



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 8th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. JAMAL (Qatar)

CONTENTS

REQUESTS FOR HEARINGS

AGENDA ITEM 94: ACTIVITIES OF FOREIGN ECONOMIC AND OTHER INTERESTS WHICH ARE IMPEDING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES IN NAMIBIA AND IN ALL OTHER TERRITORIES UNDER COLONIAL DOMINATION AND EFFORTS TO ELIMINATE COLONIALISM, APARTHEID AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION IN SOUTHERN AFRICA: REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION WITH REGARD TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (continued)

UN LIBRARY

OCT 30 1981

UN/SA COLLECTION

\* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550, 866 United Nations Plaza (Alcoa Building), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate fascicle for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL  
A/C.4/36/SR.8  
30 October 1981

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 10.45 a.m.

#### REQUESTS FOR HEARINGS

Question of East Timor (A/C.4/36/2 and Add.1-8, A/C.4/36/5/Add.1, A/C.4/36/7)

1. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had before it five communications containing requests for hearings concerning the question of East Timor (A/C.4/36/2/Add.1-8). It also had before it a letter from the Permanent Representative of Indonesia to the United Nations (A/C.4/36/5/Add.1), and a letter from the Permanent Representative of Portugal to the United Nations (A/C.4/36/7) relating to the communication in document A/C.4/36/2, on which the Committee had already taken action.
2. Mr. WAYARABI (Indonesia) said, with reference to the requests for hearings in documents A/C.4/36/2/Add.4-8, that his delegation again took the position that consideration of the question of East Timor by the Committee constituted an interference in the domestic affairs of a sovereign State and was therefore inappropriate. Any granting of hearings was therefore unacceptable and served no useful purpose. It was strongly opposed to the request of the so-called petitioners on grounds which it had outlined in its previous statements.
3. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no further objections, he would take it that the Committee wished to grant the requests mentioned.
4. It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 94: ACTIVITIES OF FOREIGN ECONOMIC AND OTHER INTERESTS WHICH ARE IMPEDING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES IN NAMIBIA AND IN ALL OTHER TERRITORIES UNDER COLONIAL DOMINATION AND EFFORTS TO ELIMINATE COLONIALISM, APARTHEID AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION IN SOUTHERN AFRICA: REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION WITH REGARD TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (continued) (A/36/23 (Part III); A/AC.109/652 and Corr.1, 655, 656, 658)

5. Mr. FOURATI (Tunisia) said that the facts provided in the excellent report in document A/36/23 (Part III) were alone enough to show where the responsibility lay for the persistence of a colonial situation, particularly in southern Africa. Despite all the United Nations decisions and appeals, foreign economic interests, motivated solely by concern for immediate profits, were pursuing their activities there and intensifying their collaboration with the Pretoria régime. Foreign corporations were plundering irreplaceable natural resources with total disregard for the rights and interests of the Namibian and South African peoples. Foreign

/...

(Mr. Fourati, Tunisia)

investments shored up the racist régime and incited it to greater repression, arrogance and aggression. South Africa, defying the United Nations decision in 1966 to take direct control of the Territory of Namibia, had illegally pursued the exploitation of Namibia's natural resources, extended its territorial sea and proclaimed an economic zone off the Namibian coast. That policy had brought upon the régime a series of sanctions which had not particularly discouraged it.

6. In South Africa itself, the situation had always been complicated by a formidable array of foreign economic or other interests working closely with the régime to exploit the natural resources of the oppressed South African people through a policy of exporting massive quantities of minerals, fish and agricultural products and investing in areas not conducive to improving the standard of living of the African people. It was a policy which favoured the racist white minority and kept the majority of the people in a state of servitude. As long as outside financial support continued, the régime would not be inclined to change its system.

7. It was a bitter fact that moves made by the United Nations, often at the price of hard-won compromise, had not been appreciated by the South African Government. It was therefore time for the Security Council to take strong measures, in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter, to compel South Africa to implement the relevant United Nations resolutions. Although there was an international consensus in denouncing apartheid and the occupation of Namibia, the political will to act had been sadly lacking whenever it came to putting principles into effect. Those States which had hitherto impeded the Security Council from taking action should now associate themselves fully with the international community in a united front, moving resolutely to replace oppression and the law of force by fraternity and the force of law, and thus usher in a new era.

8. Mr. ZAGAJAC (Yugoslavia) said that the activities of foreign economic and other interests were the core of the whole problem of decolonization. The Centre against Apartheid and the Special Committee of 24 had provided documentary evidence that the collaboration between colonial Powers and foreign economic interests had perpetuated exploitation, repression and racism in Non-Self-Governing Territories. There were a substantial number of foreign-owned companies operating in South Africa and Namibia, with investments totalling some \$35 billion and exorbitant profits derived from the exploitation of cheap black labour.

9. Needless to say, an overwhelming majority of States resolutely opposed the situation in southern Africa. The Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries, held in New Delhi in February 1981, had condemned the collusion of powerful Western interests with the Pretoria régime and called for an end to all economic, military and nuclear collaboration with South Africa. The International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa, held in Paris in May 1981, had also condemned that continuing collaboration and outlined a

/...

(Mr. Zagajac, Yugoslavia)

programme of sanctions that would end all military, nuclear, financial and commercial relations with South Africa.

10. In the small Territories, the activities of foreign interests were also oriented towards their own profits rather than towards developing the self-reliance of the Territories. That was especially the case where foreign military bases had been set up, making those Territories potential targets in future conflicts.

11. The foreign military presence and activities were especially dangerous in Namibia, which was being used as a base for acts of aggression against peace-loving neighbouring countries. The non-aligned countries had expressed their resolute opposition to a foreign military presence in Non-Self-Governing Territories.

12. Yugoslavia stood with the majority in resolutely opposing the perpetuation of any form of exploitation of the wealth of peoples under colonial rule by foreign economic interests, which usually went hand in hand with repression and discrimination.

13. Mr. RASON (Madagascar) observed that the criminal situation in Namibia could have been resolved if certain countries had not collaborated with the forces of racism and colonialism. The goal should be to establish an economic system benefiting the majority and to eliminate all interests incompatible with that approach.

14. The Committee should not become side-tracked, however, into debating the whole question of foreign investments and profits. The essential issue was the elimination of colonialism. The Special Committee had clearly established that investments based upon economic domination stood in the way of indigenous control of natural resources. Sovereign countries could not be equated with dependent Territories in respect of foreign investments and banking. To place them on an equal footing would be to confuse effective sovereignty with economic subjugation, as distinct from real co-operation between developed and developing countries.

15. The process of decolonization was irreversible and went hand in hand with a strict control of foreign investments. The link between development and decolonization was also obvious, since both were grounded on a recognition of the fundamental rights of peoples. Any attempt to maintain a neo-colonialist structure under the guise of maintaining existing prosperity would in reality be perpetuating injustice and exploitation.

16. Mr. N'JI-LAMULE TSHIAMALA (Zaire) said that, in the area of foreign economic and other interests in dependent Territories, little headway seemed to have been made towards the goal of freedom and independence. In southern Africa, the efforts of the international community had been stymied by a lack of political will on the part of certain Member States which continued their collaboration with the racist

/...



(Mr. N'Ji-Lamule Tshiamala, Zaire)

régime of South Africa, thus reinforcing its arrogance and its capacity to resist the injunctions of the international community.

17. Those whose consciences were not disturbed by the systematic pillage of the natural wealth of the Namibians, and those who misled the international community as to the benefits of foreign investments to the peoples of southern Africa, should recall certain facts. They should note that in South Africa, 80 per cent of the national income went to 3 million white inhabitants, while 17 million were forced to share the remaining 20 per cent; the enormous foreign investments directly supported the perpetuation of the criminal policy of apartheid. South Africa's principal partners should heed the appeals to change their outlook and finally bring their actions into line with their declarations of intention and with their proclamations of faith in human rights and in the principles of equality and freedom.

18. Mr. DENICHIN (Bulgaria) said that only an analysis of the activities of foreign economic and other interests could explain the root causes of the capitalist colonial system and why the forces of imperialism made every effort to perpetuate that system and its inseparable companions, racial discrimination and apartheid. The General Assembly, in its resolution 35/28, had denounced the co-operation of the Western countries with the racist régime of South Africa as a major obstacle to the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and had proposed measures to put an end to it.

19. The majority of the population of southern Africa had no chance to reap the benefits of its natural wealth and strategic location because the human and natural resources of the area were exploited by South African and Western corporations. More than 2,000 of them, including 540 based in the United States, had economic interests in South Africa, and in Namibia more than 88 of them squandered the mineral resources of the Territory. The blatant hypocrisy of the claim of transnational corporations that their "codes of conduct" were designed to mitigate apartheid was clearly revealed in the fact that in Namibia the average annual income of black workers was one twelfth of that of white workers while in South Africa it was one eleventh.

20. The dramatic increase in United States investments in South Africa in the past 15 years, which now exceeded \$2 billion, was particularly significant. United States companies controlled the most important branches of the economy, and provided the technology and technical expertise which were helping South Africa achieve strategic self-sufficiency. It should be noted in that connexion that the largest Western oil companies, whose total assets in South Africa totalled more than \$1.5 billion, helped to shield South Africa, which imported 99 per cent of its oil, against strategic vulnerability: without oil, South Africa's military machine would cease to function and its economy would eventually collapse. Hence the oil companies and the Western Governments which refused to curb their activities

/...

(Mr. Denichin, Bulgaria)

bore responsibility for the crimes of the apartheid régime and for the illegal occupation of Namibia.

21. Equally important for the Pretoria régime was Western military and nuclear co-operation, which had enabled it to intensify its military build-up to the point of possessing the most sophisticated war machine in Africa, even in the face of the Security Council's mandatory arms embargo. Many firms in the United States and other Western countries had established subsidiaries in South Africa which were not bound by that embargo, while Israel continued to be one of its major suppliers of weapons. The South African régime was on the verge of achieving military self-sufficiency owing to the virtually unrestricted import of military matériel from NATO countries and from Israel.

22. Even more ominous was the fact that the United States had condoned illegal weapons sales which had given South Africa the means for delivery of nuclear weapons and, together with other NATO countries and Israel, had helped it acquire a nuclear capability which threatened international peace and security.

23. The attitude of the United States and the other NATO countries regarding settlement of the Namibian question was revealed in the veto cast by the United States, the United Kingdom and France against the proposal to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter. The Western contact group, under pressure from the United States, had bent every effort to modify the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia so as to guarantee the white minority and the capitalist monopolies the opportunity to exploit the resources of the Territory even after it had achieved independence.

24. The same Western economic and other interests played an equally sinister role in the small Non-Self-Governing Territories, where they worked to promote the strategic interests of imperialism, to stifle the national liberation struggles and to establish a world-wide network of military bases. Those military activities prevented implementation of the Declaration and even threatened world peace. An eloquent example of the flouting of United Nations appeals to terminate those activities was the activity of the United States in the strategic Territory of Micronesia in violation of Chapter 83 of the Charter.

25. His country unreservedly and consistently supported the colonial peoples in their just struggle for self-determination and independence. It held that the activities of foreign economic and other interests in colonial Territories impeded implementation of the Declaration and violated both the letter and the spirit of the Charter. It favoured the immediate imposition of sanctions against South Africa in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter and held that countries which continued to provide assistance to that country should be condemned in a Committee resolution.

/...

(Mr. Denichin, Bulgaria)

26. His delegation welcomed the decisions on Namibia adopted at the eighteenth session of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of OAU, the Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries held at New Delhi in February 1981, the International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa held at Paris in May 1981 and the eighth emergency special session of the General Assembly. As a member of the Special Committee of 24, Bulgaria whole-heartedly endorsed chapter V of that Committee's report (A/36/23 (Part III)).

27. In his delegation's view, the proposal put forward by the delegation of the German Democratic Republic that the Centre on Transnational Corporations should prepare a register of the profits earned by transnational corporations in colonial countries was helpful and timely. Such a register would be indispensable to the work of the various United Nations bodies dealing with decolonization.

28. Mr. TOUSSAINT (Haiti) said that the activities of foreign economic and other interests constituted a serious obstacle to the implementation of the Declaration of the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and that, while it was commendable for the Fourth Committee to try to secure the sacred rights of freedom, self-determination and national sovereignty for the oppressed peoples by peaceful means, it was even more urgent to prevent the mortgaging of their future through the systematic plundering of their natural resources. The international community must be made aware of that problem and certain Powers must be induced to bring their policies into line with the relevant General Assembly and Security Council resolutions.

29. The most striking example of the plundering of the natural resources of a colonial country was the case of Namibia, the illegal occupation of which had no other purpose. The transnational corporations in that Territory were simply intent on maximizing their profits without regard for legitimate rights of the Namibian people, and in doing so not only became accomplices of the Pretoria régime but also discredited the States which had the power to curb their operations.

30. Most serious of all was the fact that that systematic plundering was based on the barbaric exploitation of the black population by an apartheid régime, which still enjoyed economic, military and nuclear support from certain Powers in defiance of world opinion. The international community must not be deceived by efforts to "whitewash" apartheid. It should instead work for the complete isolation of a regime which survived only because of the misguided support it received from influential Members of the United Nations. His delegation would support all efforts aimed at inducing those Powers to terminate their co-operation with South Africa so as to hasten the historically inevitable victory of the population of the occupied Territories.

/...

31. Mr. YERE (Ivory Coast) said that proper consideration of the item must take account of all the differing situations involved. A distinction should be drawn between the small Territories and the particularly sensitive case of Namibia.

32. The former were in a particularly difficult economic situation, their inhabitants suffering from the disastrous effects of the disruption in the world economy. Foreign investment would help them but the administrative Powers should ensure that no contract or project was allowed to prejudice the interests of the inhabitants and that unscrupulous organizations were not permitted to pursue their nefarious activities in those Territories.

33. In the case of Namibia, the questions of the activities of foreign interests and the Territory's independence could not be separated. His delegation deplored the short-term policy of certain Powers - not South Africa, which was a lost cause - but the Western countries which knew that companies under their jurisdiction were carrying out illicit operations in Namibia. Those countries should realize that the speedy achievement of independence by Namibia, on a just and stable foundation, would be in their own long-term interests. Namibia had long been ready for independence, but the delays and evasions, which could well be interpreted as concessions to South Africa, might ultimately cause irreparable harm to the economies those countries were supposed to be fostering. He appealed to the countries concerned, in their own interests, to show good faith. He commended those which had understood the situation and trusted that the others would ultimately follow their example and show the political will to close the door on a regrettable past.

34. The debate on the activities of foreign interests had shown that the relevant resolutions adopted over the years were still ineffective and no attempt had been made to implement a single one. Yet the Committee was once again engaging in the same ritual of condemnations, knowing only too well that they would be ignored. The General Assembly must take the necessary measures to ensure that its resolutions were implemented.

35. Governments would hardly seek to implement resolutions which they had opposed - even if the resolutions had been adopted by an overwhelming majority; but no Member State could be excused for failing to implement a recommendation of the General Assembly formulated in terms acceptable to all. Better results might be obtained by persuasion rather than confrontation. The Committee should make an urgent appeal to the Governments of the countries whose corporations were involved in undesirable activities to use all political, legislative and administrative means in their power to bring those corporations to reason. His delegation would be profoundly disappointed if the draft resolution on the item were once again the subject of division, and it hoped that the Committee would overcome its differences and achieve a consensus.

36. Mr. AMPAT (Congo) said that for some time already the United Nations and the international community had been deeply concerned over the growing activities of

/...

(Mr. Ampat, Congo)

foreign economic and other interests in the colonial Territories, and particularly the feverish exploitation of the natural resources of Namibia, mostly by Western companies, whose heaviest investments were concentrated in mining, especially uranium. Western European banks and insurance companies had even increased their investments there on the misguided assumption that South Africa would always be able to protect them. In doing so they embedded themselves in the diabolical logic of a system designed by the South African racists to deny the legitimate aspirations of the peoples under their yoke to freedom and independence.

37. No attempts to cloak apartheid in a mantle of legality should deceive international opinion as to its cruel reality. In the mining industries, for example, despite the outlawing on paper of racial discrimination and the official abolition of the system of migrant labour, the wages and living conditions of black workers were far inferior to those of white workers.

38. The growing economic relations between the Pretoria régime and certain Western countries made those countries accomplices not only in the illegal occupation of Namibia but also in the repeated attacks by South Africa against neighbouring States, mainly Angola; they also provided support for apartheid and racial discrimination and for the economic exploitation of the Territory by transnational corporations. It was ironic that the very Powers which were members of the Western contact group - States which had sponsored proposals resulting in the adoption of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) on Namibian independence and had the means to press South Africa to withdraw from Namibia and renounce apartheid - instead co-operated closely with South Africa through their transnational corporations. Some even abused their right of veto in the Security Council to prevent the imposition against South Africa of sanctions provided for in the United Nations Charter, thereby enabling South Africa to flout the relevant resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly.

39. His delegation rejected as completely groundless all arguments that foreign economic activities in colonial Territories did not necessarily impede implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, particularly since they were also accompanied by military activities designed to keep the colonial peoples under control. His delegation therefore felt that, in order to eliminate every vestige of colonialism, it was urgent to take resolute action against all economic and other foreign interests which gave significant material support to the racists and to the administering Powers in colonial Territories.

40. Mr. ADHAMI (Syrian Arab Republic), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that, far from being unsubstantiated, as claimed by the United States representative at the previous meeting, the Syrian delegation's information on the United States agreement to supply arms and spare parts to the South African régime had come from an article in The New York Times dated 27 February 1981.

/...



(Mr. Adhami, Syrian Arab Republic)

Furthermore, since the election of President Reagan, the United States Government had publicly and officially declared its support for the Pretoria régime, which it regarded as a strategically important ally. Other reports had referred to high-level meetings between those responsible for the information and intelligence services of the two countries.

41. He believed it was now the first time that the United States had denied that it was selling arms to South Africa. He trusted that its denial was an expression of a basic change in the policy of the United States towards the Pretoria authorities, particularly on the question of arms, heralding a radical change in its policy on national liberation movements and bringing its attitude into harmony with the aspirations of peace-loving and justice-loving peoples all over the world.

42. Mr. ORON (Israel), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, noted that the representative of Syria, in his earlier statement, had expressed concern regarding the alleged increasing trade between South Africa and Israel, citing, among other accounts, the report of the Special Committee against Apartheid (A/36/22/Add.1). Even if the figures in paragraph 22 of that report were taken as accurate, a comparison of those figures with South Africa's total international trade, as reported in the latest trade statistics issued by the International Monetary Fund, would show a decrease in the volume of trade between South Africa and Israel, both in relative and in absolute terms. The total volume of trade had decreased from approximately 1 per cent of South Africa's total international trade in 1979 to one half of 1 per cent in the first nine months of 1980.

43. Regarding the substance of the issue, Israel, unlike a number of speakers in the debate, had never tried to hide the fact that it traded with South Africa. As a country which had been subjected to an Arab economic boycott, it rejected in principle the use of the economic boycott as a means of conducting international relations. Ninety-nine per cent of South Africa's international trade was with the rest of the world, including virtually every State represented on the Committee and some which had preached against Israel in the current debate.

44. Some delegations preferred to repeat the unfounded accusations against Israel concerning arms supply for which, as in the past, no evidence had been presented. His Government's consistent position, as stated in the note verbale dated 4 September 1979 from the Deputy Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations addressed to the Security Council Committee Established by Security Council Resolution 421 (1977) (S/AC.20/17), and as reiterated in the Israeli Ambassador's letter of 23 June 1980 to the same Committee, was that Israel would comply with Security Council resolution 418 (1977), and accordingly would not provide South Africa with arms or related material of any types, including the sale or transfer of weapons and ammunition, military vehicles and equipment.

45. No evidence had ever been presented to support the unfounded allegations of nuclear co-operation with South Africa. As stated in paragraph 13 of the report of a group of experts on Israeli nuclear armament (A/36/431), it had

/...



(Mr. Oron, Israel)

been noted in paragraph 37 of a comprehensive report on South Africa's plan and capability in the nuclear field, prepared pursuant to General Assembly resolution 34/76 B, that, until specific examples of actual nuclear exchanges or transactions between Israel and South Africa could be cited as clear evidence of such co-operation, the whole question remained in a state of uncertainty.

46. Those speculations and uncertainties appeared to have been interpreted by some representatives as absolute and established facts.

47. Mr. BURAYZAT (Jordan), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said it was well known that the Zionist entity co-operated openly with the Pretoria régime in the nuclear field. The United Nations had ample proof of the Zionist entity's manoeuvring and was aware of the close co-operation between Pretoria and Tel Aviv in a number of areas. The report of a scientific congress on collaboration between Israel and the Pretoria régime, held in London in February 1981, referred to evidence of collaboration on scientific and nuclear research. Details of the exchange of nuclear information since the state of Israel's nuclear activities - the nuclear reactor in occupied Palestine being supplied partly by fuel from South Africa - had appeared in a book published by the Centre for Nuclear Strategy in London, which had been published in a number of languages and had no doubt been read by the representative of the Zionist entity.

48. Evidence of nuclear co-operation between the Zionist entity and the Pretoria régime was contained in a report of the Special Committee against Apartheid (A/35/22/Add.2), paragraph 11 of which referred to Israeli participation in an apparent nuclear explosion on 22 September 1979 in an area of the Indian Ocean and the South Atlantic, as reported on United States CBS television on 22 February 1980.

49. Mr. ADHAMI (Syrian Arab Republic), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the representative of the Zionist entity, in an effort to discredit information in statements made in the Committee, had claimed that there were omissions in the report of the Special Committee against Apartheid on the question of trade between Israel and the racist régime of Pretoria: he appeared to have forgotten the information published in an Israeli agency report on 25 September 1981, which clearly indicated the growth of trade relations between Israel and South Africa, stating that Israel was one of the main partners of South Africa and that bilateral trade between the two countries now amounted to 10,000 rand a year.

50. He also quoted from a United Press report referring to Israel's efforts to persuade the United States to use Israel as its "proxy arms salesman" to politically sensitive areas such as Taiwan and South Africa, and quoting an Israeli minister, a close confidant of Prime Minister Begin, as having said that Israel intended to ask the United States not to compete with it in arms

/...

(Mr. Adhami, Syrian Arab Republic)

sales to Taiwan, South Africa, the Caribbean, or certain other areas, and suggesting Israel as a proxy under an agreement to be worked out on the sharing out of markets.

51. Mr. ABDEL WAHAB (Sudan), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the representative of Israel, by distorting the facts, had tried to discredit delegations which had referred to its collaboration with South Africa. There was no need to repeat the tale of collaboration between the two countries, since everyone knew the major facts, if not all the minor details.

52. The greatest form of self-delusion in which Israel and South Africa indulged was the conviction that, by consolidating their alliance, the perpetrators of zionism and apartheid could stifle forever the nationalist resistance within and stop the winds of change blowing without.

53. It was no surprise to his delegation that the representative of an entity which had defied all the relevant United Nations resolutions was now challenging the report of the Secretary-General concerning Israel's nuclear capability.

54. Mr. ORON (Israel), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the representative of Jordan had stated that his allegations regarding nuclear co-operation between Israel and South Africa were supported by United Nations documents, particularly the report of the Special Committee against Apartheid entitled "Recent developments concerning relations between Israel and South Africa" (A/36/22/Add.1). While paragraphs 8 and 9 of the report considered the alleged nuclear co-operation, a closer look at the footnotes to those paragraphs revealed that the only sources supporting the "facts" reported in paragraph 8 were journalistic speculations published once by the New York Daily News and once by two other newspapers; and the sources of paragraph 9 were first, a speculative news account published in the mass media and, secondly, documents A/35/22/Add.1 and 2, which in fact referred to a previous report of the same committee, under the same title; further, the "facts" stated in the previous report were also only speculation published by the same newspaper.

55. The Special Committee appeared to have used a strange and unreliable process to verify the validity of its hypotheses and had omitted even the slightest reference to views expressed on the subject by experts, as reflected in two reports issued by the Secretary-General: the report on the implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa (A/35/402) and the report entitled "Israeli nuclear armament" (A/36/431). Paradoxically, the same delegations which had initiated the request to the Secretary-General to prepare the latter report had chosen to ignore the experts' views on the matter contained in that report, and to rely in the current debate on a document based exclusively on journalistic speculation. The contempt of those delegations for the report of the Secretary-General could be explained only by their refusal to acknowledge any data or views which contradicted their unfounded accusations.

The meeting rose at 12.35 p.m.