



General Assembly

PROVISIONAL

A/43/PV.66  
5 December 1988

ENGLISH

Forty-third session

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE SIXTY-SIXTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Friday, 2 December 1988, at 10 a.m.

President:

Mr. CAPUTO

(Argentina)

later:

Mr. DLAMINI (Vice-President)

(Swaziland)

- Cyclone in Bangladesh and India
- Policies of apartheid of the Government of South Africa [36] (continued)
  - (a) Report of the Special Committee against Apartheid
  - (b) Report of the Intergovernmental Group to Monitor the Supply and Shipping of Oil and Petroleum Products to South Africa
  - (c) Reports of the Secretary-General
  - (d) Report of the Special Political Committee
  - (e) Draft resolutions

/...

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 General Assembly.

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.

- Elections to fill vacancies in subsidiary organs and other elections:  
[16] (continued)
- (f) Election of the Executive Director of the United Nations Environment  
programme: note by the Secretary-General
- Fortieth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights [38]

The meeting was called to order at 10.25 a.m.

**CYCLONE IN BANGLADESH AND INDIA**

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): Before taking up the items on our agenda this morning, may I, on behalf of the members of the General Assembly and on my own behalf, extend to the Governments and peoples of Bangladesh and India, which have recently been struck by a disastrous cyclone, our deepest sympathy at this major disaster that has caused tragic loss of lives and extensive material damage.

May I also express the solidarity of the international community with the peoples of Bangladesh and India in these particularly difficult circumstances.

Mr. CHOWDHURY (Bangladesh): Mr. President, my delegation is profoundly touched by your kind words of solace and expression of solidarity on behalf of the Assembly.

Yet another natural calamity has struck my country, Bangladesh. Its impact has been all the greater, as the cyclone hit us just as we were recovering from the worst floods in living memory. There is perhaps a modicum of truth in the saying that "the unhappy hour does not come alone". However, thanks to the state of preparedness, precautions taken in time have prevented the toll in human life from being as heavy as might have been expected.

Reports of death and devastation are still coming in. Hundreds of thousands of families have been rendered shelterless by the force of the winds that whipped up waves that were over eight feet high. The coastal areas along the Bay of Bengal have been the worst hit. The extent of the damage is still being computed. The Government of Bangladesh is doing all it can to bring succour to the affected.

(Mr. Chowdhury, Bangladesh)

This is yet another example of the helplessness of man against the forces of nature. We draw comfort from the fact that we have with us the sympathy, support and understanding of the global community. This is what gives us strength and fortitude at this hour of our deep distress.

Mr. ANSARI (India): Mr. President, my delegation expresses its deep appreciation for the sympathy you have expressed regarding the cyclone that has hit my country. My Government is doing its utmost to assure relief to the people and areas affected. The solidarity of the international community, which you have extended, will be cherished and valued at this difficult time.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): Having concluded our statements on this subject, which is very close to the deep feelings of the Members of the Assembly, the disasters which have struck Bangladesh and India, and having heard statements by the representatives of both of these countries, we shall now continue with this morning's agenda.

AGENDA ITEM 36 (continued)

POLICIES OF APARTHEID OF THE GOVERNMENT OF SOUTH AFRICA

- (a) REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE AGAINST APARTHEID (A/43/22)
- (b) REPORT OF THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL GROUP TO MONITOR THE SUPPLY AND SHIPPING OF OIL AND PETROLEUM PRODUCTS TO SOUTH AFRICA (A/43/44)
- (c) REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/43/682, A/43/699, A/43/786)
- (d) REPORT OF THE SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE (A/43/802)
- (e) DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/43/L.30/Rev.1, A/43/L.31 and Corr.1, A/43/L.32 and Corr.1, A/43/L.33 and Corr.1, A/43/L.34 and Corr.1, A/43/L.35 and Corr.1, A/43/L.36 and Corr.1, A/43/L.37 and Corr.1, A/43/L.38, A/43/L.41, A/43/L.42)
- (f) REPORT OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE (A/43/901)

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I call on the representative of Nigeria, who wishes to introduce four draft resolutions, namely: draft resolution A/43/L.30/Rev.1, entitled "International solidarity with the liberation struggle in South Africa"; draft resolution A/43/L.33 and Corr.1, entitled "Imposition, co-ordination and strict monitoring of measures against racist South Africa"; draft resolution A/43/L.35 and Corr.1, entitled "Programme of work of the Special Committee against Apartheid"; and draft resolution A/43/L.36 and Corr.1, entitled "Special session of the General Assembly on apartheid and its destructive consequences in southern Africa".

Mr. OBAZE (Nigeria): On behalf of the sponsors, which include my own delegation, I have the honour to introduce draft resolutions A/43/L.30/Rev.1, entitled "International solidarity with the liberation struggle in South Africa"; A/43/L.33 and Corr.1, entitled "Imposition, co-ordination and strict monitoring of measures against racist South Africa"; A/43/L.35 and Corr.1, entitled "Programme of work of the Special Committee against Apartheid"; and draft resolution A/43/L.36 and Corr.1, entitled "Special session of the General Assembly on apartheid and its destructive consequences in southern Africa".

I should like at the outset, to bring to the General Assembly's attention the efforts of the sponsors of draft resolutions A/43/L.30 to L.36 in introducing seven draft resolutions this year under agenda item 36. Each of them focuses on a particular subject in a very clear, succinct and direct manner. The length of the draft resolutions has been deliberately kept short and unnecessary duplications and overlapping have been virtually eliminated and condemnations avoided. This reflects the deep concern of the sponsors not to offend the sensibilities of those Member States that have often been irritated by condemnations. We hope that they will recognize this gesture and reciprocate accordingly, by voting positively for these draft resolutions. Having listened to so many statements made in the course of the debate on agenda item 36, my delegation and the other sponsors are most hopeful that these efforts of the sponsors will be appreciated by the members of this body. We sincerely hope that the voting on these draft resolutions will demonstrate an overwhelming, positive response to our efforts and, of course, to the overall struggle against apartheid.

Permit me to introduce first draft resolution A/43/L.30/Rev.1 and Corr.1 on international solidarity with the liberation struggle in South Africa. This is a similar draft resolution to that which the General Assembly adopted last year

(Mr. Obaze, Nigeria)

under the same heading. By expressing in two preambular paragraphs its concern about South Africa's internal situation, its acts of aggression and destabilization against independent African States and its illegal occupation of Namibia, the General Assembly would reaffirm its full support for the majority of the South African people in their struggle to eradicate apartheid totally. It would reaffirm further that, under the leadership of their national liberation movements, the people of South Africa have the right to choose the necessary means to attain this objective in order to establish a free, democratic, unfragmented and non-racial South Africa.

In operative paragraphs 3, 4 and 5, the General Assembly would list a catalogue of demands, the implementation of which it regards as creating appropriate conditions for free consultations among the people of South Africa with a view to negotiating a just and lasting solution to the conflict in that country. Such negotiations, as many speakers from this rostrum have emphasized, are urgently needed to establish the necessary conditions for building a free, democratic and non-racial South Africa. I may, perhaps, add that inherent in the demands to create appropriate conditions for free consultations is the need to guarantee freedom of speech, freedom of the press, the right of the people to assemble peaceably and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

As part of a concrete demonstration of international solidarity with the liberation struggle in South Africa, the General Assembly, in operative paragraphs 7 to 9, would appeal to all States, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations, the mass media, city and other local authorities, and individuals, to increase urgently political, economic, educational, legal, humanitarian and all other forms of necessary material, financial and other assistance to the people of South Africa and their liberation movements and to the

(Mr. Obaze, Nigeria)

front-line and other neighbouring independent States of Africa. In particular, they would be called upon to contribute generously to the Action for Resisting Invasion, Colonialism and Apartheid (AFRICA) Fund.

All these paragraphs, I have no doubt, are in tune with the views of the delegations which participated in the debate on agenda item 36. This is true in regard to draft resolution A/43/L.33 and Corr.1 on imposition, co-ordination and strict monitoring of measures against racist South Africa, which I should also like to introduce on behalf of the sponsors.

Against the background of the Special Committee's annual report (A/43/22), in particular its paragraphs 191 to 194, and the Secretary-General's report (A/43/786) on "Implementation of national measures adopted against South Africa", the draft resolution in its preambular paragraphs expresses the General Assembly's views on measures by States, taken individually or collectively, against racist South Africa. While many of these measures are very commendable, we see that they vary widely in coverage, effect and degree of enforcement, and that allows for the exploitation of existing gaps and loopholes by an increasing number of States. Taking that into account, the draft resolution urges all States that have not yet done so, to adopt, pending the imposition of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions, legislative and/or comparable measures to impose effective sanctions against South Africa and, in particular, to take appropriate action in favour of measures listed in operative paragraph 1 (a) to (g).

In operative paragraph 2, the General Assembly would urge all States to monitor strictly the implementation of those measures. It regards as necessary the adoption of appropriate legislation providing for penalties on individuals and enterprises violating the measures.



(Mr. Obaze, Nigeria)

I also express the sincere hope of the sponsors of this draft resolution that those Member States which feel that they cannot support our call for the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions, for whatever reason, can at least support the second-best option, which is selective sanctions in critical areas - unilateral sanctions seriously implemented and co-ordinated.

Next, I wish to introduce draft resolution A/43/L.35 and Corr.1, on the programme of work of the Special Committee against Apartheid. In the draft resolution, the General Assembly commends the Special Committee against Apartheid for its work in the discharge of its responsibilities, in particular in promoting international action against apartheid. In taking note of the annual report of the Special Committee it endorses the recommendations contained in its paragraph 194, relating to the Special Committee's programme of work for 1989.

The modest financial request in operative paragraph 3 is the minimum amount that will allow the Special Committee to carry out its 1989 programmes effectively. This year again the Special Committee recognizes the need for continued austerity measures by our Organization and therefore requests an amount of \$400,000 only, which is almost the same sum as was voted last year. The minimal increase of less than 3 per cent does not even take account of inflationary factors.

Let me state clearly that this modest amount for 1989 should in no way be construed as indicating a tendency towards diminishing our activities. On the contrary, it is an example of prudent fiscal responsibility by the Special Committee against Apartheid. In 1989 we plan further to execute our programmes with effectiveness, selecting our priorities with a view to maximizing the use of our resources, increasing pressure and mobilizing the world against apartheid.

In the draft resolution the General Assembly requests Governments and organizations to provide financial and other forms of assistance for the special

(Mr. Obaze, Nigeria)

projects of the Special Committee and to make generous contributions to the Trust Fund for Publicity against Apartheid.

Finally, it appeals to Governments, intergovernmental organizations, information media, non-governmental organizations and individuals to co-operate with the Centre against Apartheid and the Department of Public Information of the United Nations Secretariat in their activities against apartheid and, in particular, in disseminating information on the deteriorating situation in South Africa, in order to mitigate the effects of the restraints on the press in South Africa and effectively counteract racist South African propaganda.

In conclusion, I also wish to introduce draft resolution A/43/L.36 and Corr.1, on a special session of the General Assembly on apartheid and its destructive consequences in southern Africa. The thrust of this draft resolution emanates from the Final Document of the Conference of Foreign Ministers of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, held in Nicosia, Cyprus, from 5 to 10 September 1988, as well as from the findings in the Special Committee's annual report, in particular the part reviewing developments in South Africa, and the conclusions and recommendations in the report. In this draft resolution the General Assembly expresses not only its grave concern at the escalating repression against the opponents of apartheid, and the régime's continued aggression against front-line States and its destructive consequences, but also its indignation at the continued non-implementation by South Africa of United Nations resolutions. The Assembly takes cognizance of the need to discuss the critical and deteriorating situation in South Africa, and indeed the southern African subregion, with a view to bringing about a peaceful end to apartheid, which is the root cause of the problems in that subregion.

(Mr. Obaze, Nigeria)

Against that background, the General Assembly, in operative paragraph 1, decides to hold a special session on apartheid and its destructive consequences in southern Africa before its forty-fourth session, on a date to be determined by the Secretary-General in consultation with the Special Committee against Apartheid.

These paragraphs, I have no doubt, are in tune with the views of the overwhelming number of delegations which participated in the debate, and I believe that they express the consensus in this Hall.

Finally, on behalf of the sponsors, I express their hope not only that the four draft resolutions just introduced will be adopted unanimously, but that member States, in truly following up the provisions of the draft resolutions, will contribute with initiative and vigour to ensuring the fulfilment of the Special Committee's mandate. As the Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid, Mr. Joseph Garba, said in his address to the Assembly,

"Let us remember that the fate of millions of black and white South Africans is bound to our actions and our votes." (A/43/PV.60, p. 17)

I therefore call on Member States to vote positively on these draft resolutions.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I now call on the representative of Ghana, who wishes to introduce draft resolution A/43/L.31 and Corr.1, entitled "Military collaboration with South Africa", and draft resolution A/43/L.32 and Corr.1, entitled "Comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against the racist régime of South Africa".

Mr. GBEHO (Ghana): I have the honour and privilege of introducing to the Assembly two of the 10 draft resolutions pertaining to agenda item 36, entitled "Policies of apartheid of the Government of South Africa". The two draft resolutions are A/43/L.31 and Corr.1 and A/43/L.32 and Corr.1 and are entitled, respectively, "Military collaboration with South Africa", and "Comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against the racist régime of South Africa". In

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

A/43/L.31/Corr.1 there is an up-to-date list of the co-sponsors of that draft resolution, and the co-sponsors of draft resolution A/43/L.32 can be found in A/43/L.32/Corr.1.

In addition, I should like to announce that the following countries have joined the co-sponsors of draft resolution A/43/L.31 and Corr.1: the Philippines, Somalia and Trinidad and Tobago. As far as draft resolution A/43/L.32 and Corr.1 is concerned, the following countries have joined the co-sponsors: Somalia and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

In draft resolution A/43/L.31 and Corr.1, which is a new draft resolution, the Assembly strongly urges States which directly or indirectly infringe the arms embargo and continue to collaborate with South Africa in the military, nuclear, and military intelligence and technology fields to terminate such acts forthwith. The Assembly also urges the Security Council to consider immediate steps to ensure the scrupulous and full implementation of the arms embargo imposed by the Council in resolution 418 (1977) and its effective monitoring; and requests the Special Committee to keep the matter under constant review and report thereon to the General Assembly and the Security Council as appropriate.

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

The two draft resolutions are considered necessary because of the worsening situation in South Africa. Despite the many appeals addressed to South Africa in previous years, the racist régime has remained intransigent and defiant. In the past year, the régime has, rather, increased its repression of anti-apartheid organizations and individuals, has engaged in strict censorship of information, has detained, imprisoned and even executed political opponents and has generally taken measures to bolster the system of apartheid.

Crucial to these measures has been South Africa's military prowess, which is fully employed in crushing and silencing internal opposition as well as committing acts of aggression against neighbouring States. Of course, South Africa's military might would not have reached its present peak and arrogance had it not been for the collaboration that it has enjoyed and continues to enjoy from abroad, in spite of the arms embargo instituted against it by the Security Council. There is thus a need to deal urgently with this unacceptable and threatening situation.

Furthermore, the overwhelming majority of the international community maintains its conviction that the racist régime should be isolated politically, economically and socially as the best peaceful means of exerting maximum pressure on South Africa for a quick end to the system of apartheid. During the current debate this sentiment has been reiterated by several delegations and therefore needs to be addressed in whatever decision the Assembly takes.

Under draft resolution A/43/L.32 and Corr.1, entitled "Comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against the racist régime of South Africa", the General Assembly would reaffirm that apartheid is a crime against humanity and a threat to international peace and security, and that it is a primary responsibility of the United Nations to assist in its immediate elimination. Encouraging States that have not yet done so to accede to the International Convention against Apartheid in

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

Sports, the Assembly would call upon all States to support the work of the Commission against Apartheid in Sports. The Assembly would also call upon those States that have increased their trade with South Africa to sever trade relations with the racist régime.

The crux of the draft resolution is that, under it, the Assembly would decide once again that 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 and peaceful means to end apartheid, and therefore would urgently request the Security Council to consider immediate action under that Chapter, while calling upon those Governments opposing the application of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions to reassess their policies.

In this connection, the Assembly would also appeal to the Governments of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America to co-operate in the imposition of comprehensive, mandatory sanctions by the international community against South Africa as a means for achieving peaceful change in that country. Finally, the Assembly would urge the Security Council to strengthen the mandatory arms embargo imposed by its resolutions 418 (1977) of 4 November 1977 and 558 (1984) of 13 December 1984 in order to end the continued violations of the arms embargo.

As already pointed out, draft resolution A/43/L.31 and Corr.1, entitled "Military collaboration with South Africa", is a new draft resolution being introduced this year under agenda item 36. The introduction of this draft resolution is deemed expedient by the Special Committee against Apartheid because of the Committee's growing apprehension over the increasing collaboration by certain countries with the racist régime of South Africa in the military field.

Considering the importance of the question of apartheid, which has been labelled a crime against humanity, and the progressively deteriorating situation in

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

South Africa itself and the southern African subregion in general as a result of this abominable political system, I wish, on behalf of the sponsors of these two draft resolutions, to take this opportunity to appeal to all delegations to give them and the other draft resolutions pertaining to agenda item 36 their maximum support. It is necessary at this time that the General Assembly indicate in no uncertain terms to the racist régime in South Africa that it will no longer tolerate its unacceptable system of apartheid.

Indeed, the system of apartheid cannot be reformed; it must be completely uprooted. Delegations should not allow themselves to be hoodwinked by the sham, piecemeal reforms of the racist régime of Pretoria, whose purpose is only further to entrench that evil system of apartheid so that its elimination by the international community will be all the more difficult.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I now call on the representative of Sudan, who wishes to introduce draft resolution A/43/L.34 and Corr.1, entitled "Relations between South Africa and Israel".

Mr. IDRIS (Sudan) (interpretation from Arabic): My delegation is pleased to be among those introducing the draft resolutions designed to combat the policies of apartheid of the Government of South Africa. These draft resolutions were endorsed by the African Group when they were prepared in the Special Committee against Apartheid, following broad and intensive consultations among various regional groups.

The draft resolution I am now introducing is contained in document A/43/L.34 and Corr.1 and is entitled "Relations between South Africa and Israel".

The relations between South Africa and Israel are significant and, indeed, very dangerous because they constitute a major vehicle by which the Pretoria régime attempts to continue disregarding the international political will and resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council, in order to circumvent

(Mr. Idris, Sudan)

the measures for an embargo and blockade imposed against it and in order to deflect international pressure designed to induce it to abandon its policies of apartheid.

The broad relations between Israel and South Africa cover many important areas in, for instance, the military, security and intelligence fields, in addition to economic, commercial and cultural relations.

All the African liberation movements - especially the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania, the African National Congress and the South West Africa People's Organization - have expressed repeatedly and in various forums their concern at the growing relations between South Africa and Israel.



(Mr. Idris, Sudan)

Although the Special Committee against Apartheid welcomed the Israeli Government's decision to curtail its relations with South Africa, it nevertheless expressed certain reservations on that decision concerning such elements as its loose language and its many obvious loopholes, not to mention the fact that when the decision was taken it was intended for certain American quarters and not as a response to the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly, especially those regarding the struggle against apartheid.

According to the report of the Special Committee against Apartheid and its annexes, submitted to the current session of the General Assembly in document A/43/22 of 27 October 1988, despite Israel's decision, and the tight secrecy surrounding relations between South Africa and Israel, the information available last year suggests that their relations have not only continued but actually developed further. The report of the Special Committee against Apartheid underlines that fact, citing, in paragraph 4 of annex I, statements by the Israeli Government itself to the effect that relations would not really change.

The report goes on to state that military contracts between the two countries will not expire until the 1990s, and that the Government of South Africa recruited all the workers and engineers of Israel's Lavi jet-fighter project following its cancellation, in addition to a team of Israeli engineers who had been working on the Cheetah upgrade programme in Johannesburg since December 1987.

Reliable sources have emphasized the intensive co-operation involving military advisors in the recent war against Angola, as the number of Israelis involved amounted to some 600 technicians. Such co-operation was highlighted by the visit of the Israeli Defence Minister Sharon to occupied Namibia in 1976.

The report of the Special Committee against Apartheid also indicates that Israel's annual arms sales to South Africa amount to some 10 per cent of its total military exports.

(Mr. Idris, Sudan)

On the basis of all those facts, draft resolution A/43/L.34 and Corr.1 calls upon Israel to abide by the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council by terminating forthwith all forms of military, nuclear, intelligence and economic collaboration with South Africa, particularly its long-term contracts.

The draft resolution also requests the Special Committee against Apartheid to continue to monitor relations between South Africa and Israel and to submit a report on the subject.

The following States are the sponsors of draft resolution A/43/L.34 and Corr.1: Albania, Algeria, Angola, Benin, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Burundi, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Congo, Cuba, Ethiopia, the German Democratic Republic, Ghana, India, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Kenya, Liberia, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mongolia, Mozambique, Niger, Nigeria, Somalia, Tunisia, Uganda, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Zambia, Zimbabwe and Sudan.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on the representative of Zaire who wishes to introduce draft resolution A/43/L.37 and Corr.1, entitled "Dissemination of information against the policies of apartheid of the régime of racist South Africa".

Mr. BAGBENI ADEITO NZENGEYA (Zaire) (interpretation from French): Draft resolution A/43/37 and Corr.1, entitled "Dissemination of information against the policies of apartheid of the régime of racist South Africa", is sponsored by 33 countries, including the Philippines, Trinidad and Tobago, and Zaire, whose names should be added to the list of sponsors. It is in keeping with the spirit of the terms of reference contained in paragraph 4 of General Assembly resolution 32/105 H, of 14 December 1977, and in General Assembly resolution 33/183 I of 24 January 1979, requesting the Secretary-General to undertake, in co-operation

(Mr. Bagbeni Adeito Nzengeya, Zaire)

with Member States, a regular programme of radio broadcasts directed at South Africa.

It is indeed pursuant to the fundamental role of the United Nations and its specialized agencies to disseminate information against apartheid, and to expand and intensify their activities in order to mobilize world public opinion against the heinous system of apartheid in South Africa that draft resolution A/43/L.37 and Corr.1 seeks to publicize the acts of barbarous repression and the iniquitous hangings, violating the law and denying respect for human values, committed by the racist minority régime in South Africa.

Since 1983, the racist minority régime in South Africa has executed 638 prisoners, the majority of whom were Blacks.

Last Thursday, 24 November 1988, five prisoners were hanged, bringing the number of prisoners executed this year to 115, of whom 79 were Blacks, 33 of mixed-race and only 33 white.

Such atrocities show the murderous style of the racist minority régime, which is carrying out with impunity the progressive elimination of the black race in South Africa.

The crimes of the minority racist régime extend from arbitrary arrests to hangings and the torture, physical abuse and inhuman treatment inflicted constantly upon the black population of South Africa.

With a view to preventing international public opinion from closely following its repressive practices, the régime has set up a police machinery called a state of emergency, together with press censorship, so that the outside world should be prevented from learning of the crimes it commits inside the country.

Carrying the internal conflict raging there outside its own boundaries, the régime perpetrates numerous acts of military aggression and destabilization against front-line States and other States in the area.

(Mr. Bagbeni Adeito Nzengeya, Zaire)

The international community is alarmed at the planned reduction in the Establishment of the Anti-Apartheid Programmes Section of the Department of Public Information of the Secretariat. It is concerned at the continuous reduction over the years in programme output aimed at stigmatizing the practice of apartheid. It is distressed at the prospect of the Department of Public Information's proposal further to reduce radio programmes directed at the people of South Africa and Namibia at this crucial period when the racist régime has escalated its disinformation campaign and mass-media black-out.

According to draft resolution A/43/L.37 and Corr.1, the General Assembly, bearing in mind the efforts made by the Secretary-General in initiating radio programmes in co-operation with Member States whose broadcasts can be heard in southern Africa in the main languages spoken in South Africa - English, Afrikaans, Sesotho, Setswana, Xhosa and Zulu - would urge the Secretary-General to intensify, increase and expand those radio broadcasts, as well as the production of audio-visual material, and to maintain the unique linguistic features and characteristics of those programmes. It would appeal to all Governments, non-governmental organizations and the specialized agencies to co-operate with the Secretary-General in order to ensure the widest possible dissemination of information against apartheid, in particular those radio programmes.

That is the aim of draft resolution A/43/L.37 and Corr.1, which I hope the General Assembly will adopt unanimously, thereby expressing the solidarity of all Member States with the oppressed black people of South Africa, a solidarity that will thereby acquire its true humanitarian significance.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I now call upon the representative of Sweden to introduce draft resolution A/43/L.38, "United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa", and draft resolution A/43/L.42, "Concerted international action for the elimination of apartheid".

Mr. ELIASSON (Sweden): I have the honour first to introduce draft resolution A/43/L.38 concerning the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa, sponsored by 40 Member States.

The Trust Fund was set up more than 20 years ago. Its purpose is basically humanitarian: to provide legal assistance to persons persecuted for their opposition to apartheid. The Fund is a concrete testimony to the fact that the United Nations and its members are supporting the struggle against apartheid, not only in words, but also in deeds. Since 1965 the Fund has contributed a total of more than \$30 million to several thousand persons persecuted under the apartheid legislation in South Africa and Namibia.

The debate this week in the General Assembly has clearly demonstrated our common and grave concern at the unprecedented repression in South Africa and Namibia of opponents of apartheid, including leaders of democratic and non-racial political mass organizations, trade unionists, community and church leaders and students. In the Secretary-General's report on the Fund (A/43/682) we find ample indications of the extent and depth of that repression.

Despite the severe limitations imposed on the courts, lawyers have been able to render significant relief to political detainees in Namibia and South Africa. In many cases this year detainees have been released, sentences reduced and dependants allowed access with legal assistance provided through the United Nations Trust Fund. The support from the Fund for civil action challenging apartheid laws and the humanitarian assistance in those cases have been of crucial importance. Such action is vital for defending fundamental human rights. It also serves the cause of abolishing apartheid and the establishment of a democratic and non-racial society in South Africa.

(Mr. Eliasson, Sweden)

During the past few months the Trust Fund has received several reports of the dire needs for more funds. The agencies involved in this work cannot meet the soaring costs of supporting the drastically increasing number of cases. Therefore, we strongly appeal in the draft resolution for increased contributions to the Trust Fund and the voluntary agencies. We express our appreciation to the Governments and organizations that have contributed to those ends. As Chairman of the Committee of Trustees, I appreciate that a large number of Governments contribute to the Fund, and I appeal to those that have not contributed so far to join in these worthy efforts. I cannot fail to note that four Governments contribute more than 75 per cent of the Fund's budget. It is indeed my hope that the industrialized countries in particular will find it possible to contribute or to increase their support for the Fund. I would hope that the many eloquent statements made from this rostrum against apartheid and in favour of solidarity with the detained and imprisoned victims of apartheid made here and elsewhere will be reflected in increased contributions.

On behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/43/L.38, I wish to express the hope that this year, as last year, the General Assembly will adopt the draft resolution without a vote.

I now turn to draft resolution A/43/L.42, "Concerted international action for the elimination of apartheid". For the past five years a similar text has been submitted as the result of a joint effort by a number of countries, including the Nordic and several African countries, with the aim of rallying as broad as possible support of the international community on ways and means finally to persuade South Africa of the necessity to abolish apartheid.

The draft resolution emphasizes the responsibility of the United Nations and the international community to co-ordinate and strengthen its pressure against

(Mr. Eliasson, Sweden)

South Africa as a way of achieving the immediate abolition of apartheid by peaceful means. It urges the Security Council to consider without delay the adoption of effective mandatory sanctions against South Africa.

Similarly, the draft resolution recognizes the urgent need for assistance both to the oppressed people of South Africa and to neighbouring States. This is reflected in appeals to increase humanitarian, legal and educational assistance to the victims of apartheid as well as assistance to the front-line States and to the Southern African Development Co-ordination Conference (SADCC).

While continuing to favour effective mandatory sanctions by the Security Council, the draft resolution, pending such actions, contains appeals to increase the pressure on the apartheid régime by implementing a large number of voluntary measures listed in operative paragraph 7 of the draft resolution.

The present text is sponsored by a wide group of countries: Angola, Australia, Austria, Denmark, Egypt, Finland, Ghana, Greece, Iceland, India, Ireland, Madagascar, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Sweden, the United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe. In addition, the following States have today joined us as sponsors: the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Senegal, Somalia, Trinidad and Tobago and the Philippines.

(Mr. Eliasson, Sweden)

It is in the light of the manifest need for joint international action that we now urge all Member States to support the just aspirations of the South African people by casting a positive vote on this draft resolution now before the Assembly.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I call now on the representative of Kuwait to introduce draft resolution A/43/L.41, "Oil embargo against South Africa".

Miss AL-MULLA (Kuwait): Kuwait is honoured to join previous speakers in the introduction of draft resolutions on agenda item 36, "Policies of apartheid of the Government of South Africa". It is my delegation's pleasure to introduce draft resolution A/43/L.41, "Oil embargo against South Africa", now before the Assembly. The draft resolution is sponsored by all the members of the Intergovernmental Group to Monitor the Supply and Shipping of Oil and Petroleum Products to South Africa: Algeria, Cuba, the German Democratic Republic, Indonesia, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, the Ukrainian SSR, the United Republic of Tanzania and Kuwait. The following States have also joined the Group as sponsors: Albania, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, the Islamic Republic of Iran, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mongolia, Senegal, Somalia, the Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago and Venezuela.

It will be recalled that the Intergovernmental Group was established following the adoption of resolution 41/35 F in November 1986. In accordance with that resolution, the Group presented its first report to the General Assembly at its forty-second session; the Assembly subsequently adopted resolution 42/23 F on an oil embargo against South Africa, on 20 November 1987, by a vote of 138 in favour to 4 against, with 12 abstentions. This year too we hope to retain such overwhelming support, if not to increase it.



(Miss Al-Mulla, Kuwait)

The draft resolution before the Assembly is basically similar to resolution 42/23 F. There are some minor editorial changes and, as a result of the Group's two years of experience, some important additions. In resolution 42/23 F, the Security Council was urged to take action without further delay to impose a mandatory embargo on the supply and shipping of oil and petroleum products to South Africa as well as the supply of equipment and technology to its oil industry and coal liquefaction projects. Paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/43/L.41 contains two additional elements for the embargo, namely finance and investment.

Last year's resolution laid down a set of measures to broaden the scope of the embargo. These elements have been retained in draft resolution A/43/L.41. For example, in paragraph 3 (i) we request, as we did last year, that, pending a decision by the Security Council to adopt effective measures, all States impose penal action against companies and individuals that have been involved in violating the oil embargo, to which we have this year added the following:

"and to publicize cases of successful prosecutions in conformity with their national laws".

In sub-paragraph (j) of the same paragraph, we request, as we did last year, that, again pending a decision by the Security Council, all States gather, exchange and disseminate information regarding violations of the oil embargo, to which we have this year added the following:

"including ways and means to prevent such violations and to take concerted measures against violators".

Paragraph 4 reads that the General Assembly

"Decides to hold hearings in April 1989 on the strengthening of the oil embargo against South Africa, to be organized by the Intergovernmental Group in co-operation with the Special Committee against Apartheid". (para. 4)

(Miss Al-Mulla, Kuwait)

We are confident that a hearing with the participation of experts and eminent persons in this field will pave the way for further meaningful action by the international community against South Africa.

In addition to organizing the hearing, the Intergovernmental Group is requested, as was the case last year, to submit to the General Assembly at its forty-fourth session a report on the implementation of the resolution, including proposals for strengthening the mechanism to monitor the supply and shipment of oil and petroleum products to South Africa.

The draft resolution before the Assembly is a significant component of the international efforts to assist in the dismantling of the abhorrent apartheid system by peaceful means. Increased international pressure, particularly through meaningful comprehensive mandatory sanctions, is the only peaceful means available to the international community to assist the just struggle of the national majority of South Africa. The sponsors of the draft resolution believe that an effective oil embargo would have a significant potential for success. Let us bear in mind that oil is almost the only strategic commodity in which South Africa is not self-sufficient. Such an embargo would also convey the message of the international community to Pretoria that it will not tolerate apartheid. Pretoria has to decide soon either to join the international community by peacefully abolishing apartheid or to remain an international outcast and face further international sanctions.

One way of conveying our message to Pretoria is to adopt the draft resolutions under agenda item 36 by an overwhelming majority, if not unanimously.

Ms. THORPE (Trinidad and Tobago): May I begin by again extending, on behalf of the Government and the people of Trinidad and Tobago, our sympathy to the Governments and the peoples of Bangladesh and India on the loss of life and severe damage just suffered by those countries.

The General Assembly is meeting yet again to consider the deteriorating situation in South Africa and the formidable, but not insurmountable, challenges facing both the oppressed majority in that country and the international community at large in their common struggle against apartheid.\*

---

\*Mr. Dlamini (Swaziland), Vice-President, took the Chair.

(Ms. Thorpe, Trinidad and Tobago)

In the past year, we have borne witness to the continued escalation by the Pretoria régime of draconian and arbitrary measures, measures aimed at eliminating all opposition to the abhorrent system of apartheid and at further subjugating the black majority population. Towards this end, South Africa has accorded wide-ranging repressive powers to its security forces. Under the rubric of the extended state of emergency, various forms of legitimate political activity have been designated criminal acts; killings, detentions without trial of men, women and children, and the torture of prisoners and detainees persist; rigid control and censorship of the local and foreign media have continued to be imposed and enforced, thus hampering the media's ability to reveal, in an unfettered manner, the repugnant and inhuman acts perpetrated against the non-white majority.

The Pretoria régime also continues to vent its frustrations on the leading anti-apartheid organizations and individuals who actively and peacefully demonstrate their opposition to the vile system. This year severe restrictions amounting to virtual bans were imposed on 17 prominent anti-apartheid organizations, on 18 individuals and on the Congress of South African Trade Unions, the largest trade union federation in South Africa. Also of serious concern is the imposition in September of this year of the harsh Labour Relations Amendment, which seeks, among other things, to curtail black labour's ability to strike and to stage solidarity boycotts, and allows for the imposition of punitive damages for production losses during walk-outs.

It should be abundantly clear to all that in its undeclared war against the majority population of South Africa, both devious and overtly terrorist means will be employed by the régime to ensure the continued survival of that reprehensible system, a system which the international community has declared to be a crime against humanity. That harsh reality was forcefully confirmed earlier this year,

(Ms. Thorpe, Trinidad and Tobago)

with the assassination and maiming within and outside southern Africa of prominent members of the African National Congress of South Africa and anti-apartheid organizations. Trinidad and Tobago resolutely condemns those unmitigated acts of State terrorism, which constitute a threat to international peace and security.

It is certainly ironic that in the face of the racist régime's unrelenting onslaught on the inalienable rights and fundamental freedoms of the majority population of South Africa, Pretoria persists in its vain efforts to portray itself as reformist and even benevolent. Had the attempt to camouflage its criminal deeds been any less tragic and dangerous, and had the cost of the propaganda machinery been any less significant, those machinations could have been dismissed as the desperate, but futile attempts of an international pariah to secure national and international legitimacy. But the reality is that genuine supporters of the anti-apartheid struggle face the all-too-frequent readiness of South Africa's collaborators, both governmental and private, to use those so-called signs of reform as justification for their continued or increasing links with apartheid. It is for this reason that Trinidad and Tobago welcomed the Organization's swift and unequivocal rejection of the sham "municipal elections" conducted in South Africa in October of this year. The Assembly recognized the racial "municipal elections" for what they were:

"... insidious manoeuvres by the racist minority régime of South Africa further to entrench white minority rule and apartheid". (resolution 43/13, para. 2)

It is only regrettable that a resolution of that nature was not adopted by consensus, thereby avoiding sending mixed signals to the apartheid régime.

In spite of Pretoria's efforts to hoodwink the international community into believing that substantive changes are under way in South Africa, it is very evident

(Ms. Thorpe, Trinidad and Tobago)

that the pillars of the apartheid system remain entrenched and continue to govern the daily existence of millions of South Africans. According to the current report of the Special Committee against Apartheid, one such pillar, the Group Areas Act, which provides for the forced removal of the black population to so-called homelands and deprives them of their citizenship, has been enforced with greater frequency in recent times and also with much severity. Concerted and sustained international pressure must be brought to bear on Pretoria to end this loathsome practice, for the oppressed people of South Africa and the international community cannot rest until South Africa attains a united, non-racial democratic society free from apartheid and based on majority rule.

Trinidad and Tobago welcomed the release on 26 November of the President of the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania, Mr. Zephania Mothopeng, and Mr. Harry Gwala of the African National Congress as well as the recent commutation of the death sentences imposed on the "Sharpeville Six". Trinidad and Tobago however joins other Member States in calling for the immediate and unconditional release of all political prisoners in South Africa, including that stalwart of justice, freedom and equality, Nelson Mandela, for my delegation cannot but suspect that the long overdue release of these ailing freedom fighters and the decision concerning the "Sharpeville Six" included an element of propaganda and attempted manipulation, especially in the light of the recent executions of four prominent leaders of the mass-based United Democratic Front on a charge of treason and the subsequent execution only last week of five black South Africans.

Various reports and studies, including the report of the Secretary-General (A/43/786), the report of the Special Committee against Apartheid (A/43/22), now under consideration, and studies commissioned by the Commonwealth Secretariat, have all concluded that some aspects of the limited restrictions and sanctions

(Ms. Thorpe, Trinidad and Tobago)

imposed on South Africa thus far are having significant impact. It is felt that the impact would be increased with the adoption of comprehensive mandatory sanctions. As the Commonwealth Secretary-General, Mr. Shridath Ramphal, observed in a recent address in Australia:

"It is now obvious from South Africa's propaganda outside and press reaction within the country that Pretoria is troubled by sanctions. Most telling of all, President Botha has made it a criminal offence for any South African to express support for sanctions."

Unhappily, some of the reports under consideration also acknowledge that there are loopholes even in existing measures and sanctions. Those loopholes ensue in part from imprecision in the language of legislation, from the voluntary nature of some measures and from the fact that violations of sanctions are sometimes not deemed punishable. Also of utmost importance in this regard is the fact that sanctions are not universally applied, thus opening the way for the undermining of sanctions by States and entities not fully restricted by those measures.

There is clearly then an urgent need for the international community to devise means to eliminate those loopholes and to establish appropriate monitoring mechanisms, which are indispensable to the process. Trinidad and Tobago stands ready to contribute towards that end. We will also continue to seek the adoption of comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter, for Trinidad and Tobago is resolved to continue its commitment to a free, non-racial, democratic South Africa.

Mr. KARUKUBIRO-KAMUNANWIRE (Uganda): I wish at the outset to express my delegation's appreciation to the Chairman, Ambassador Joseph Garba, and all the members of the Special Committee against Apartheid for the reports they have submitted to the General Assembly. Over the 25 years of the Special Committee's existence it has registered considerable progress in mobilizing international opinion in support of the struggle to combat the evil policy of apartheid. Its reports and recommendations have been valuable in keeping the dangerous and critical situation in South Africa high on the international agenda. My appreciation goes equally to the Chairman and other members of the Intergovernmental Group to Monitor the Supply and Shipping of Oil and Petroleum Products to South Africa. The Group has been helpful in ensuring that the pressure of the oil embargo is put on South Africa and that the culprits violating it are exposed.

This year we mark the fortieth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which spells out the fundamental human rights of individuals and all peoples. It spells out the right of every individual to enjoy all the rights and freedoms set forth in the Universal Declaration, without distinction of any kind as to race, colour, sex, language, religion or ethnic or national origin. The adoption of the Declaration 40 years ago by the General Assembly was a milestone. It marked the recognition that the maintenance of international peace and security was inextricably linked with full respect for human rights. It ushered in the age in which the emancipation of all peoples and the affirmation of human rights and fundamental freedoms are viewed as sacrosanct objectives.



Mr. Karukubiro-Kamunanwire, Uganda)

The anachronistic apartheid régime in South Africa stands out as a sad monument of a bygone slave era, defying the spirit of our age. The actions and policies of that régime are predicated on ensuring the perpetuation of apartheid. That such a system, similar to the one practised by Nazi Germany, can be allowed to flourish in our midst is a sad commentary on our times. We all agree that the system of apartheid is evil and immoral and must be ended. This Organization has adopted numerous resolutions calling for the dismantling of apartheid and an end to the institutionalized racism and oppression practised by Pretoria. Indeed, apartheid has been characterized by the United Nations as a crime against humanity. Regrettably, a number of powerful countries have not displayed the necessary political will to bring the régime to an end.

In spite of our condemnation the régime has not relented and shows no sign of doing so. It has instead embarked on a policy of intensified oppression at home on the one hand, and a campaign of aggression and destabilization against the front-line States on the other. The economic infrastructures of all these countries have been targeted for destruction. The economic costs to the Southern African Development Co-ordination Conference (SADCC) countries arising from the war against apartheid was estimated to have totalled \$10 billion in the period 1980 to 1984. The aim of South Africa is to make the front-line States more economically dependent on South Africa. We call on the international community to increase its assistance to SADCC.

In the meantime, while pretending to work for the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), South Africa is attempting to manipulate events in Namibia in such a way that the Government of independent Namibia is either directed from Pretoria or, alternatively, held economic hostage through the illegal occupation of Walvis Bay.

(Mr. Karukubiro-Kamunanwire, Uganda)

We maintain that Walvis Bay and the Penguin Islands are integral parts of Namibia. In any settlement South Africa appears intent on clinging to Walvis Bay in order to compromise Namibia's independence and use its territory as a base for subversive and aggressive action against the front-line States. The General Assembly should send the unmistakable message that this is unacceptable. We should give unflinching support to the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) in its efforts to ensure that Namibia becomes a truly independent country.

The report of the Special Committee has amply chronicled the grim picture in South Africa resulting from the oppressive policies and practices of apartheid. In response to the growing outcry from both within and outside the country, South Africa has adopted a host of Draconian measures. The state of emergency, under which the régime is armed with arbitrary powers of arrest, has become a permanent feature of life in South Africa. In February this year the régime clamped a ban on the political activities of 17 anti-apartheid organizations, including the United Democratic Front (UDF). An ominous recent development has been the conviction on charges of treason of prominent black leaders of the UDF and seven others. Their only crime was to engage in peaceful opposition to the apartheid régime. Clearly their conviction is bound to increase unrest. It is a demonstration that in South Africa all avenues for peaceful opposition to the régime are foreclosed.

In addition to arbitrary arrests under Draconian laws, the Pretoria régime is using vigilantes and other surrogate forces to liquidate black leaders. This practice of State terrorism is not confined within the borders of South Africa; the policy extends to abduction and assassination of exiles and representatives of liberation movements living abroad. A case in point is the assassination of an

(Mr. Karukubiro-Ramunanwire, Uganda)

African National Congress of South Africa (ANC) representative in Paris in March this year. Besides extrajudicial physical elimination, South Africa has the undignified honour of having one of the highest execution rates in the world. Almost all of the victims are black leaders. Equally, South Africa has one of the highest prison populations per capitaz. The whole country can be described as a vast concentration camp.

In an attempt to deceive the world and placate its apologists, the régime has instituted so-called reforms, which as we know are devoid of any substance. The objective was partly to co-opt sections of the oppressed while leaving the whole system of oppression and domination intact. This will deceive no one.

(Mr. Karukubiro-Kamunanwire, Uganda)

The General Assembly in resolution 38/11 and the Security Council in its resolution 554 (1984) expressed the unanimous view of the international community by pronouncing those sham reforms null and void. Another ploy to give legitimacy and the appearance of reform was the election of black representatives in the so-called Community Councils, held in October this year. The General Assembly, in resolution 43/13 adopted at this session, unanimously denounced them as having the object of entrenching minority rule and being contrary to the principles of the Charter. The people of South Africa massively rejected these sham elections. It is a measure of the régime's insensitivity that it continued to carry out its obnoxious scheme. Apartheid cannot be reformed, it must be dismantled.

Uganda welcomes the release from prison of Mr. Zephania Mothopeng, President of the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania (PAC), and Mr. Harry Gwala of the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC). We wish, however, to caution that we should not be deluded into believing that this marks a change of heart on the part of Mr. Botha. Their incarceration was unwarranted in the first place. The release of these patriots is partly intended to blunt the international outcry over the Draconian measures the régime is implementing internally. He also wants to create a feeling that there is a dialogue going on. Rather than engaging in meaningful dialogue with the authentic leaders inside South Africa, Botha has been shuttling to capitals abroad, masquerading as a peace-maker. We should all be wary of being unwitting accomplices to Botha's sinister designs by offering him a platform from which to act.

If Botha is serious in seeking a peaceful abolition of apartheid, he must show genuine willingness to negotiate with the authentic leaders of the majority. He should unconditionally release Nelson Mandela and other black leaders, lift the ban on all political organizations, allow exiles to return, repeal the Internal Security Act and end the state of emergency.

(Mr. Karukubiro-Kamunanjire, Uganda)

Uganda welcomes the Geneva quadripartite agreement negotiated between Angola, Cuba, South Africa and the United States. We hope that this time South Africa is serious and that it will implement Security Council resolution 435 (1978). In view of South Africa's previous conduct, however, it is our considered view that the international community should remain vigilant.

Some have attempted to use the developments in Namibia as a sign of an improving climate in the region and as a convenient cover for protecting South Africa from overdue comprehensive mandatory sanctions. South Africa's withdrawal from Angola and its being forced into negotiations over Namibia are not charitable acts. They are a consequence of its disastrous defeat at Cuito-Cuanavale at the hands of the Angolan and Cuban internationalist forces. We salute Cuba and Angola for their statesmanship and the courage to sacrifice and fight for the ideals we all share: repelling apartheid aggression from Angola and the illegal occupation of Namibia.

We salute those countries that have imposed sanctions. Regrettably, the actions of a few Western Governments in blocking the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions by the Security Council can only give comfort to the apartheid régime and encourage its intransigence.

We note with regret that the United Kingdom and the Federal Republic of Germany stood in the way of the imposition by the European Economic Community (EEC) of stricter measures against the régime. Uganda also finds it deplorable that, while some States have moved to impose sanctions, others have stepped in to fish in troubled waters by filling the gap left by others. We are not impressed by statistics showing that trade is declining between certain countries and the pariah State. What we desire is determined action to make the apartheid enterprise a costly adventure. We also find the argument that sanctions will not work and that they can only harm the victims of apartheid merely self-serving and paternalistic.

(Mr. Karukubiro-Kamunanwire, Uganda)

The countries advancing this line have not hesitated to impose sanctions in instances that were less deserving. Their posture can be aimed only at maintaining their political, economic and military collaboration with South Africa. History will not judge them very kindly.

Uganda maintains that the conduct of South Africa clearly falls within the purview of Article 39 of the United Nations Charter. It therefore follows that the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter is imperative.

We in Uganda will continue to give full support and assistance to the people of South Africa and the liberation movements in their struggle.

We equally support the work of the Special Committee against Apartheid. We are aware that there are some who wish to take advantage of the present retrenchment in the United Nations budget to limit unduly the United Nations programmes concerning apartheid. This is unfortunate. More than ever before, the Special Committee's work needs to be strengthened. Its contribution to the isolation of the racist régime and mobilization of the international community is commendable. It deserves the full support of all those who champion freedom.

In conclusion, I wish to reiterate Uganda's view that the issue is not whether apartheid will end, but rather when and how. We can hasten its demise by concerted action. The African Heads of State 20 years ago, in the Lusaka Manifesto, clearly indicated their readiness to live up to both the challenge of negotiations and the challenge of armed struggle. As all peaceful means continue to be blocked, our duty is to assist the liberation movements in their struggle. By imposing comprehensive economic sanctions we can make their task easier.

Mr. LOHIA (Papua New Guinea): Once again the General Assembly is considering the item, "Policies of apartheid of the Government of South Africa".

Over 40 years have lapsed, and yet there is no apparent change of attitude in racist South Africa.

In that regard my Government expresses concern that the racist régime of South Africa continues to suppress and exploit the majority of the people of South Africa who are Africans.

(Mr. Lohia, Papua New Guinea)

As a country and a people enjoying freedom, peace and harmony in a diversity of more than 750 different languages, dialects and ethnic groups, the people and the Government of Papua New Guinea are concerned and must condemn the policies and practices of apartheid in South Africa, for racism is, along with the arms race, one of the most severe threats to peace and stability in the world today.

It is apparent that the Government of South Africa considers the oppressed black African majority to be inferior and, accordingly, the majority have been denied the wealth and comfort of their land and the rights and privileges that have been earned, more often than not, through the sweat and toil of those oppressed black South Africans.

The ghettos of Soweto are an affront to the dignity of humankind. They are a visible sign of degradation and of the inhuman policies of the racist South African Government.

Persistent failure to deal effectively with this abhorrent offence to humankind is likely to have a serious negative outcome for all the people of South Africa. Racism and apartheid impose a serious threat to human societies all over the world.

The first Prime Minister and now Foreign Minister of Papua New Guinea, Mr. Michael Somare, said in his address to the Assembly on 13 October 1983:

"Racism and apartheid are by their very nature inconsistent with any concept of lasting international order. They offend the principles on which societies like mine are founded. (Their) practitioners ... deserve not only condemnation but isolation. The opponents of racism deserve our strong, continual support". (A/38/PV.31, p. 17)



(Mr. Lohia, Papua New Guinea)

One of the many obstacles to the resolution of the problem has been the support - direct and indirect - given to the South African Government by some members of the Assembly. This has given the racist régime great confidence in its ability to continue its apartheid policies and practices despite world-wide support for sanctions.

My delegation is concerned at the contradictory positions taken by many Members of the United Nations on this important matter. Some nations, both developed and developing, endorse the view that apartheid is barbaric and has no place in the civilized world, and yet those same nations lend considerable support to the Government of South Africa through active socio-economic, cultural and political co-operation.

If the international community is seriously opposed to apartheid, it should take positive steps designed to bring maximum pressure to bear on the Government of South Africa to abolish apartheid immediately.

As stated by our Foreign Minister during the general debate in October of this year:

"My delegation believes that the option of mandatory sanctions against South Africa holds some prospects for success. We acknowledge that such a course of action, if adopted, could create economic hardship. But what other options are there? Economic hardship can be corrected over time ...". (A/43/PV.27, p. 33)

Papua New Guinea for its part has severed all relations with the racist régime of South Africa. We therefore maintain no trade, diplomatic, consular or even sporting links with that country. Recently, a South African company tried to buy shares in a multinational company, Remison Goldfields, which has interests in two

(Mr. Lohia, Papua New Guinea)

of Papua New Guinea's huge gold mines. The Prime Minister of Papua New Guinea publicly stated that the Papua New Guinea Government will not - I repeat, will not - allow the apartheid régime to benefit from our resources.

The international community's efforts are frustrated by the following considerations: the continued lack of effective economic sanctions by South Africa's major trade partners; difficulties and economic hardships faced by the developing countries in taking effective sanctions against South Africa; South Africa, with its enormous reserves of mineral resources, especially gold, has lured investors from developed countries to invest in South Africa; and South Africa's calculated and continued harassment of neighbouring front-line African countries.

Numerous resolutions have been adopted by the General Assembly on the question of South Africa's apartheid policies. However, none of those resolutions has had any real impact on South Africa, mainly because the Organization has no enforcement capability to ensure their effective implementation.

Furthermore, perhaps a more serious hindrance is the veto power vested in the hands of the permanent members of the Security Council. Some have consistently objected to and vetoed comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa.

My Government is convinced that if there is any sense of moral conviction by States Members of the Assembly, then Governments both individually and collectively can take positive measures to end the inhumane practices of apartheid perpetrated by the racist régime in Pretoria. We are left with some hope, in that the international community agrees that apartheid is evil and is the worst crime against humanity.

In solidarity with the black South Africans and other like-minded countries, Papua New Guinea will continue to support United Nations efforts totally to eradicate racism and apartheid from the face of the earth.

Mr. MESSMER (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): Once again Bolivia deems it necessary to express its vigorous protest and indignation over the unbearable suffering being inflicted on the peoples of South Africa and Namibia. It is hard to imagine that with only a few years left in this millenium, there can still exist a régime with primitive motivations of alleged racial supremacy.

In keeping with humanitarian feelings and international solidarity, Bolivia wishes to express its full support for those peoples fighting for freedom and recognition of their inalienable and legitimate rights.

In this spirit, we wish to send a message of support and hope to the courageous people of South Africa and to their liberation movement in their just and heroic struggle against apartheid and for full recognition of and respect for their rights to self-determination and to the creation of a new South African State within the framework of democratic principles, unity, non-racism and peaceful coexistence.

(Mr. Messmer, Bolivia)

The régime of injustice in South Africa remains unchanged because of the dominance of a white minority which is doing nothing to change its inadmissible attitude and heed the fervent appeals of the community of civilized nations.

In that country, people continue to live in a world in which repression, torture, arbitrary detention and crimes have virtually become institutions.

The international community has not perceived any signs of real change in the system of apartheid. Indeed, that régime has become more intransigent with every passing year. We must redouble our efforts to reverse this trend towards confrontation, which has become more and more explosive and the culmination of which is quite unpredictable.

In the opinion of my delegation, therefore, it is essential to establish serious, responsible dialogue with the true representatives of the black people of South Africa. The aim of this dialogue should not be to reform the apartheid régime but to eliminate it once and for all and to build a new South African State free from the present anachronistic characteristics.

As long as the system of apartheid continues, the possibilities of co-operation among the countries of the region are quite remote. The continued existence of apartheid is a cause of violence, destruction and destabilization in the neighbouring countries.

It is undeniable that the efforts at negotiation that are being carried out in South Africa might help alleviate tension and bring peace to the subcontinent, but it is illusory to believe that a lasting solution will be found if we avoid the problem that lies at the root of the conflict, namely apartheid.

In conclusion, the delegation of Bolivia wishes to reiterate its respect for and recognition of the work being done by the institutions and individuals that are fighting against this terrible system. We wish also to pay a tribute to the long-suffering people of South Africa.

Mr. LEGWAILA (Botswana): The report of the Special Committee against Apartheid (A/43/22) of 27 October 1988, shows that, unlike the rest of the world, where momentous and constructive developments have taken place in the past year, and are indeed taking place even as we meet here, South Africa remains the country it was last year when we debated this perennial and vexing item in this Assembly. The report of the Special Committee against Apartheid is an anthology of woes. Contrary to the inexplicably optimistic picture of South Africa which some members of the Assembly inexplicably seek to paint, the report contains harrowing details of massive abuses, not simply of human rights in South Africa but, most important, of the opponents of apartheid themselves, abuses ranging from the usual cases of banning and detention without trial to trials for political treason, assassinations and disappearances.

It is difficult to describe South Africa today. The so-called reforms, now almost totally abandoned for their unworkability, have produced a South Africa of another kind. In addition to the fact that it is an archipelago of prisons to which opponents of apartheid routinely disappear, rarely to be seen again, a vigilante phenomenon has become established in that country. In the service of the State and the régime, vigilante groups roam the streets of South Africa's teeming townships to mete out instant punishment on opponents of apartheid. The distinction between what would in a normal, civilized society pass for regular forces of law and order, and gangs of political parastatal provocateurs has become so blurred as to be virtually non-existent.

There is a fact concerning South Africa which we must never tire of harping on if we are to be truly faithful to our obligations and to our debt of honour to the people of South Africa. The truth is that the determination by the Government of South Africa to preserve apartheid remains unchanged. This will continue to be the case as long as Pretoria is continually commended for shuffling its feet backwards

(Mr. Legwaila, Botswana)

and forwards in the name of reform. South Africa's State President has repeatedly rejected majority rule, arguing that he has not been elected President of South Africa to preside over the downfall of white power.

Now what does the rejection of majority rule imply? In what way can apartheid be abolished and majority rule denied? Is the abolition of apartheid not supposed to open the flood-gates of freedom in South Africa? Is it not supposed to facilitate the creation of a non-racial, democratic society in a non-fragmented South Africa? How can we have non-racialism, democracy, justice and freedom in South Africa without majority rule? These are pertinent and crucial questions, which only the leaders of the white community in South Africa can answer and must answer.

We, for our part, consider that the rejection of majority rule can mean one thing and one thing only, and it is that the so-called reforms were never intended to lead to the abolition of apartheid. They were never intended to lead to the establishment, in a united, non-racial and non-fragmented South Africa, of a government of the people, by the people and for the people. The intention of the reforms have always been to nibble away at apartheid sufficiently to contort its appearance, to moderate its application and to legitimize its perceived necessity in the forlorn hope that in the fulness of time its victims would accept and bear its strictures - the whole idea being to leave control of the Government in South Africa for ever in the hands of the whites.

(Mr. Legwaila, Botswana)

What is happening in South Africa today frightens us all - to say the least. The spectacle of Afrikaners waging war against each other because they do not know whether their tribe should accept its rendezvous with the twenty-first century or go on a trek back to the nineteenth, or even the seventeenth, century to find comfort and security in racism and bigotry is no joke at all; at least, for those who live in South Africa it is no joke. The offshoots of the civil war within Afrikanerdom are a plethora of white tribal "liberation or resistance movements", such as the so-called White Wolves and others whose mission is to fight to the death for the preservation of white supremacy in South Africa.

Typically, the reaction to this dangerous development in that country on the part of the white Government in Pretoria is to bend over backwards to accommodate or give vent to the wild and destructive aspirations of the lunatic fringe of the white community, as if accommodation of such a vicious and racist fringe were possible without the régime itself running the risk of joining the fringe in a final blow to any pretensions of intent to abolish apartheid. If the régime in Pretoria is serious, as it suggests it is, about the type of change that the people of South Africa and the international community seek in that country, it should give no quarter to those on the white side of the colour line who, so late in the evolution of human history, still believe racism has a place in human existence. The so-called White Wolves as a whole, not simply the little cell that has recently been proscribed, must not be allowed to see the light of day. The counterbalancing of the reprieve of the Sharpeville Six, who had been convicted for purely political crimes, by the extension of clemency to brutal white police murderers cannot help Pretoria's vaunted good intentions.

Yet the fact is that there are those among us here and elsewhere who see light where we see darkness in South Africa. It is said that South Africa, like the

(Mr. Legwaila, Botswana)

rest of the world, is changing for the better - so say the apologists. It is argued that the language of resolutions we adopt here must be tempered by appreciation of the positive changes that are taking place in South Africa. It is suggested that even before Namibia's long-denied independence is attained we must kneel down and thank South Africa in anticipation for co-operating in the quadripartite talks, and that we should be for ever so grateful to South Africa for its magnanimity regarding Namibia as to be sympathetic to Pretoria's plight when it comes to the fight for the abolition of apartheid.

First, we do not know what change people see in South Africa that the rest of us cannot see. Unless we can be told and convinced that trying and convicting innocent United Democratic Front (UDF) activists on trumped-up treason charges amount to constructive change aimed at the abolition of apartheid, we will remain unimpressed by the so-called change people see in South Africa, which we cannot see. On the other hand, there may be those who are wont to regard the reprieve of the Sharpeville Six as constructive change consistent with the struggle for the abolition of apartheid. We see the reprieve as a neither-here-nor-there issue, even though we are, as human beings, relieved that the lives of our brothers and sister of the Sharpeville Six have been saved. The fact is, however, that the Six, in our view, were guilty only of wanting to be free. That is the only common purpose we have associated with their right to struggle for the freedom of their people, and they share that common purpose with 28 million of their countrymen.

Secondly, we frankly do not see any reason why the United Nations, which has for so long been frustrated by South Africa's defiance of its resolutions on Namibia, should be asked with such indecent haste to thank South Africa for its co-operation, if co-operation indeed it is, in the quadripartite talks. No thanks are due for South Africa's involuntary compliance with United Nations resolutions



(Mr. Legwaila, Botswana)

which it has defiantly scorned for so long. In any case, there probably would have been no South African participation in the quadripartite talks had there been no Cuito Cuanavale.

Thirdly, the long-awaited departure of South Africa from Namibia, when and if it came about, would have no relevance whatsoever to our attitude towards South Africa on the question of apartheid. There should be no morsel of gratitude for South Africa's doing what it has to do either in fulfilling its obligation to get rid of apartheid or in ending the illegality of its presence in Namibia.

So far as we are concerned, the best approach to the South African question, the question of apartheid, is not to relax pressure through too much willingness and readiness to reward South Africa for doing so little, if anything. South Africa should not be made to feel that it is all right to reform apartheid incrementally, instead of abolishing it. It is not all right to reform apartheid incrementally or to reform it in any way. The solution to apartheid can be found only in its total abolition, certainly not in relieving one group of condemned political prisoners, whose place on death row, in any case, is immediately taken by another group of condemned freedom fighters.

Pressure must be continued on Pretoria to accept the fact that apartheid, if it is to be ended peacefully, can be ended only by the combined efforts of the two communities in South Africa coming together to negotiate a constitutional dispensation acceptable to both. The alternative is bloodshed and clear and inevitable endangerment of the very future of the white minority in South Africa.

In past weeks we have heard people say that some elections have taken place in South Africa and therefore South Africa must be congratulated. I will now turn to those elections, the recent municipal elections, which some in the outside world have tended to regard as credible evidence of the evolution of constructive

(Mr. Legwaila, Botswana)

change in South Africa. The question we have to ask when we look at those elections is how they were organized. It is a known fact that the elections were organized on racial lines, in accordance with the ideological strictures of apartheid, and were meant to perpetuate racial segregation, apartheid. We are at a loss as to why anyone could find anything constructive and encouraging in such elections. Why should we ever imagine it to be possible that a true democracy in South Africa can be achieved by the white minority single-handed and using blatantly racist methods? Why should we accept the devilish perception that the only path to democracy and peace in South Africa must be a racist one? Is it not clear that the segregated municipal elections were an obvious extension of the racist schizophrenia so typical of the South African society, with its tribal homelands, tribal parliaments, tribal schools, tribal restaurants, tribal toilets and tribal cemeteries?

(Mr. Legwaila, Botswana)

Why should the international community accept such undemocratic, unjust and dangerous elections, the effect of which, if they had succeeded, would certainly have been a witting extension of legitimacy to racial segregation and tyranny in South Africa?

The South African régime knows with whom it must negotiate the future of South Africa if such a future is to be assured. It does not need racially polarized municipal elections to identify the true and authentic leaders of black South Africans. Municipal elections such as those on 26 October were meant to circumvent those leaders by supplanting them with black interlocuters of the Government's choice. That is a dangerous game which we can ill afford in South Africa.

We must insist, therefore, that Mr. Mandela and his compatriots, now wasting away in prisons or clinics, be released to participate in shaping the future of South Africa. Mandela, in a clinic or wherever else he might be transferred on completion of his recovery, remains a prisoner of Pretoria, as his family and the world contend. He will remain a prisoner of Pretoria until he is free. Thus he is unable to negotiate the freedom of his people and the future destiny of his country. He is unable to work for the peace and stability of South Africa.

In this epoch, the year 1988 has been not only a year of continued transformations in the character of relations between the super-Powers and a year of qualitative and decisive amelioration of tensions in most regions of the world, but also the year in which once again the leaders of South Africa, with the general relaxation of world tensions as a backdrop, have tried to break out of the isolation in which their apartheid policies have for so long imprisoned their country. Forgetting that charity begins at home, the President of South Africa has visited members of the Organization of African Unity in southern, central and west Africa ostensibly to talk peace, in addition perhaps to asserting South Africa's

(Mr. Legwails, Botswana)

self-appointed role as the regional Power of southern Africa. The visits attracted a lot of attention as if they were in some sense historic or ground-breaking. It has been said that the visits are a demonstration of South Africa's readiness to engage in a dialogue on peace in our region.

The "outward looking" policy and travels of the late John Vorster, the Prime Minister of the white minority of South Africa in the 1970s, were also ascribed to some readiness by South Africa to talk peace, some kind of readiness genuinely to extend the hand of friendship to Africa. There was the present State President's celebrated diplomatic safari of 1984, the year of regional peace accords, which failed. What did the people of southern Africa and Africa as a whole gain from all those safaris, from all the travels by South African Presidents outside Africa? I can tell representatives that those of us who come from South Africa have seen intensified South African State terrorism against our independent States. That is all that we gained from those safaris.

The destabilization that has been wreaked on the region since 1984 has become legendary. The peace accords have been rendered worthless by the very same people who went around peddling them. Not only have they been rendered worthless but they have become very dangerous as the bandits have escalated their murderous attacks on innocent men, women and children all over the region. In my own country, every year since 1984 has been a year of one trauma after another; for we cannot forget the brutal attacks on our capital by South African commandos in June 1985, July 1986 and March 1988, or ignore those attacks which are still to come. It is the same story all over the region.

What dialogue, we ask? We insist that charity begins at home. The best and most logical place for President Botha's dialogue is inside South Africa, where almost 30 million of his black countrymen are yearning to be free from apartheid. Why should he come and talk to the President of Botswana when he can talk to

(Mr. Legwala, Botswana)

Mandela? It is with Mandela, Mthopeng and their compatriots that President Botha's dialogue must begin, for no leader or country in southern Africa or elsewhere outside South Africa can speak for black South Africans or has the right to do so. Only the people of South Africa can best express their aspirations. Only they know the searing agony and pain of racial tyranny and oppression in South Africa. Only they have a direct and immediate stake in the future of South Africa.

I should not be misunderstood in suggesting that we in South Africa are opposed to anybody outside South Africa talking to President Botha about their own concerns. That is not the point. We in the front-line States are saying that we are not prepared to talk to Botha, simply because we want to be fair to ourselves and to the people of South Africa. We are called refuseniks, but we are not refuseniks because all we are trying to do is to respect the laws of logic and good sense.

We are talking here about countries whose centuries-old economic dialogue with South Africa remains intact despite commando raids and rampant destabilization. So our refusal to usurp the place of black South Africans on the other side of President Botha's table is not to suggest that those of us in southern Africa have absolutely nothing to do with South Africa. We have a lot to do with it, but not to the extent that we can arrogate to ourselves the prerogative of deciding the future of South Africa with the leaders of the white minority over the heads of black South Africans.

Hence our insistence - and we are going to continue to insist - that President Botha meet Mandela, Mthopeng and their compatriots to negotiate once and for all the end of apartheid and the beginning of a new era in South Africa. There is no other way out. Nothing will save the whites in South Africa if they do not talk to their brethren on the black side of the colour line. There is no way out for South Africa. The whites can never rule South Africa alone and enjoy peace and

(Mr. Legwaila, Botswana)

prosperity at the same time. I think they have realized that. The South Africa in which they live today is good neither for them nor for the blacks or any other community in that country. How can the whites enjoy peace if to do that they have constantly to treat their black brethren brutally, to suppress their aspirations to freedom and justice? How can they enjoy the power they have so ruthlessly clung to for so long if to do so they have constantly to send their children into black townships to attack black children and to die in the process; to suppress their aspirations to freedom and justice?

A different kind of South Africa is feasible and achievable, a kinder and gentler South Africa free of the brutalities of apartheid and racism, provided only that white South Africans can see the folly of their ways and conform to and change with the rest of the world, for their own sake. The ball is in their court.

Mr. MENDIETA (Colombia) (interpretation from Spanish): The world is now experiencing an important period of détente, resulting from the continuing improvement in relations between the great Powers and the understanding between them. Like any other process, this one has had clear ripple effects that have been moving us slowly towards a final settlement of a large number of regional conflicts and problems.

The African continent has not been untouched by that process. On the contrary, thanks to détente and active co-operation and determination in the region, Africa, under the leadership of the Organization of African Unity, has made some very significant strides forward.

This process, which might be called external pacification, is without any doubt one of the basic prerequisites for a just and lasting peace in regions where there is tension. But it is not the only prerequisite. History proves that any process of regional consolidation and stabilization is possible only if, in addition to external peace, the countries or peoples within regions involved in such conflicts enjoy conditions of freedom and justice. For it is precisely internally that there exists today the major threat to the peace processes that have begun, some of them under the auspices of our Organization. Nowhere is that more obvious than in southern Africa.

The existence of a racist minority régime in South Africa, which stubbornly maintains an institutional system violating the most fundamental human rights, will continue to make a just and lasting peace impossible in that region. The progress being made in the context of the four-party talks which are aimed at finding a final solution to the problem of Namibia and have entered a crucial stage with the signing of the Brazzaville agreement, is a positive but not a final step towards stability in southern Africa. As members of the international community, we cannot

(Mr. Mendieta, Colombia)

be satisfied with a partial solution. Still less can we rely on such a solution to justify economic or commercial interests or needs. So long as the system of apartheid persists in South Africa, not only will the chances of lasting peace in the region remain remote, but a system will be perpetuated whose very essence is disregard for the most elemental human rights. We cannot remain indifferent to such a situation.

Colombia has always advocated and still advocates the use of all kinds of pressure against the Pretoria Government, not only at the political level by ratifying international conventions against apartheid, but also at the economic level by imposing comprehensive, mandatory sanctions against South Africa, in keeping with the recommendation of the Special Committee against Apartheid. Moreover, we must not stop supporting the South African people, particularly their leaders and representatives of the various movements struggling for freedom and justice.

The Government of Colombia has always valued the example of those great leaders. That is why, on 15 July last, in Decree No. 1433, President Virgilio Barco awarded the National Order of Merit, with the Grand Cross, to Mr. Nelson Mandela, the leader of the African National Congress of South Africa. The award was accepted by Mr. Neo Mnumzana, the head of that movement's United Nations mission, on 26 August last in Bogota. During the award ceremony, President Barco said:

"Mr. Mandela is an example of wisdom, courage and commitment. He is a world symbol of the defence of human rights, dignity and equality".

President Barco also described Mr. Mandela as



(Mr. Mandieta, Colombia)

"a leader with exceptional human qualities, whose convictions have not been weakened by unjust imprisonment, by suffering or by solitary confinement. He is a man whom the world admires and respects, whose sole weapons are his peaceful ideals and his moral force".

The sacrifices of exemplary leaders like Nelson Mandela must not be in vain. With that award, my Government wished to recognize him as a worthy example not only to his people but to the peoples of the world. The stalwart figure of Nelson Mandela must guide us in our efforts to achieve the total and immediate elimination of apartheid. The slow rate of progress to that end has led - contrary to many expectations - to a radicalization of forces in the Government and among the minority that it represents, which have exerted pressure against any possibility of change.

In those circumstances, the only viable alternative is for all States to resolve to use the means available to our Organization, and particularly the Security Council, in order to exert greater pressure on the Government of Pretoria to introduce real reforms, including the lifting of the state of emergency, the immediate release of all political prisoners and the introduction of a broad system of participatory democracy. If such reforms are not made, the desired peace and stability in southern Africa will remain in jeopardy.

Finally, our delegation calls on all the Members of the Organization to vote in favour of the draft resolutions now before the Assembly.

Mr. MUDENGE (Zimbabwe): Once again the Assembly has before it agenda item 36, entitled "Policies of apartheid of the Government of South Africa". One would have wanted by this time to be able to think of apartheid as a nightmare of the past, only to be read about in textbooks as a tragic aberration in the history of mankind which could never be allowed to occur again, a dark page in the story of

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

time to which human hearts should be forever closed. Unfortunately, apartheid is still very much with us today, and the indications are that it will continue to be for some time to come, despite the efforts of the international community to purge the world of this malignant perversity.

Last week South Africa indicated its favourable, if somewhat cagey and delayed, response to the Geneva proposals for a settlement in southwestern Africa. Zimbabwe welcomed the results of the Geneva talks and has urged all the parties involved to implement the agreement faithfully. It is my Government's conviction that if the agreement were to be honestly implemented it would make a significant contribution to the lessening of tension in our region. But we have yet to see if Pretoria will honour its side of the bargain.

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

In the mean time, Pretoria is taking every advantage of the Geneva agreement in order to polish its international image. It is trying to project itself as a responsible interlocutor and regional Power working to reduce tension in southern Africa. At home, the régime talks of reform and power-sharing. It has released a few African leaders from its jails, including Zephania Mothopeng. And on the African continent, it is involved in its own brand of pan-Africanism. Are we seeing the apartheid Gordian knot beginning to loosen, or are we again merely the victims of the fantasies created by those past masters of illusion and dissimulation? That question is being asked in the press and even among some serious observers of the South African scene.

History has taught those of us in southern Africa not to read the lips of apartheid but to watch its actions. It is by its actions that it shall be judged. The practitioners of apartheid have a track record by which we can measure them. And it is a record without honour - only a grim tale of broken promises. And even as they talk peace and preach reform they continue to support and supply armed bandits against their neighbours and to act toughly and brutally against the majority of their citizens.

Such contradictions are nothing new from Pretoria. They are inherent in the ideology of apartheid. And they will continue to be part and parcel of the South African political landscape until apartheid is destroyed. Apartheid is and will always be a brutal and inhuman system. Because of its very nature, it cannot be otherwise. It is a menace to its neighbours, a threat to international peace and security and a scourge to its citizens.

Apartheid South Africa is still a nasty and brutish society. Even today, whole communities can find of a morning that their homes have been bulldozed to the ground. Individuals can suddenly discover that at the stroke of a pen they been reclassified without regard to their race: no longer black but coloured, no longer

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

Indian but Chinese, no longer Malay but black, no longer white but coloured and vice versa. Botha still plays a little Afrikaaner god. Men and women are incarcerated indefinitely without benefit of a trial, and groups of children are taken to reorientation camps to be brainwashed into becoming what are called "good, law-abiding" apartheid-controlled second-class citizens. In the townships, the state of emergency allows the military to kill and maim with impunity. And in the courts of law, strange hangman concepts of justice are introduced. According to a recent Amnesty International report, South Africa "has one of the highest rates of judicial executions in the world". Last year, South Africa hanged more people than it has in its history since its independence from Britain in 1910. The report states that

"During the last 10 years, an increasing number of defendants have been sentenced to death after political trials or trials for politically motivated killings during the nation-wide protests in the urban townships".

This year alone, according to the régime's Minister of Justice, 83 such politically motivated prisoners were awaiting execution in September. According to the Amnesty report, a black person is more likely to be sentenced to death on capital charges than a European. That differentiation on the basis of race is both "conscious and deliberate". That is the reality of South Africa today. And it is what we are fighting against.

Pretoria is involved in a massive Goebbels-esque propaganda and public-relations extravaganza throughout the world. Most Member States of the Organization are aware of Pretoria's ubiquitous functionaries popping up all over the globe as businessmen, cultural officers, information officers, seminar organizers, experts, tourists - you name it, they have the category. Many of us recall with pride the firm and decisive action taken by the President at the current session of the General Assembly when, in his capacity as Foreign Minister

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

of friendly Argentina, he flushed out and exposed the activities of those operatives in his country.

For those of us who live in southern Africa, Pretoria has special radio stations or programmes directed against each of our countries. Zimbabwe is targeted by a notorious station in the northern Transvaal misnamed "Radio Truth". It is a veritable contraption of air-wave pollution in my country.

In addition to its aggressive campaigns of external disinformation, the régime has a perverse and massive internal propaganda programme to tranquilize the white South African community into accepting the immorality of apartheid. It is a well-orchestrated information offensive to put white South Africa into a moral coma, at peace with its conscience and the ill-gotten comforts of apartheid. Reinforcing that propaganda machinery is a battery of draconian press laws backed by a state of emergency, imposing a virtual information black-out on the country's media. Such laws deny information to all South Africans and attempt to hide the reality within the country from the outside world. Behind the thick cloud of obfuscation, repression and murder are committed for the preservation of apartheid.

Valiant efforts have been and are being made to expose the true story unfolding in South Africa. For example, the Commonwealth Secretariat in London organized a very successful conference on that subject and more recently the Commonwealth Committee of Foreign Ministers on southern Africa met in Toronto, Canada in order, inter alia, to review the question of information on and to South Africa. Some useful ideas emerged at that meeting and I recommend them to the members of the Assembly. Also, here in the United States, public television Channel 13 has introduced a weekly programme called "South Africa Now", which is worthy of our attention.

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

The United Nations system, through its Department of Public Information, has over the years tried to provide accurate news and information to the people inside South Africa by means of its anti-apartheid radio section, which has been a valuable service to the people of South Africa. My delegation is particularly pleased that the Assembly has before it a draft resolution that takes note of and supports the important service being rendered by that section. If the section did not exist, we would today have called for its immediate creation.

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

It is therefore with a sense of singular satisfaction that from this rostrum we render richly deserved praise to the efforts of the Anti-Apartheid Programmes Section and plead for its continued and strengthened existence as a unique and separate entity symbolizing in a poignant and fitting manner humanity's revulsion and outrage at the abhorrent policies of apartheid.

We the international community have the means to pressure Pretoria to change, and we have seen in recent days that Pretoria does respond to pressure and sanctions. Those who say that Boers do not respond to pressure are either ignorant of history or have blinded themselves to facts. From the history of the Anglo-Boer war we recall that not only did the Boers invent and perfect commando raiding as a military tactic and inspire the British army to use khaki uniforms instead of the traditional British red coats in the savannah grasslands; more importantly, faced with the might of the British Imperial Army and its ingenious invention of the concentration camp as a weapon of war in which it detained Boer women and children in what Boer nationalists describe as appalling incarceration centres of death and starvation, the Boers, instead of committing national hara-kiri, surrendered and sued for peace. Those who argue that today's Boers would rather commit national suicide than negotiate for a peaceful existence with the black majority do not appreciate the Afrikaner's instinct for survival.

A few months ago the South African army was whipped and bloodied at Cuito Cuanavale, in southern Angola. The decision of the Afrikaner generals was not to call for a Custer-like last stand. No. They negotiated and obtained terms to beat a quiet retreat. Now, under pressure from the present limited international sanctions and major economic dislocation at home, and threatened by massive debt repayments and lack of foreign capital, Botha is hopping all over Africa and Europe, hippity-hopptity, high and low, like some desert grasshopper trying to lower the political body temperature by his hopping around.

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

Years of the so-called policy of dialogue, of "constructive engagement", of option "Tar-Baby" did not yield any significant result. It was all carrot and no stick. Now, if Namibia does gain its independence, let not those who advocated a policy of all carrot and no stick delude themselves that it was their prescription that moved Pretoria in the end.

Recently the white rugby authorities, frustrated by the effectiveness of the United Nations-sponsored international sports boycott, decided to sue for peace by negotiating with the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC) and promising to introduce non-racial rugby in South Africa. Pressure and boycott did that, not so-called dialogue and persuasion. We therefore appeal to the international community, and especially to the friends of South Africa, to maintain and support the policy of pressure and sanctions, which is now beginning to show some results. This is not the time to relent or to change a policy that is at last bearing fruit. It is important to maintain it and make it more effective.

Botha's recent initiatives are prompted by his fear of increased international sanctions and aimed at blunting or removing existing ones. It would be a tragic error were we to let him off the hook so cheaply. Pretoria must take certain irreversible steps for change before we can believe in its bona fides. Zimbabwe remains convinced that the international community should increase the pressure until Pretoria is ready to dismantle apartheid and to negotiate with the true leaders of the majority of its people. So long as the ANC and the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania (PAC) remain banned and leaders like Nelson Mandela incarcerated, Botha is not serious about solving the problems of his country, and we should remain steadfast in our resolve to apply pressure, through sanctions, in order to convince him to change.



(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

My delegation wishes to thank the Special Committee against Apartheid for all the good work it has been doing under the leadership of our brother Ambassador Garba of Nigeria.

The PRESIDENT: We have heard the last speaker in the debate on this agenda item. The Assembly will consider draft resolutions submitted under the item at its meeting this afternoon.

AGENDA ITEM 16 (continued)

ELECTIONS TO FILL VACANCIES IN SUBSIDIARY ORGANS AND OTHER ELECTIONS:

- (f) ELECTION OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE UNITED NATIONS ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME: NOTE BY THE SECRETARY GENERAL (A/43/898)

The PRESIDENT: I now invite members to turn their attention to the note by the Secretary-General (A/43/898), dealing with the election of the Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme.

In his note the Secretary-General informs the Assembly that he wishes to nominate Mr. Mostafa Kamal Tolba to be Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme for a further term of four years beginning 1 January 1989.

May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to elect Mr. Tolba as Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme for a four-year term beginning 1 January 1989, as recommended by the Secretary-General?

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: The Assembly has concluded its consideration of sub-item (f) of agenda item 16.

AGENDA ITEM 38

FORTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS

The PRESIDENT: I should like to make an announcement with regard to agenda item 38, "Fortieth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights", which will be commemorated on the morning of Thursday, 8 December.

(The President)

At its third meeting, on 23 September, the Assembly decided, as provided in paragraph 7 of General Assembly resolution 42/131 of 7 December 1987, that one plenary meeting should be devoted to the celebration of that event. After consultations with the Chairmen of the regional groups on how best to accommodate the large number of delegations wishing to speak on that agenda item, it appears that not all groups have endorsed the suggestion that the Chairmen speak on their behalfs. Therefore, it is evident that, in view of the large number of speakers already inscribed to speak on that item, there will be no option but to limit the length of statements accordingly.

The Assembly will be further informed in this respect once the full list of speakers has been finalized. Bearing that in mind, it is proposed that the list of speakers be closed today at 4 p.m. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Assembly agrees.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.