



**Economic and Social
Council**

Distr.
GENERAL

E/CN.4/Sub.2/1988/SR.16/Add.1
31 August 1988

Original: ENGLISH

COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

SUB-COMMISSION ON PREVENTION OF DISCRIMINATION AND
PROTECTION OF MINORITIES

Fortieth session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE SECOND PART* OF THE 16th MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Thursday, 18 August 1988, at 6 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. BHANDARE

CONTENTS

The administration of justice and the human rights of detainees:

- (a) Question of the human rights of persons subjected to any form of
detention and imprisonment;

* The summary record of the first part of the meeting appears as
document E/CN.4/Sub.2/1988/SR.16.

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages. They
should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the
record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this document to
the Official Records Editing Section, room E.6108, Palais des Nations, Geneva.

Any corrections to the records of the public meetings of the
Sub-Commission at this session will be consolidated in a single corrigendum,
to be issued shortly after the end of the session.

CONTENTS (continued)

- (b) Question of human rights and states of emergency;
- (c) Individualization of prosecution and penalties, and repercussions of violations of human rights on families

Question of the violation of human rights and fundamental freedoms, including policies of racial discrimination and segregation and of apartheid, in all countries, with particular reference to colonial and other dependent countries and territories: report of the Sub-Commission under Commission on Human Rights resolution 8 (XXIII) (continued)

THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE AND THE HUMAN RIGHTS OF DETAINEES
(agenda item 9):

- (a) QUESTION OF THE HUMAN RIGHTS OF PERSONS SUBJECTED TO ANY FORM OF DETENTION AND IMPRISONMENT (E/CN.4/Sub.2/1988/13, E/CN.4/Sub.2/1988/14, E/CN.4/Sub.2/1988/15, E/CN.4/Sub.2/1988/16, E/CN.4/Sub.2/1988/NGO/10, E/CN.4/1988/NGO/51, E/CN.4/Sub.2/1987/20)
- (b) QUESTION OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND STATES OF EMERGENCY (E/CN.4/Sub.2/1988/18 and Add.1)
- (c) INDIVIDUALIZATION OF PROSECUTION AND PENALTIES, AND REPERCUSSIONS OF VIOLATIONS OF HUMAN RIGHTS ON FAMILIES (E/CN.4/Sub.2/1988/19)

1. Mr. NYAMEKYE (Deputy Director, Centre for Human Rights), introducing agenda item 9, said that the question of the human rights of persons subjected to any form of detention or imprisonment had been on the agenda of the Sub-Commission since its twenty-seventh session in 1974. Since 1983, the Sub-Commission had considered that issue under a broader agenda item entitled "The administration of justice and the human rights of detainees", which included various sub-items.

2. Under sub-item (a), the Sub-Commission carried out its annual review of developments relating to the human rights of persons subjected to any form of detention or imprisonment. As in the past, the Sub-Commission would have before it information submitted by Governments, specialized agencies and intergovernmental organizations as well as a synopsis of material submitted by non-governmental organizations on the matter. In that connection, the Sub-Commission would also have before it updated succinct information regarding the work of the Human Rights Committee, the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, and developments elsewhere in the human rights programme and the activities within the United Nations programme of crime prevention and control. Furthermore, the Sub-Commission would consider the report of its sessional Working Group on Detention which, in addition to the annual review, had dealt with various particular issues, such as (a) international standards for adequate investigations into all cases of suspicious deaths in detention, as well as adequate autopsy; (b) detention resulting from the exercise of the right to freedom of opinion and expression; (c) Draft Body of Principles for the Protection of All Persons under Any Form of Detention or Imprisonment; (d) restraints on the use of force by law enforcement and military personnel; (e) detention of staff members of the United Nations and specialized agencies; (f) solitary confinement and incommunicado detention; (g) administrative detention without charge or trial; (h) draft declaration on the protection of all persons from enforced or involuntary disappearance; (i) privatization of prisons; and (j) execution of young offenders.

3. In relation to its consideration of the administration of justice and the human rights of detainees, the Sub-Commission would have before it reports by the Special Rapporteurs on different issues. Mr. Louis Joinet would present orally an analysis of questions related to administrative detention without charge or trial on the basis of the replies to the questionnaire drafted pursuant to Sub-Commission resolution 1987/24. Mr. Marc Bossuyt would introduce his report on the elaboration of a second optional protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights aiming at the abolition

of the death penalty. Mr. Leandro Despouy had submitted a second annual report on the question of human rights and states of emergency under sub-item 9 (b), and Mr. Theo van Boven had also submitted a report on the prevention of the disappearance of children in connection with sub-item 9 (c).

4. As could be seen from the annotations to the agenda, the item on the administration of justice and the human rights of detainees contained many other issues of importance which required the detailed attention of the members of the Sub-Commission.

5. Mr. JOINET, presenting orally his analysis of questions related to administrative detention without charge or trial, said that the mandate for his study derived from Commission on Human Rights resolution 1985/16, in which the Sub-Commission had been requested to analyse available information concerning the practice of administrative detention without charge or trial, and to make recommendations regarding its use. To facilitate the implementation of that resolution, in 1987 he had prepared an explanatory paper concerning the practice of administrative detention (E/CN.4/Sub.2/1987/16) and had also drafted, pursuant to Sub-Commission resolution 1987/24, a questionnaire with a view to obtaining further information and views relating to the matters dealt with in that paper. Such information and views would be used, together with other material, in the compilation of his final report, which he hoped would be ready in 1989. He hoped that those States which had not yet submitted their reports would take advantage of the extended deadline. To avoid confusion, he also wished to point out that the questionnaire sought information only on the subject of administrative detention without charge or trial, and not on the practice of preventive detention.

6. Thus far, he had received about 50 replies to the questionnaire and more were expected later in the year. In general, the answers to the questionnaire had confirmed the correctness of the findings presented in his explanatory paper. No modifications seemed to be necessary regarding the definitions to be employed in the study or with respect to the classification of purposes of administrative detention. Concerning the comparative analysis of the legal features of administrative detention, supplementary information had been made available but no new features had become apparent. Consequently, he would confine his presentation to two essential questions, namely the scope of the study to be undertaken and procedures by which the Sub-Commission might carry out its responsibilities under Commission on Human Rights resolution 1985/16.

7. On the first point, there were a number of co-ordination problems which the members of the Sub-Commission needed to bear in mind to avoid duplication of work. One concerned the question of the detention of mentally ill persons. In that regard, he would draw the Sub-Commission's attention to the activities of the Working Group on the question of persons detained on the grounds of mental ill health or suffering from mental disorder, which was examining a draft body of principles, guidelines and guarantees relating to that subject. Secondly, concerning the detention of persons who exercised the right to freedom of opinion and expression, he noted that the Working Group on Detention had decided to include that question in its programme of future work. That aspect of administrative detention would therefore not be dealt with in his study, and, accordingly, he would provide such information as he had received on that subject to the Working Group for its consideration. Lastly, on the question of persons detained under states of emergency, he

would refer the members of the Sub-Commission to the suggestions which would be made by Mr. Despouy on what procedures might be adopted to avoid overlapping or duplication.

8. With regard to the final delimitation of the scope of the study on administrative detention, it was in his view essential to focus on four categories or types of detention. The first related to measures for the prevention of serious disturbances of public order, including detention under states of emergency, as well as measures to protect civilian populations in time of war, in particular coercive measures under article 42 of the Fourth Geneva Convention of 1949. The second type concerned measures relating to the status of foreigners, including asylum-seekers and political refugees, an area in which UNHCR had recently made a major contribution that he would discuss in his final report. A third type of administrative detention involved the application of disciplinary sanctions, and the fourth area to be covered in the study would be measures to combat social maladjustment, in other words measures taken in respect of certain persons in a socially precarious situation, such as the homeless or unemployed persons reduced to a state of vagrancy.

9. Turning to the second main question, he said that with a view to recommending procedures by which the Sub-Commission might carry out its responsibilities under Commission on Human Rights resolution 1985/16, he had consulted a number of non-governmental organizations which had made particular contributions to the discussions held in the Working Group on Detention. One suggestion had been to prepare guidelines or standard minimum rules, and another had been to draft a declaration regarding the use of the practice of administrative detention. Personally, he would be in favour of the first option, and in his explanatory paper (E/CN.4/Sub.2/1987/16) he had already outlined various considerations that would have to be borne in mind in the preparation of a future set of guidelines. First of all, it must be remembered that administrative detention was not prohibited by international law: what was prohibited was the abuse of administrative detention. Thus, certain minimum standards or norms would have to be developed and attention would need to be focused on overcoming the enormous discrepancies which existed between different legal systems in respect of the authorities empowered to issue detention orders, the length of detention, the status of the premises of detention, the right to communicate and the existence and applicability of remedies. Lastly, it was essential to elaborate the guidelines in the light of information obtained on ways in which legal safeguards were circumvented in practice (see E/CN.4/Sub.2/1987/16, Chapter III.I), in order to ensure that the future guidelines would be a practical working tool for human rights advocates and not simply the product of an academic exercise.

10. Mr. DESPOUY, introducing his second annual report and list of States which, since 1 January 1985, had proclaimed, extended or terminated a state of emergency, (E/CN.4/Sub.2/1988/18 and Add.1) said that a state of emergency was to be understood as any situation of serious disorder, whether resulting from war and strife or caused by natural disaster, which threatened the security of the State. In analysing the special measures used to cope with such situations, he had identified a number of requirements or criteria which could be generally applied. The first, of course, was the basis in law, both internal and international, on which emergency measures were taken. A second requirement was that there should be public announcement of any state of

emergency, so that the population concerned would be aware that certain rights were being limited or restricted. In that regard, some European and inter-American legal instruments established an additional obligation to provide notification of emergency situations to other States. A third requirement was that measures under states of emergency must be temporary, pending a return to normal conditions. Further, there was the question of proportionality: the measures adopted should be commensurate with the seriousness of the crisis. Above all, emergency measures must be specifically aimed at overcoming the crisis situation and should not be discriminatory: certain human rights could not be suspended or restricted even under states of emergency.

11. His mandate had been to draw up a list of countries in which states of emergency existed and to report on compliance with the rules guaranteeing the legality of the introduction of emergency measures. In doing so he had applied the criteria which he had described. One of his main findings had been that there was a direct correlation between non-respect for those criteria and violations of human rights. The information he had gathered revealed in particular a number of instances in which states of emergency had been perpetuated and had become the rule, and there was also the question of de facto states of emergency, an issue on which the Commission on Human Rights had already focused special attention.

12. He had submitted an initial set of findings to the Commission on Human Rights in the updated version of his first report (E/CN.4/Sub.2/1987/19/Rev.1 and Add.1 and 2). On the basis of the replies and comments received since then, his second report (E/CN.4/Sub.2/1988/18 and Add.1) provided further findings and recommendations pursuant to Commission on Human Rights resolution 1983/18.

13. Regarding his latest recommendations, he wished to draw the attention of the members of the Sub-Commission to chapter IV of his second report, where he had made the general point that measures taken under a state of emergency should not be excessive. He had therefore suggested that the Sub-Commission recommend that the Commission on Human Rights should request States which had not yet done so to consider adopting provisions of internal law which were in keeping with the requirements of international norms on states of emergency. For that purpose, he would submit model provisions to the Sub-Commission on the basis of the criteria and principles which he had outlined.

14. With regard specifically to inalienable rights, including the right to life, he wished to emphasize the need for Governments, other special rapporteurs dealing with the questions of summary executions and torture and the working groups concerned with enforced or involuntary disappearances and with detention to devote particular attention to the protection of the right to life in emergency situations. He wished to study in particular any link that might exist between the phenomenon of enforced or involuntary disappearances and emergency situations. In his view, the time had come for the United Nations to establish more effective machinery to combat that phenomenon, for example through the elaboration of international norms or, indeed, a convention designed to strengthen respect for inalienable rights. The experience of the Latin American countries showed that the non-existence of an international legal framework relating to the phenomenon of disappearances limited the possibility of investigating the fate of persons who found themselves in such situations in periods of emergency.

15. In chapter IV of his report, he had noted also that the prohibition of torture had been strengthened, at the universal level, through the adoption of the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, which provided in its article 2 that no exceptional circumstances whatsoever could be invoked as a justification of torture. At the regional level, a number of important safeguards were contained in the 1987 European Convention for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, and the Inter-American Convention to Prevent and Punish Torture, adopted in 1985, ruled out the possibility that torture could be justified by exceptional circumstances. A detailed commentary on those international instruments was to be found in paragraphs 43 to 47 of his report.

16. On the subject of the protection of the family and the rights of the child (paras. 48-50), he wished to draw attention to the staggering fact that since 1945 there had been 145 wars and conflicts throughout the world and that, whereas during the First World War only 5 per cent of the victims had been civilians, the current figure would appear to be between 80 and 90 per cent, mostly women and children. His report also provided detailed comments concerning procedural guarantees such as habeas corpus or amparo (paras. 51-53), and went on to consider specific categories of persons who enjoyed a lower level of protection or who were liable to be more particularly affected by a state of emergency. Those persons included not only the political opponents of existing régimes, but also foreigners, indigenous populations, ethnic minorities and even members of parliament.

17. In the past few decades, international law had evolved considerably in the area of the protection of human rights and, although the ultimate responsibility for providing legal safeguards rested with States themselves, it had become increasingly possible since the Second World War for the international community to monitor and influence the ways in which Governments responded to situations of emergency, violence and disorder with a view to ensuring compliance with international norms and principles. However, given the present-day realities of crisis situations in which excessive measures led to a further escalation of violence and human rights abuses, it was vital to build upon those positive developments. Respect for human rights in states of emergency must be seen as a prelude to peace and the restoration of normal conditions. No suspension of a right could be justified except to guarantee other rights. It was in the light of those considerations that he had prepared his report and submitted his various recommendations to the Sub-Commission for its consideration.

QUESTION OF THE VIOLATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS, INCLUDING POLICIES OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION AND SEGREGATION AND OF APARTHEID, IN ALL COUNTRIES, WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO COLONIAL AND OTHER DEPENDENT COUNTRIES AND TERRITORIES: REPORT OF THE SUB-COMMISSION UNDER COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS RESOLUTION 8 (XXIII) (agenda item 6) (continued)
(E/CN.4/Sub.2/1988/8, E/CN.4/Sub.2/1988/9, E/CN.4/Sub.2/1988/10, E/CN.4/Sub.2/1988/37, E/CN.4/Sub.2/1988/38, E/CN.4/Sub.2/1988/40, E/CN.4/1988/NGO/51)

18. Mr. APARICIO (National Aboriginal and Islander Legal Services Secretariat) said that he was a Timorese who had been forced to abandon his country because he could no longer tolerate life there. The people of East Timor were being decimated yet the world remained silent. He had been

12 years old at the time of the invasion of East Timor by the Indonesian Armed Forces in 1975 and, although enjoying some degree of protection as a student at a Catholic seminary, he had witnessed a great many violations of basic human rights by the invading forces. Most of the population in his native town, Baucau, had fled to the mountains after the invasion but had been pursued and bombarded by the airforce, heavy artillery and other military means until they had been forced to surrender. Within the following years, a large-scale offensive had been mounted against the resistance movement, during which a great many civilians, including several of his own relatives, had been captured or killed. Subsequently, two wounded men suspected of being guerrilla fighters had been stoned to death before his very eyes by Indonesian soldiers. He had also personally seen a number of Timorese arrested; all of them had been tortured during interrogation. One, his friend Cristiano Costa, had addressed the Commission on Human Rights at its previous session, and another Timorese, Jose Guterres, had described methods of torture to the Sub-Commission the previous year.

19. Between 1979 and 1981 the Indonesian military forces had launched further operations against the resistance movement and some of his own closest relatives, among others, had been forcibly mobilized to serve as shields to protect the Indonesian soldiers. In 1982, he had obtained permission to visit his family in Baucau but had fallen ill on the way and had stopped at Manatuto. Because he had not presented his travel documents to the military authorities within the time prescribed, he had been arrested and brutally beaten by an Indonesian sergeant and had been released only after the intervention of a priest. Earlier, when only 15, for having defended the Catholic religion he had been beaten in front of his mother by a group of marines. At the time of the Indonesian general election in 1982, he and one of his seminary colleagues had been taken away at night by secret service agents, interrogated and threatened because they had not gone to vote. On the eve of the elections, he had seen Indonesian soldiers order Timorese to vote for the Golkar, the leading party in Indonesia.

20. In 1983, while visiting a relative detained at the Comarca Prison in Dili, he had seen prisoners showing obvious signs of ill treatment and torture. Some were still being detained at the central prison in Djakarta. Several of his companions had simply disappeared after their arrest. In the same year, his school had been visited by a Portuguese television crew. The crew had been constantly followed by Indonesian secret agents, who had noted any attempt to make contact with it. All military equipment in Dili had been concealed from the television cameras. During the rare visits by foreign delegations and journalists, streets leading to the Indonesian barracks and the military cemetery were always closed to traffic. In May 1987, he had unwittingly passed in front of the military cemetery at the time of the burial of Indonesian soldiers killed in action against the resistance movement. As a result, he had been harassed and humiliated by the military police, who had afterwards thrown him into a pit full of human and animal excrement. In December 1987, one of his friends, a former teacher, had been taken away by the Indonesian police never to be seen again. In January 1988 he had been kicked and beaten by soldiers at a control post in Dili for having failed to salute them.

21. In his last few months at Dili, he had taught at the San Jose Diocesan School, the only such institution to teach Portuguese and one that was constantly being accused by the Indonesian secret services of engaging in

political activities against the Government. The pupils and teachers were under strict surveillance and some had been arrested or had disappeared. Two priests, moreover, accused of having distributed anti-Indonesian pamphlets in the capital, had been subjected to interrogation. In conclusion, his experience caused him to fear reprisals against his relatives as a result of the evidence he had given, and he therefore appealed to the Sub-Commission to use every available means to protect his family as well as to promote the fundamental rights of the Timorese people.

22. Mr. RODRIGO (Observer for Sri Lanka) said that the statement made the previous afternoon by the representative of the Minority Rights Group had been somewhat confusing in that it had not clearly identified areas of responsibility for the continuation, and even exacerbation, of the unfortunate developments in Sri Lanka. He therefore wished to provide some clarification of the situation and help to place it in the proper perspective. His Government's commitment to a negotiated political settlement of the country's ethnic issues was undiminished, despite the continued violence by terrorist groups against Sri Lankan civilians, service and Government personnel and members of the Indian peace-keeping force. The political process initiated by his Government in 1984 to redress the grievances of the Tamil community had led to the signature of the Indo-Sri Lanka Agreement at Colombo on 29 June 1987. That Agreement involved a complex of interlinked obligations on the part of the Sri Lanka Government, the armed militant groups and the Indian Government, the fulfilment of which was essential to strengthen the traditional friendship between Sri Lanka and India, to resolve the ethnic problem in Sri Lanka and to ensure the safety, well being and prosperity of all communities in the country.

23. His Government had in good faith taken necessary action to fulfil more than its share of responsibility under the Agreement. In response to the grievances of the Tamil minority and in furtherance of efforts towards the devolution of power and administrative authority to the various regional units, the Agreement envisaged the setting up of provincial councils for each of the nine provinces. Necessary amendments to the Sri Lanka Constitution had been enacted and seven of the nine councils had already been constituted; it was hoped that elections for the remaining two councils, in the northern and eastern provinces, would be held in the near future. In accordance with the Agreement, moreover, a general amnesty had been granted by the Government to over 3,600 persons held in custody or serving sentences under the Prevention of Terrorism Act and other emergency laws. To assist in the political rehabilitation of Tamil militants who had decided to enter the democratic mainstream of political life, the Government had registered some of those groups as legitimate political parties free to contest elections.

24. It had been stipulated in the Agreement that India would take the necessary steps to ensure that its territory was not used for activities prejudicial to the integrity and security of Sri Lanka, and it had been further agreed that the Indian Navy and coastguard service would co-operate with the Sri Lankan Navy in preventing Tamil militant activities against Sri Lanka. Under the Agreement, India had sent a peace-keeping force to Sri Lanka, its first task being to bring about the complete surrender of arms by Tamil militant groups with a view to a non-violent resolution of the ethnic issues through peaceful negotiations and without terrorist intimidation. All militant groups had initially accepted the Agreement and consultations had taken place on setting up an Interim Council to assist in the administration of the northern and eastern provinces, pending the establishment of provincial councils.

25. However, the group calling itself the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE) had refused to participate in the constitution of the Interim Council, and thus elections in the northern and eastern provinces had been delayed. Dates of elections would have to be set taking into account the security situation in those provinces, where violence and unrest continued unabated with the LTTE carrying out armed assaults on civilians, on the Sri Lankan authorities, on the Indian peace-keeping forces and on rival armed militant groups. Members of various citizens' committees in those provinces, as well as human rights workers who had sought to defend civilians and highlight their grievances, had also been assassinated by terrorist groups. In the eastern province, the LTTE had begun systematic killings of persons of the Sinhala and Muslim communities with the clear objective of expelling them from the province and forcibly creating a mono-ethnic, racist entity. Hundreds of civilians of all communities had been killed in the group's campaign of planting landmines and setting off explosives in crowded places, carrying out night attacks on innocent sleeping villagers, slaughtering unarmed civilians in temples, churches and mosques, and ambushing public transport vehicles and massacring passengers.

26. The magnitude of the violence and dislocation could be judged by the fact that the number of displaced persons in Sri Lanka had increased from about 100,000 in July 1987 to over 400,000, a figure confirmed by UNHCR. The LTTE was still opposed to a peacefully negotiated settlement and, in a very welcome gesture, the Indian Government had closed down the LTTE offices in Tamil Nadu, placing under arrest large numbers of LTTE operatives. If the LTTE gave up its violent ways, an immediate cessation of hostilities would be possible and the group could join other Tamil representatives in a democratic process that would be the best means of ensuring the fulfilment of that people's aspirations.

27. Reference had also been made by the Minority Rights Group to the activities of the Janatha Vimukthi Peramuna (JVP), which had opposed the Indo-Sri Lanka Agreement. In July 1977 his Government had pardoned members of that group who had been sentenced and imprisoned for their involvement in an insurrection earlier that year, and the JVP had subsequently been registered as a political party. It had participated in the district development council elections in 1981 and in the presidential elections in 1982. However, in view of the evidence linking it to acts of violence, the party had been proscribed in 1983. The proscription on the JVP had been lifted in May 1988 in the expectation that it would renounce violence and participate in the democratic process. It was hoped that those expectations would be realized.

28. Mr. PHARAON (Observer for the Syrian Arab Republic) said that, despite the adoption in 1960 of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, the peoples of some countries and regions, such as South Africa and Namibia, occupied Palestine and other occupied Arab territories, were still suffering under the yoke of colonialism and the baneful influence of the international monopolies and the imperialist forces supporting them. Since the nineteenth century, racism had been one of the basic instruments by which colonialism had sought to impose its domination, plunder the resources of the world and persecute its peoples. In the first part of the twentieth century, ethnic racism and discrimination based on colour and on the supposed supremacy of the European race had given rise to Nazism. Today, the racists of Pretoria were still pursuing policies based on the philosophy that black African citizens did not deserve to be treated on

the same footing with whites. They were continuing to enact legislation to deprive the majority of the population of their basic rights, such as the right to worship in common churches, the right to participate in elections and the right to equal employment opportunities.

29. The Zionists were following suit. They were expelling the majority Arab population from the Arab lands of Palestine, where they had lived for thousands of years, and replacing them by people brought from various continents who had no ties with those lands except in the form of racist and biblical claims for which there was no scientific basis whatsoever. As in South Africa and Namibia, the colonialists were classifying peoples into different categories according to the colour of their skin and were wiping out complete villages where their inhabitants resisted occupation.

30. The Declaration of 1960 clearly specified that all peoples should be guaranteed the right to self-determination and independence. Therefore, the subjugation of any people to foreign domination or occupation, in defiance of the Charter of the United Nations and resolutions of the General Assembly, constituted a mass and flagrant violation of human rights. The Arab peoples in occupied Palestine and other occupied Arab territories, together with their sister African peoples in Namibia and South Africa, had repeatedly called on the world community to lend its support in their quest for independence, but the endeavours of the international organizations had so far failed to bear fruit, largely because of the continued financial, military and technical assistance given by certain Western countries, primarily the United States, to the two racist régimes.

31. In the last year, uprisings had taken place in both South Africa and occupied Palestine. The African labour unions had taken the decision to join forces with the other national liberation movements. School students had rebelled against racist educational methods and demanded the elimination of segregation. As a result, the apartheid régime had launched a massive campaign of arrests and harassment of union activists and students, as well as their parents and teachers, and other citizens. In occupied Palestine and other occupied Arab territories, children had begun a heroic uprising in December 1987. Their actions defied the racist strategy of the Zionists and their supporters. In spite of inhuman practices such as the maiming and burning alive of protesters, the deportation of Palestinians, the imposition of Israeli identity on the occupied Arab lands and the imprisonment of thousands of their inhabitants under conditions reminiscent of those of the Nazi era, the stone-throwing children and others were continuing their resistance today in the hope that their sacrifices would lead to the elimination of Israeli occupation and bring nearer the goal of self-determination and independence.

32. Those children and their counterparts in South Africa and Namibia once again appealed to the international community for its support. His delegation was fully convinced that the hateful apartheid and Zionist colonial systems which had given rise to such barbaric policies and practices were doomed to extinction, just like all other régimes based on the supremacy of force and racist ideology. It therefore wished to emphasize its unshakeable belief in peace based on equality and justice and it urged the world community to heed the call of those fighting against colonialism and racism to assist them in their heroic struggle.

The meeting rose at 7.30 p.m.