very clear sign to Pretoria that, unless it demonstrates its willingness to cease to apply restrictive measures and to engage in dialogue with the legitimate leadership of the black majority of its population - thereby removing a source of serious tensions in southern Africa - the Council is ready to take effective action.

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

I should like to inform members of the Council that I have just received a letter from the representative of Czechoslovakia in which he requests to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In accordance with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite that representative to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Zapotocky (Czechoslovakia) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council Chamber.

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

Mr. ZAPOTOCKY (Czechoslovakia): First, I wish to extend sincere congratulations to you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of March. We are confident that your able guidance based on long diplomatic experience and great professional skills will significantly contribute to productive work by the Council this month.

(Mr. Zapotocky, Czechoslovakia)

I should like also to express our gratitude to your predecessor, Ambassador Walters of the United States of America, for the efficient manner in which he performed this responsible task during the month of February.

The unsatisfactory situation in southern Africa has been the subject of deliberations of various United Nations bodies for a number of years. The current series of meetings, convened at the request of the Group of African countries, is fully justified and topical in light of recent developments in South Africa.

Tension is mounting in the South African region as a result of the persistent policy of apartheid practised by the Government of South Africa. In South Africa itself there has been a further exacerbation of the internal political and economic crisis. To save and artificially perpetuate the existence of apartheid the racist régime is resorting to various forms and methods, ranging from escalated violence and terror to the imposition of curfews and the prohibition of the activities of progressively oriented social and political organizations.

(Mr. Zapotocky, Czechoslovakia)

The policy of apartheid of the Government of South Africa has been condemned by the international community on countless occasions. A series of resolutions has been adopted by the General Assembly and by the Security Council in which apartheid is described as a crime against humanity and as a constant threat to peace and security in the world. None the less, the situation in South Africa is still not changing for the better, in spite of the permanent attention of the international community. Quite the contrary, the crisis in that part of the world has further aggravated and deepened in recent days. In an attempt to retain and preserve its position, the Pretoria rulers have this time decided to place a ban upon the activities of 17 progressive organizations and of their representatives who have been critical of the foul policy of apartheid perpetrated by the Government of South Africa. By that measure South Africa is aiming at a substantial restriction or even a complete prohibition of political activity on the part of progressively oriented, anti-racist groups of the South African population. Instead of unfolding an active dialogue with representatives of those organizations the Government of South Africa, in contrast, is implementing policies to curtail the fundamental political freedoms and rights of the African population. This is a blind-alley policy which makes a political solution of the crisis in that region impossible and the already explosive situation even worse.

The present escalation of violence by the Government of South Africa against the local African population, with the aim of paralysing and thwarting the just national liberation struggle, is a reality that cannot leave the international community indifferent. We cannot tolerate any further continuation by the apartheid régime of the present policy of trampling underfoot the basic rights of the black majority in South Africa. That situation is an anachronism in the world of today and in sharp contradiction with the general, accepted norms of life of

(Mr. Zapotocky, Czechoslovakia)

the world community. The policy of the apartheid régime not only threatens peace and stability in the southern African region, but it also constitutes a constant challenge to peace and security world wide. In that context it is an urgent task of the Security Council to prevent any additional exacerbation and worsening of the situation. If the nations of southern Africa are to live in the freedom and unity of a non-racist democratic society, if all States in the region are to develop in peace, security and non-interference, then resolute measures against the régime of apartheid must be adopted.

The present situation in South Africa again gives rise to the imperative question of the justifiability of imposing general mandatory sanctions. Experience thus far shows that limited selective sanctions are not the means by which to coerce the racist régime into refraining from its policy of apartheid. This is why only general mandatory sanctions and unified, co-ordinated pressure by the international community can have an effective impact on the régime of Pretoria. It is necessary jointly to increase the international isolation of South Africa to prevent it from continuing the aggressive, destabilizing policy that stifles the anti-apartheid struggle in the region and weakens the process of the national liberation movements.

At the end of the twentieth century, when a democratization and humanization of international relations are becoming a condition basic to the development of human civilization, an undelayed and all-round decolonization and a complete and final eradication of all forms of racial discrimination are ever more urgent and imperative. The United Nations and all its respective bodies, including the Security Council as well as all Member States, must fully live up to the role entrusted to it by the international community more than 25 years ago, that is, to grant freedom and independence to all nations without exception.

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

Mr. BELONOGOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The convening of the Security Council has been dictated by the international community's very deep concern at the dangerous turn of events in South Africa. The racist authorities in South Africa have resorted to a further aggravation of their repressive measures. Some days ago they decided to impose a prohibition on all political activities by several democratic mass organizations, notably the United Democratic Front and the Congress of South African Trade Unions. A number of South African clergy, among them Archbishop Desmond Tutu, were arrested on their way to the Parliament to express their protests at such measures and call for their reversal.

We have also learned that a bill is pending in South Africa directed against the part of that country's white population that is campaigning in favour of national dialogue in the country. The régime has thereby posed a challenge to all honest people in South Africa who are demanding freedom and justice, and rejecting injustice and domination. The ban on all activities by democratic opposition organizations reveals once again the true face of the South African racist régime, which seeks to crush all progressive movements in the country.

As was stressed in the statement made by the Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union on 6 March, the Soviet Union feels both indignation and anger at the escalation of the policy of apartheid. The actions of the South African authorities are unanimously and decisively condemned by the broadest circles of international opinion. This is borne out by the many communications reaching us from all corners of the globe. All these messages describe the measures taken by Pretoria as a further manifestation of political violence and as one more link in

(Mr. Belonogov, USSR)

the chain of crimes committed by the racist régime against the people of its own country, as well as a violation of universally recognized principles of law and freedom. The measures that have been adopted do not constitute merely a tightening of the repressive legislation; they are being used by the racist régime to eliminate even the last vestiges of freedom that made possible some action against the tentacles of apartheid now crushing the country.

(Mr. Belonogov, USSR)

By these actions, the Pretoria régime has proved that it is incapable of learning from the history of the struggle waged by the African people of South Africa for their inalienable human rights: That is the challenge before the apartheid régime.

These actions are but another vain attempt to suppress the growing resistance to the racist régime and the wave of active democratic anti-racist organizations, in which members of all races and social strata of the country's people participate. The racist régime appears to hope that by banning mass democratic organizations in South Africa it can eliminate resistance to apartheid. They hope in vain: There is no doubt that the courageous South African people will find the strength within themselves to create a new wave in the struggle. That was what happened after the 1960 banning of the African National Congress of South Africa and the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania, after the 1977 disbanding of approximately two dozen anti-apartheid organizations, and after the adoption in the mid-1980s of the emergency laws.

Repressive measures demonstrate the régime's weakness, not its strength; they reveal its reactionary nature. The banned organizations have supported peaceful struggle and have never been accused of attempts to use violence to achieve their goals. Again, this shows Pretoria's scorn for the South African people's desire for freedom and basic human rights.

Moreover, the Pretoria régime has been cynically ignoring the United Nations Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the fortieth anniversary of whose adoption will be commemorated by the United Nations this year, the International Covenants on human rights, and the 1948 Freedom of Association Convention and the Right to Organize.

(Mr. Belonogov, USSR)

It is worth noting that the Government's repressive measures against democratic organizations are being carried out against a backdrop of unrestricted rampaging by ultra-right, neo-Nazi forces, whose activities have been confirmed by reports in the South African press itself. Anyone with common sense can see that the vital problems of the country cannot be resolved in this way; the situation can lead only to heightened tension and increased confrontation.

The Botha Government's decision amounts to a blow against the prospects for a political settlement of the crisis in South Africa. It appears that Pretoria has not yet understood that guaranteeing a peaceful future for the country requires national dialogue with the participation of all political groups, irrespective of race and political and religious beliefs. Pretoria should not be banning the activities of mass democratic organizations; it should be encouraging them to participate in the political life of the country. It is high time it heeded the voice of the people of its own country and the voice of world public opinion, and released the hundreds of political prisoners who are languishing in South African jails, first and foremost the leader of the anti-apartheid movement, Nelson Mandela.

Millions of people in South Africa want simply to be treated as human beings, so they can live in their own country without being subjected to humiliation or discrimination. They want the humiliating political, economic, social and other barriers raised by the repressive racist régime to be dismantled.

Not only has the apartheid régime caused enormous suffering for the people of South Africa; it also poses a real and growing threat to international peace and security by pursuing its policy of aggression, destabilization and terror against the independent States of southern Africa and by further tightening the noose of conflict. This reveals the aggressive nature of South Africa's internal and external policies and the organic link between them. Those policies can be described only as State terrorism.

(Mr. Belonogov, USSR)

There is no doubt that the South African people's struggle for their rights will not be halted by bans or repression by the racist authorities: No one can halt the course of history. Apartheid is doomed. It will not be saved by this latest wave of terror and repression, by the continued occupation of Namibia, or by acts of armed aggression against front-line African States. The régime's weakness, viciousness and unviability are demonstrated by its reliance on terror and force and its trampling under foot of the rights and freedoms of the people.

In his message to participants in the Conference of peoples of the world against apartheid and for a democratic South Africa, the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Mikhail Sergeiyevich Gorbachev, stated that

"The Soviet Union has always been and continues to be on the side of the South African patriots struggling for freedom and justice and against lawlessness and oppression. That struggle is today universal and popular in nature. Its vanguard includes the African National Congress of South Africa, which truly expresses the interests of the people of South Africa. Numerous mass anti-racist organizations are stepping up their activity in the country. It is noteworthy that among the opponents of apartheid is a growing number of whites.

"The Soviet people fully sympathize with and support the noble goal of those who are fighting for freedom: to build a united, democratic, non-racial State in South Africa."

The actions of the Pretoria authorities in South Africa and outside the country have given increasing urgency to the international community's demand that political and economic pressure against apartheid be stepped up. Clearly, mere verbal condemnations of the régime are not enough.

(Mr. Belonogov, USSR)

It is high time to take firm, decisive action, not half measures. There should be firm, unswerving, full compliance with the arms embargo decided upon by the Security Council. There should be no loss of faith in the authority of international law. It is the duty of the United Nations and the Security Council to adopt urgent, effective steps in this area. As is made clear in resolution 42/23 C, adopted by the General Assembly on 20 November 1987,

"the imposition of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions by the Security Council under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations would be the most appropriate, effective ... means to bring apartheid to an end and to discharge the responsibilities of the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security, which are threatened and violated by the apartheid régime."

The Soviet delegation, like others, is indignant at the brazen and arrogant statement made here by the South African representative, who hurled a challenge at the United Nations and the Security Council. We agree with your conclusion, Sir, that his statement was further proof that the South African authorities are disregarding the position of the international community and intend to continue their policy. We believe that this should be borne in mind by members of the Council when the draft resolution is voted on.

Within the United Nations one quite often hears talk about the authority of the United Nations and its Security Council, and the need to respect the principles of the Organization and attain its goals. But what authority are we talking about, when the Security Council has for almost 25 years been unable to resolve the question of comprehensive sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter? Back in 1965 the General Assembly adopted resolution 2054 (XX), in which the attention of the Security Council was drawn to the need to impose against South

(Mr. Belonogov, USSR)

Africa sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter. But the question of apartheid in South Africa was raised in the United Nations before that - as long ago as 1949 - and I refer to resolution 265 (III), introduced at the initiative of India.

The real authority of the United Nations and the Security Council is being undermined precisely by the inability to take practical steps against the apartheid régime in South Africa. The statement of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union, dated 6 March, quite frankly raises the question: How can one reconcile the veto, so often used in the Security Council, with the statements of those who resort to it about their devotion to human rights, the principle of self-determination and freedom of peoples? The statement of the Foreign Ministry goes on to say: The frequent resort to the veto in the Security Council is tantamount to protecting the racists. It is a veto against democratization, against humanity, against the exercise of human rights and liberty in South Africa. We should not allow this new anti-democratic act by this régime to go unpunished again. It is truly high time to think about the authority of the United Nations and the Security Council and to take practical steps to strengthen it.

The USSR - as the statement of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union states - is ready to go hand in hand with all those who cherish the lofty principles of the United Nations, the ideals of freedom and equality. Based on our position of principle, and acting in support for the struggle of the South African people for the complete elimination of apartheid and the implementation of their right to self-determination and to a free, democratic, united and non-racial South Africa, we shall support the draft resolution submitted to the Security Council by the African countries.

The PRESIDENT: There are no further speakers for this meeting. I wish to inform members of the Security Council that a draft resolution prepared by a group of States will be distributed shortly.

The next meeting of the Security Council to continue consideration of the item on its agenda will take place tomorrow, Tuesday, 8 March 1988, at 11 a.m.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.

