



General Assembly

PROVIS IONAL

A/44/PV. 52
20 November 1989

ENGLISH

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

PROVIS IONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE FIFTY-SECOND MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 10 November 1989, at 10 a.m.

President: Mr. KHARAZI (Islamic Republic of Iran)
(Vice-President)

later: Mr. GARBA (Nigeria)
(President)

- Policies of apartheid of the Government of South Africa [28] (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) Report of the Commission against Apartheid in Sports
- (d) Reports of the Secretary-General
- (e) Report of the Special Political Committee

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.

In the absence of the President, Mr. Kharazi (Islamic Republic of Iran), Vice President, took the Chair.

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

AGENDA ITEM 28 (continued)

POLICIES OF APARTHEID OF THE GOVERNMENT OF SOUTH AFRICA

- (a) REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE AGAINST APARTHEID (A/44/22 and Corr. 2)
- (b) REPORT OF THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL GROUP TO MONITOR THE SUPPLY AND SHIPPING OF OIL AND PETROLEUM PRODUCTS TO SOUTH AFRICA (A/44/44)
- (c) REPORT OF THE COMMISSION AGAINST APARTHEID IN SPORTS (A/44/47)
- (d) REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/44/533, A/44/555 and Corr. 1, A/44/556, A/44/698)
- (e) REPORT OF THE SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE (A/44/709)

Mr. PAWLAK (Poland): For over 40 years the question of apartheid has been the subject of thorough debate in the United Nations and other international organs and conferences. The results are still far from satisfactory. The Pretoria régime still practises apartheid, a racist doctrine that constitutes a total negation of the fundamental principles of the United Nations Charter. It violates fundamental human rights and continues to be a crime against humanity. South Africa is the only country in the world that maintains racial discrimination under its constitution and law. That is a travesty of the basic principles of law and justice. Instead of laws and the judicial system being dedicated to upholding human dignity, they are used to oppress the non-white majority in South Africa. Despite universal condemnation, and in flagrant disregard of the resolutions and decisions of the United Nations, apartheid still exists and the South African Government continues to resort to terror and repression to preserve its

(Mr. Pawlak, Poland)

institutionalized racism. No one can believe that moral indignation and rejection alone will bring about the abolition of apartheid, and no one can be fooled by recent cosmetic changes in South Africa.

Of course we notice some changes introduced by South Africa's new President, Mr. F.W. De Klerk. But in fact they do not change much in the daily life of the suppressed black majority of that country. We really do not regard as a substantial change, for example, the ban on whips called sjamboks in Afrikaans, which have been standard police equipment for dispersing crowds.

The so-called reforms do not envisage the abolition of the legislative pillars of apartheid; they are retained as the basic concept in the organization of society. In any event apartheid cannot be reformed; it must be dismantled. The end of that system is inevitable; it will go, sooner or later.

It has become evident that one of the most important ways of bringing about peaceful changes in South Africa and achieving the eradication of apartheid is resolute international action, including sanctions provided for in Security Council resolutions and those in accordance with Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter. These are the most appropriate and effective means by which the international community can assist the legitimate struggle of the oppressed people of South Africa and hasten the demise of apartheid. It should also be remembered that credit for the release of Walter Sisulu and seven other political prisoners goes to the continuous pressure exerted on the South African Government by the international community.

(Mr. Pawlak, Poland)

South Africa will never be a free and democratic State until all South Africans are granted their fundamental and inalienable rights and human dignity. The solution lies in dialogue between the non-white majority and the Government on putting an end to apartheid and on a peaceful transition to a non-racial society. We are heartened by the news that this opinion is shared by an increasing number of white inhabitants of South Africa. In the anti-apartheid march that took place in Cape Town on 13 September this year most of the 20,000 demonstrators were black or of mixed race but many hundreds of whites mingled with them in the packed procession - including Cape Town's Mayor, Gordon Oliver, and some of his councilmen.

However, to make such dialogue with the majority of the country's population possible the South African Government must lift the state of emergency and associated restrictions on political activity, release all remaining political prisoners, including Nelson Mandela, end the ban on the African National Congress and other anti-apartheid organizations and permit exiles to return home.

We fully agree with Archbishop Desmond Tutu that the declared willingness of President De Klerk's Government to move towards the establishment of a non-racial democracy in South Africa must be judged by his actions, not his words.

On no other issue do States members of the United Nations stand more united than in their condemnation of apartheid. The oppressed people of South Africa have a right to demand that the international community take effective measures to bring pressure to bear on the racist Government in order to eradicate the obnoxious system of apartheid.

We continue to believe that the only peaceful, effective measure which would bring about the elimination of apartheid is a co-ordinated international effort aimed at isolating South Africa politically and economically. There are times in

(Mr. Pawlak, Poland)

history when political wisdom and foresight demand that foreseeable catastrophes be forestalled by peaceful preventive action. There is no doubt that we are at such a juncture now. Let us therefore act with conviction; let us give encouragement to the opponents of apartheid that their cause is shared by the international community. Let us demonstrate clearly that the apartheid system is intolerable, that people everywhere feel repugnance towards it and that without fundamental changes Pretoria cannot expect to have normal relations with the rest of the world.

Poland shares the universal hope for peaceful changes in South Africa, for an end to oppression, violence and brutality and for the restoration of human rights, equality and fundamental freedoms. We therefore appeal for a redoubling of international efforts in the search for an end to apartheid and support for a political solution which would replace that system by a system based on racial equality and justice.

Mr. PIBULSONOGRAM (Thailand): My delegation wishes to commend the Special Committee against Apartheid for its valuable contributions towards the eradication of apartheid. My delegation's tribute goes to General Garba, Chairman of the Special Committee and President of this session of the General Assembly, and the other members of the Special Committee. Our appreciation also goes to the Secretary-General for his tireless efforts against apartheid.

It has been said that the winds of change are now blowing over South Africa. The new leadership in Pretoria has created a sense of optimism. The recent release of seven members of the African National Congress, including Walter Sisulu, was a positive signal. The authorities' decision not to enforce the state of emergency ban on protest marches was another step in the right direction. We call on the South African authorities to keep alive the positive momentum for change.

(Mr. Pibulsonggram, Thailand)

However, we note with regret that the bankrupt policy of apartheid remains intact today. The state of emergency continues. People are still being held without trial. Nelson Mandela and another 3,000 political prisoners remain incarcerated.

The policies of the apartheid régime in Pretoria also continue to be harmful to the entire southern African region. It seems that Pretoria is deliberately attempting to destroy the economies of its neighbours.

A study conducted by the Inter-Agency Task Force of the United Nations Programme of Action for African Economic Recovery and Development has indicated that the front-line States suffered a loss of approximately \$60 billion of their gross domestic product during the period 1980 to 1988. Angola alone suffered a loss of about \$4.5 billion in 1988 and approximately \$30 billion during the period 1980 to 1988. Mozambique suffered a loss of \$3 billion during 1988 and \$15 billion during the period 1980 to 1988.

Over 1.5 million lives have been lost in the region as a consequence of the policies of the Pretoria régime. Approximately half the population of Angola and Mozambique have become displaced persons and refugees.

Strong and steadfast international support for the African front-line States must be continued. An economic boycott against South Africa remains essential. Over a quarter of a century ago, Albert Luthuli, a former President of the African National Congress and the 1960 Nobel Peace Prize winner, said,

"The economic boycott of South Africa will undoubtedly entail suffering for Africans. We do not doubt that. But if it is a method that shortens the day of bloodshed, the suffering to us will be a price we are willing to pay." That remains true today.

Thailand has stood firm in its absolute rejection of apartheid. Mandatory international sanctions against South Africa must continue until apartheid is

(Mr. Pibulsonggram, Thailand)

finally eradicated. In his recent statement to the General Assembly my Foreign Minister addressed the issue of apartheid in these words:

"We have spoken out in outrage of this inhuman policy and system. We have condemned it in this and other forums. The United Nations must continue to press Pretoria to make the necessary transition, by focusing attention on the issue and by maintaining political and economic pressure. We can only hope that reason and good sense will prevail soon enough to avert the tragedy waiting to occur in South Africa." (A/44/PV.13, p. 63)

(Mr. Pibulsonggram, Thailand)

My delegation supports without reservations the various international measures against South Africa, including the oil embargo, as called for in paragraph 4 of General Assembly resolution 41/35 F. The provisions of that resolution are being implemented strictly by my Government. On 27 June 1978 the Thai Cabinet made a decision to prohibit trade between Thailand and South Africa. Thai Ministry of Commerce regulations of 1982 prohibit all kinds of trade between Thailand and South Africa, and violation is punishable in accordance with the penalties specified in the Kingdom's Importing and Exporting Act.

The South African ship of State has a new navigator. The ship has begun to veer away from its original course towards total destruction, but a slight change in direction is not enough. The new navigator must totally reverse the ship's course before time runs out and the ship runs aground.

My delegation calls upon the new leadership in South Africa to continue vigorously with the good work that it has begun. The few steps forward that Pretoria has taken so far would not add up to much if they were not followed by a real and substantial reform. Although a change in style, or a partial change, may be welcome initially, it cannot and must not be a substitute for comprehensive change. The leadership in South Africa must eradicate apartheid before the strong forces of change eradicate it together with apartheid.

The Pretoria régime must begin a process of national dialogue with all parties in South Africa. It must end the state of emergency. Nelson Mandela and other political prisoners must be released unconditionally. A short timetable must be set for the elimination of apartheid.

The eradication of apartheid will enable the international community finally to lift its sanctions. South Africa can then return to reclaim its proper place among all of us in the family of nations.

Mr. BALE (Congo) (interpretation from French): If I had to draw up a balance sheet of the general debate at the forty-fourth session of the General Assembly I would stress a common denominator in all the statements: the unanimous recognition by the international community of the improvement in international political relations. The improved political climate has certainly existed the settlement of some regional conflicts, but the persistence of hotbeds of tension throughout the world shows how precarious the improvement is, because it is based solely on détente between the two super-Powers.

Speaking only of Africa, in its southern part an anachronistic situation persists, because of the apartheid policy of the Government of South Africa, which is the epicentre of tension in the subregion and the subject of the present debate.

The Brazzaville Protocol and last year's New York Agreements, to the conclusion of which my country made a modest contribution, have led to the withdrawal of South African troops from Angola and promoted the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), thanks to which, barely two days ago, the brother people of Namibia, after many years of heroic struggle against the occupying forces, exercised for the first time one of its basic rights, the right to self-determination. My country hopes to see that process lead inexorably to Namibia's independence, which the community of nations will have to respect.

However, the positive developments in Namibia, until now unlawfully occupied by South Africa and transformed into a forward bridgehead for premeditated attacks against Angola and the other front-line States, cannot conceal the devastating

(Mr. Bale, Congo)

effects of the racist régime's policy of destabilization and aggression of racist régime against the independent neighbouring States for the unavowed purpose of ruining their economies and increasing their dependence on South Africa.

In its report (A/44/22 and Corr.2) the Special Committee against Apartheid provides a balance sheet of that policy. The Committee observes that the actions of the terrorist State have cost the nine member States of the Southern African Development Co-ordination Conference (SADCC) a very heavy price. In economic terms, for example, between 1980 and 1988 their gross domestic product had to bear a burden of \$50 billion.

The absurd strategy of undeclared war, carried out directly or indirectly, is designed solely for the feverish defence of a shameful policy allegedly based on the separate development of races, whereby, unfortunately, the black majority is denied its basic rights, indeed, its human dignity.

Apartheid, designated a crime against humanity is a violation of the purposes and principles of the Charter. Apartheid denies the validity of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Unanimous condemnation of apartheid is not enough; the international community, united in the face of this challenge, must work resolutely towards its eradication.

It is against this background that we should place the coming special session of the General Assembly devoted to apartheid.

Credit for the withdrawal of South African troops from Angola has wrongly been given wholly to the détente between the two super-Powers. Certainly the very praiseworthy contributions of the United States, as the mediating country and the USSR in their efforts to bring peace to the subregion have proved decisive;

(Mr. Bale, Congo)

nevertheless it was the combination of those efforts with the military defeat in Angola and the political and economic pressure within as well as outside South Africa that determined the attitude of the latter during the negotiations which resulted in the outcome that the international community has welcomed.

It is in that same context that we should see the recent release of political prisoners and certain black leaders, and the so-called reforms announced earlier and unjustifiably perceived by some to be a prelude to a process of democratization which the international community was supposed to view passively. How paradoxical that is when we know that the pillars of apartheid remain unshaken and the Group Areas Act, the Separate Amenities Act and many others remain in force, while the state of emergency is entering its fourth year and is doing very well.

(Mr. Bale, Congo)

But pitted against the evil spirit personified by the racist Pretoria régime, which continues to increase its repressive measures, is the fierce determination of a resistance that grows greater every day and that every day is joined by further segments of the South African population. The Democratic Party, the Institute for a Democratic Alternative for South Africa, the Five Freedoms Forum, the Johannesburg Democratic Action Committee, and so many others, have strengthened the front rejecting apartheid. In fact, it has recently been joined by the Dutch Reformed Church, which had long been the guardian of apartheid Christianity.

None the less, this odious system will not collapse solely because of the activities of the anti-apartheid forces in South Africa. To be sure, since the adoption of General Assembly resolution 1761 (XVII) of 6 November 1962, by which the General Assembly called for the breaking off of trade relations with South Africa, the United Nations has constantly increased the methods of pressure against the apartheid régime.

At this point, we must welcome the efforts undertaken by the Centre against Apartheid and the Special Committee against Apartheid in connection with the consciousness-raising campaign and the follow-up and co-ordination of our Organization's policy in the struggle against this hateful system.

Yet South Africa obstinately continues its inhuman policy, in defiance of General Assembly and Security Council resolutions. Why should we be surprised by this when we know that the apartheid system owes its survival to the complicity of certain States which, in a kind of betrayal, pursue their selfish interests at the expense of values which they loudly claim to be fiercely defending. My country, which is a party to the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid shares the point of view that the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter remains the only peaceful means capable of shaking the last ramparts of apartheid. Pretoria's

(Mr. Bale, Congo)

recent changes of attitude, as a result of limited and, unfortunately, poorly co-ordinated sanctions confirms the validity of this approach.

The international community should not allow itself to be misled once again by the attempts at adapting apartheid, because apartheid cannot be reformed; it must be eradicated.

Violence has frequently been held up as the principal obstacle to the establishment of a climate that could lead to dialogue. But it is for the Pretoria régime to provide the necessary conditions for that dialogue through the abrogation of discriminatory laws and the lifting of the repressive measures that breed violence.

As was stated from this rostrum last month by the Head of the delegation of the Congo, His Excellency Mr. Antoine Ndinga-Oba, Minister of State and Minister for Foreign Affairs:

"Peace and security in South Africa call for the immediate and unconditional release of Nelson Mandela and all political prisoners, the lifting of the state of emergency, the restoration of all civil rights for all citizens and the establishment of a genuinely democratic régime, as well as the termination of any policy aimed at destabilizing the countries of the sub-region." (A/44/PV.21, p. 67)

Also, the Declaration of the Special Committee of the Organization of African Unity issued at Harare on 21 August 1989 constitutes in our opinion a suitable basis for negotiations for peaceful changes in South Africa.

Once that is done, Pretoria will have established conditions conducive to dialogue for a democratic and multiracial South Africa, where the majority of the population will have regained its right to citizenship.

Mr. De Klerk's good faith can be measured only in terms of his renunciation of apartheid.

Mr. THOMPSON (Fiji): Perhaps not in this century has the international political climate been as conducive to settlement of differences between countries as it is now. Across all regions, the many issues which have bitterly divided nations are becoming less intense and more amenable to solutions. Formerly insoluble problems are beginning to thaw in this new spirit of understanding, co-operation and compromise. The futility of coercion, oppression and forced solutions has come to be realized as never before, heralding a new era of more productive international relationships.

This new sense of joint purpose should be brought to bear on apartheid South Africa by the international community. There can be no doubt that with such co-operation, applied totally and honestly, the system would not long survive. But that it has already survived for so many decades is a reflection of its tenacity and determination to survive. Therefore, the pressures and sanctions that have been instituted must be broadened and intensified.

The Special Committee against Apartheid, of which Ambassador Garba of Nigeria is the Chairman, is to be congratulated on the effective co-ordinating role it has played in the long and steady campaign against apartheid. The emerging signs of weaknesses and cracks in the edifice of apartheid shows that the intensive pressure which the work and scrutiny of the Special Committee, and its associated agencies and organs, have exerted is working. However, as previous speakers have noted, the war against apartheid is far from won. But it is now only a matter of time.

The report of the Special Committee is a comprehensive statement of the steps that have been taken, and the results achieved, against the apartheid régime. The cumulative effect of all these measures, many of which some Governments and

(Mr. Thompson, Fiji)

transnational corporations have been forced to take because of embarrassment at the public light shed by the Special Committee on their involvement, has brought South Africa to the negotiating table. Unable to sustain the economic and political cost of the increasing isolation it has brought on itself by its apartheid policy and by its long subjugation of Namibia, it has bargained for peace. It is regrettable that some countries which could exert influence to hasten South Africa's abandonment of apartheid find themselves unable, or without the will, to take action to add impetus to the demise of apartheid.

The elections now taking place in Namibia are the culmination of many years of colonialism and the long struggle for self-determination and liberation the people have waged against the forces of apartheid. Support from the region and from the international community has also contributed. Fiji is pleased to be playing a small, but direct, part in the independence process through the provision of a contingent of police monitors. We hope in the near future to welcome Namibia to its rightful place among the community of sovereign nations. The new nation will need continuing assistance to help it over the difficult early years. We hope that such assistance will be readily forthcoming so that its dependence on South Africa can be ended as quickly as possible.

We had hoped that the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) would rid Namibia of both apartheid and South Africa. However, we note that Walvis Bay will remain as an unhappy reminder of the Pretoria régime. This preserve not only will become a sword of Damocles over the new nation, as it has no other port outlet, but will also retard the progress of the new Government as it struggles in its infancy to establish itself. Walvis Bay will in essence dictate the terms of trade of the Government and could also cause unwarranted interference in the

(Mr. Thompson, Fiji)

affairs of the new nation. The United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG) is scheduled to end its function in April 1990, but there will remain the twin duty on the international community of, first, ensuring that South Africa does not again resume its repression of Namibia, especially in indirect ways, and, secondly, seeking ways of rejoining the alienated slice of Walvis Bay with its parent motherland.

(Mr. Thompson, Fiji)

My delegation hopes that the release in October of eight political prisoners, including Mr. Walter Sisulu, who had been imprisoned for 26 years, is a sign of the genuine thawing of South Africa's policy and attitude towards political activists. We hope that the thaw can be further manifested by the release of all the remaining political prisoners, especially Mr. Nelson Mandela, the lifting of the state of emergency and the removal of the ban on political organizations.

The special session of the General Assembly on apartheid to be held from 12 to 14 December is timely. It is an opportunity to consolidate the gains made against the abhorrent apartheid régime and to bring it to a speedy end. Peace, stability and progress in southern Africa, indeed in the world at large, is impossible with the continued existence of the apartheid régime of South Africa.

Mrs. DIALLO (Senegal) (interpretation from French): My first words will be to express my delegation's gratitude to our Secretary-General, Mr. Perez de Cuellar, and to the Special Committee against Apartheid, which Ambassador Garba of Nigeria has been directing with skill and commitment, for their efforts towards the eradication of the scourge of our century, apartheid.

The persistence of the inhuman and degrading practices of the odious system of apartheid have once again led the General Assembly to examine, in agenda item 28, the policies of apartheid of the Government of South Africa.

For more than 40 years the question of apartheid has been stated in the same terms: the legitimate aspirations of the black majority in South Africa are still stifled and its right to freedom and dignity has been thwarted by policies and practices that have been condemned by the international community. By this inhuman system of racial discrimination, which has been set up as a political doctrine, the racist régime of Pretoria continues to act ruthlessly and its repression against the black populations in South Africa has even been strengthened since the proclamation of the state of emergency on 21 July 1985.

(Mrs. Diallo, Senegal)

In its relations with neighbouring countries South Africa has set up destabilization, aggression and invasion as a "principle of coexistence", thus trampling underfoot the sacrosanct principles of sovereignty and territorial integrity of these States.

There is no doubt that in deciding to remain deaf to all appeals by the international community and all warnings from the Security Council - the principal organ of the United Nations entrusted with the maintenance of international peace and security - South Africa has chosen to defy the whole world by its obstinate refusal to respect fundamental human rights and to apply majority rule.

This defiance of reason, morality and history clearly shows the need to accelerate the joint efforts of the international community with a view to eradicating apartheid through the application of comprehensive mandatory economic sanctions against South Africa. In our opinion these measures remain the only peaceful means capable of bringing the adherents of apartheid to reason. This collective and co-ordinated movement remains at present the only response to the bloody violence inflicted on the black South African population and to the deterioration in the front-line States.

The brutality of the policy of apartheid, the constant loss of life and property it causes in the region and the threat to international peace and security which this situation has created call for urgent action by the international community, because delaying its elimination will mean additional losses of human life for which the international community will have to answer to future generations.

The proposal to open negotiations made recently, the release of the second most prominent member of the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC), Walter Sisulu, and other political prisoners, as well as the holding of the first

(Mrs. Diallo, Senegal)

public meeting of the ANC after more than 20 years of prohibition, could be considered as the first encouraging measures although they cannot be interpreted as genuine precursors of the abolition of apartheid.

Indeed, the maintenance of the state of emergency, of oppressive and repressive laws, of arbitrary sentencing, and of the ban on political and trade union organizations, as well as the muzzling of the press, are not in keeping with the declared intentions of the present South African leaders to make significant changes. By definition and by its very essence, apartheid cannot be reformed; it must be completely dismantled.

It is this immediate eradication of apartheid which remains the only prior condition for the establishment of a non-racial, democratic and egalitarian society in a united and non-fragmented South Africa. Readiness for change is dependent upon the establishment of a climate of dialogue, the prerequisites for which remain: the unconditional release of all political prisoners, including Nelson Mandela; the lifting of the state of emergency and all related and substitute measures; the complete abrogation of repressive and discriminatory legislation against anti-apartheid political and social groupings; and a commitment to genuine negotiations between the authorities in Pretoria and the legitimate representatives of liberation movements and patriotic South African forces.

To bring this about the international community must do its duty and take specific and concerted action to enhance solidarity with the freedom fighters and the front-line States which are victims of the destabilizing policies of the Pretoria régime.

It is important for the international community to intensify its efforts for the effective implementation of programmes in the struggle against apartheid and for assistance to the victims of this inhuman practice.

(Mrs. Diallo, Senegal)

As was pointed out by the Senegalese Head of State, His Excellency President Abdou Diouf,

"history is accelerating in South Africa, which is living through a very significant period, a decisive moment for its own destiny and for that of Africa."

That is why Senegal will more than ever before take part in all necessary efforts towards the realization of a consensus that will make it possible for all peace-loving and justice-loving States to contribute effectively to the definitive elimination of apartheid so that in South Africa the cause of human rights and of peace and justice may triumph. That is why I also wish to assure members that the delegation of Senegal intends to make its contribution to the consideration at the next special session of the General Assembly of apartheid and its destructive consequences in southern Africa.

Mr. IOANNIDES (Cyprus): The question of apartheid has been before the United Nations for decades now and has been debated at length. Numerous General Assembly and Security Council resolutions have been adopted condemning apartheid and racial discrimination as being in violation of the Charter of the United Nations as well as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and all other international instruments on human rights.

Yet apartheid has been and continues to be the platform on which the South African régime sets and advances its political system and policy of racism and racial discrimination in defiance of the Charter and the successive resolutions of the United Nations. Moreover, the survival of this abhorrent institutionalized system is based on acts of violence, destabilization, deprivation, suppression, aggression and dehumanizing legislation.

In order to subdue the struggling people of South Africa the Pretoria régime still maintains in force emergency laws and the ban on the activities of anti-apartheid organizations such as the African National Congress (ANC) and the Pan-Africanist Congress of Azania. Thousands of individuals and trade-union-activist opponents of apartheid continue to be persecuted and strict censorship is imposed upon the press and the other information media.

Measures of suppression against the people's struggle continue, under various guises, to deprive them unscrupulously and in the harshest possible manner of even their most basic human rights. The pernicious system of apartheid and the prolonged suffering of a disenfranchised and economically deprived people cannot be glossed over by mere talk of reforms and vague promises that important changes are imminent - even though they may be accompanied by highly publicized gestures.

The recent release of former ANC Secretary-General Sisulu and several other political prisoners, held in gaol for many years, although welcome, remains an isolated and unconvincing gesture. Nelson Mandela, the symbol of the indomitable

(Mr. Ioannides, Cyprus)

struggle of the heroic South African people against racist bondage, and other political prisoners and detainees have been languishing in South African prisons for over 20 years now. We shall continue to insist on their immediate and unconditional release for conditions to be created conducive to meaningful and promising negotiations for the desired fundamental changes in South Africa.

The removal of all bans and restrictions on all anti-apartheid organizations and individuals, along with the immediate ending of the state of emergency, will also constitute the first bold steps in the direction of a truly democratic South Africa.

Cyprus has always maintained a clear and determined stand against apartheid. Repeatedly Cyprus has underlined its firm belief that apartheid, in all its forms and manifestations, should be completely and totally dismantled and abandoned for ever. There can be no excuse - indeed there never was - for keeping 72 per cent of all South Africans deprived of their fundamental human rights and freedoms for generations.

The inalienable rights of all people collectively and as individuals are not to be trifled with by any person or régime. We firmly believe that the policies of separate development - the uprooting and transplanting of different groups or communities with a view to enforcing segregation - is inhuman and contrary to the most elementary norms of human dignity.

In a changing world characterized by reduced confrontation, relaxation of tension and the encouragement of dialogue, conciliation and co-operation, the imperative need for the effective and speedy eradication of the evil system of apartheid and racial discrimination constitutes one of the priority preoccupations of the entire world community and the primary responsibility of the United Nations.*

* The President took the Chair.

(Mr. Ioannides, Cyprus)

In view of the apartheid régime's persistent intransigence and procrastination, and its refusal - using various excuses - to adhere to the mandatory resolutions of the Security Council as well as the resolutions of the General Assembly, we firmly believe that the existing measures and the sanctions being increasingly adopted against South Africa by many Governments and organizations should be supplemented by the imposition of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter.

Cyprus, along with the rest of the members of the Non-Aligned Movement, as indeed almost the whole international community, is committed to working in a spirit of concertation to bring about the desired result. Cyprus, in line with all relevant United Nations resolutions, has never maintained diplomatic or consular relations with the South African régime. We still believe and hope that the peaceful dismantling of apartheid and the establishment of a non-racial, democratic and unified South Africa are within our reach.

An important landmark in the search for the effective and early elimination of the scourge of racism and racial discrimination and for a peaceful political settlement that will enable South Africa to become a united, democratic State in which all its people will enjoy equal civil and political rights, irrespective of their colour or their race, is the Declaration of the Organization of African Unity's Ad Hoc Committee on Southern Africa, adopted in Harare last year. In this respect, we strongly believe that the comprehensive Harare Declaration, which was endorsed in its entirety by the recent ninth summit meeting of the non-aligned countries, held in Belgrade last September, offers the best chance for a negotiated, peaceful change in South Africa.

Cyprus also reiterates its commitment to the relevant concluding documents of the ninth summit meeting of the non-aligned countries and fully supports the

(Mr. Ioannides, Cyprus)

decision taken by the Commonwealth Heads of Government at their recent meeting in Kuala Lumpur to tighten financial measures against South Africa, particularly in the area of trade-financing.

On this occasion I should also like to commend the important and significant work carried out by the Special Committee against Apartheid, under the wise and able chairmanship of the Permanent Representative of Nigeria, President of the forty-fourth session of the General Assembly, Mr. J. Garba. We firmly support the Committee's recommendations outlined in its report, and believe that the work of that Committee contributes substantially to the efforts to ensure the final eradication of apartheid and the democratization of South Africa, for the benefit of its greatly tormented people.

Although statements made and isolated actions taken recently give cause for cautious optimism, we should like to stress that it is our earnest hope that they will not remain promises but will be translated into action that will lead not to the beautification or the camouflaging of the abhorrent apartheid system, but to its total and absolute dismantling.

Mr. MAUNG (Myanmar): The General Assembly has included the agenda item entitled "Policies of apartheid of the Government of South Africa" in the programme of work of this body since 1946. We are assembled here once again to discuss the same subject-matter, which remains on the agenda of the General Assembly today. I would like to take this opportunity to point out to the international community, through this body, that the abhorrent policy of apartheid in South Africa has continued without significant changes. The inhuman and repulsive policy of apartheid perpetuates its vicious acts of violence and repression against the black majority people in South Africa.

The policy of apartheid is the root cause of unrest not only in South Africa but in the region as a whole. It poses a serious threat to both regional and international peace and security. Today, in spite of continuous condemnation by the international community, many South Africans are still imprisoned for their political beliefs and activities. The state of emergency has this summer once again, and for the fourth time, been prolonged and the South African racist régime continues its flagrant violations of fundamental human rights and its policies of discrimination, detention and suppression of the majority of the people.

The wind of change is blowing across South Africa and has raised some optimism about the final demise of apartheid. In the recent elections, even among the white minority electorate, a large majority voted for reforms. The entire black majority, which has constantly been denied the vote, is also calling urgently for change. The changing of the guard in the racist South African régime could also create a window of opportunity of putting an end to the unpopular policy of apartheid. The minority régime should therefore institute fundamental and meaningful reforms aimed at terminating that obnoxious system at an early date.

The annual report of the Special Committee against Apartheid has provided us with a very thorough and comprehensive review of the situation in South Africa

(Mr. Maung, Myanmar)

during the past year. In this respect my delegation wishes to express to the Committee our sincere appreciation of the excellent work it has done, and in particular to its able and dedicated Chairman, Mr. Garba of Nigeria.

Recent economic developments in South Africa have indicated the extent to which the South African economy has been affected by the economic and financial sanctions imposed by some Member States. In its overview of South Africa's external relations, the Special Committee stated the following in its annual report:

"Developments in the period under review underscore the continuing economic and financial fragility of the South African economy. The effects of sanctions on trade, new loans and the transfer of technology, the shortage of capital for productive investment, due to low domestic savings rates and a dearth of foreign financing, the burden of external debt repayments and the impact of large-scale withdrawal of transnational corporations, all continue to cause strains on the economy". (A/44/22, para. 95)

These are only the preliminary indications of the effects of the economic and financial sanctions imposed by some Member States; therefore there is greater need for further concerted efforts by all Member States to bring the policy of apartheid to an end.

At this critical juncture the international community should exert greater pressure, on the South African authorities, including enforcement of economic sanctions, with a view to attaining the objective of racial equality and majority rule in that country on the basis of universal suffrage. At the same time, encouragement should be given to the rising tide of liberal white opinion in South Africa in favour of fundamental change.

In conclusion, I would like to stress again our consistent position on this important issue. We in Myanmar have always opposed and condemned the policy of

(Mr. Maung, Myanmar)

apartheid in South Africa ever since the item was inscribed on the United Nations agenda. We are of the view that this racial policy constitutes a serious violation of the Charter and of the basic human rights of the majority black population in South Africa. We strongly demand the cessation of South Africa's policy of apartheid and racial discrimination, which we consider to be the legacy of colonialism, and we support the right of the indigenous people to self-determination.

Mr. CEVILLE (Panama) (interpretation from Spanish): As a nation which is a melting pot of races and in which the descendants of Africans constitute a very large part of the Panamanian society and make extraordinary contributions to the political, economic, cultural and social development of the country, Panama is participating in the debate on the item "Policies of apartheid of the Government of South Africa" to reiterate its categoric rejection of the racist policies and practices of the shameful apartheid régime and to testify to the fact that it firmly supports the struggle of the South African people for the complete and definitive abolition of apartheid.

My delegation wishes to thank the Special Committee against Apartheid for its wide-ranging and well-documented report covering events in South Africa with the consequent unlimited repression, detentions without trial, and death sentences and summary executions without due process, as well as the atrocities committed by vigilante groups and death squads. We greatly appreciate the valuable information with which the Special Committee has provided us regarding the resistance by the black majority in South Africa, the progress of international pressure against apartheid and world-wide efforts to resolve the conflicts in the southern Africa region.

(Mr. Ceville, Panama)

Panama shares the belief expressed by the peoples of Africa that where there is colonial or racist domination and apartheid there can be no peace, justice or development.

The apartheid system, which has rightly been declared a crime against humanity and an affront to the universal conscience, continues to be the major cause of the suffering and serious shortages afflicting the South African people, and the main reason for the serious threats to international peace and security in that region.

The expressions of good will and the reforms proposed by the new administration in Pretoria do not result from the generosity of the apartheid régime. They are, rather, the clearest evidence of the fact that this shameful system of racial discrimination, established against the tide of history, is now at a dead end because of the overwhelming pressure exerted by the international community.

(Mr. Ceville, Panama)

Despite Pretoria's efforts at the international level to dissimulate, the aberrant character of the system of white domination and its continuing policies of repression of the opponents of apartheid - policies which in the past year have led to the death of many peaceful demonstrators, including children and women, prove that the régime has no intention of beginning a real process of political negotiations with the black majority.

The dismantling of the structure that supports the apartheid system, not its reform, is the international community's unquestionable priority. As we have said on previous occasions, and reiterate now, the racist Pretoria régime must put an end to repression and the assassination of South African people. It must release unconditionally and immediately Nelson Mandela and the heroic black freedom fighters who today are being subjected to imprisonment and torture and it must stop once and for all the torture and assassination of men, women and children, as laid down in the Geneva agreements and Conventions. We call also for the immediate cessation of the bantustanization policy, with the consequent forced displacement of the population, hunger, poverty and death.

As the struggle continues, Panama wishes to send a message of support and encouragement to the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania, and to the African National Congress, whose representative we had the honour of receiving as a guest in our country last year and through whom we were able to bestow on Nelson Mandela the highest decoration that our country awards to foreigners.

Panama considers the cause of the South African people to be its own cause, because it too has paid in flesh and blood the high cost of a system of racial segregation, which was imposed by a foreign Government on Panamanian territory called the Canal Zone. Under that system there was discrimination against all who were not white settlers and two categories of human beings were established on the basis of colour of skin. Separate communities and housing, differential pay scales

(Mr. Ceville, Panama)

and separate education and health systems were established. The dismantling of that system of segregation has been a fundamental and important aspect of our struggle against colonialism.

Panama, whose political Constitution prohibits all forms of racial discrimination, is a party to the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination and the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid. We have invariably supported the adoption of all United Nations resolutions on apartheid and adopted programmes of action against apartheid.

The Government of the Republic of Panama maintains no contractual links with the Republic of South Africa and my country's banking and financial centre has not replenished the monetary reserves in kruggerands.

Despite our economic difficulties, with which everyone is familiar and which have been exacerbated by the rampant economic aggression against my country, Panama offers a modest voluntary contribution to the United Nations Council for Namibia as a gesture of solidarity with the heroic Namibian people in its struggle for independence.

With regard to the information and education about apartheid provided to our people, Panama participated actively in the World Day proclaimed by the United Nations for the purpose of exerting international pressure on the white minority Government of South Africa. The Panamanian population has been provided with conferences, round-table discussions, films, documents and other cultural events to increase its awareness of the struggle of the South African black majority subjugated by the racist Pretoria régime.

(Mr. Ceville, Panama)

As a result of these activities, the various sectors of Panamanian society have organized themselves into what is called the National Movement against Apartheid, which is at present doing preparatory work for the First Continental Meeting against Discrimination and Apartheid.

From this rostrum we reaffirm our political support for and solidarity with Mozambique, Angola, Zambia, Tanzania, Zimbabwe and Botswana, front-line nations which are courageously confronting the destabilizing activities of the South African Government directed against their sovereignty, stability and political independence. We denounce the policy of State terrorism carried out by the Pretoria régime against those States in order to overthrow their Governments.

We believe that the practice of apartheid is a threat to the peace and security of southern Africa and that the dismantling of the structure that supports it is one of the most urgent tasks facing the international community.

Panama reiterates its position that apartheid cannot be reformed; apartheid must be erased from the face of the earth. This is why we commit ourselves, and my country commits itself, to a stepping up of the international campaign against the Pretoria régime and the implementation of the relevant General Assembly and Security Council resolutions as effective tools in the struggle to achieve the elimination of the apartheid system in all its forms and manifestations.

We cannot conclude this statement without drawing the Assembly's attention to the Panamanian opinion of the position taken by a Member of the Organization with which we share - or, at least, should share until 1999 - obligations relating to the Panama Canal; a Member which is impeding and resisting the adoption of wide-ranging mandatory sanctions against the universally condemned South African racist régime, but which in Latin America is keeping many countries, including my own, subjected to the most brutal, cruel economic sanctions and embargoes simply

(Mr. Ceville, Panama)

because we have tried to be masters of our own fate, without foreign tutelage on intervention.

To our brothers in southern Africa who, like us, are struggling against colonial domination, we say that in Panama they will always have an unconditional and determined ally, ready to support them in achieving their objectives.

Mr. LOHIA (Papua New Guinea): Apartheid, racism and other forms of discrimination and colonialism based on colour, creed, ethnic origin or cultural way of life are still practised in many parts of the world, even today. All these forms of human behaviour and attitudes are historical anachronisms and a disgrace to our civilization everywhere today.

Apartheid, in particular, is a repugnant form of institutionalized and/or legalized racism and discrimination and must be condemned by the entire human race as a serious crime against humanity.

(Mr. Lohia, Papua New Guinea)

Therefore the entire international community must rise up against the abhorrent system and have it completely dismantled and eradicated from the face of the earth.

In 1948 a "Nationalist" Government committed to legalized racial segregation - apartheid - came into power in South Africa and put in place the major pillars of apartheid, especially the Group Areas Act, the Population Registration Act, the bantustan "homelands" policy, and the system of separate education. Ironically, 1948 was also the year in which the United Nations adopted the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. More than 40 years have already elapsed and, sadly, the system of apartheid in South Africa remains intact, despite the international community's total rejection and isolation of the abhorrent régime.

South Africa has intensified a campaign of internal repression and oppression against anti-apartheid forces in that country. The state of emergency that was imposed in 1986 has been renewed and remains in force. The African National Congress, the Pan Africanist Congress and many other organizations against apartheid South Africa remain banned. Nelson Mandela and other political prisoners remain incarcerated, while many more continue to be detained without trial. Vigilantes and death squads have become a common feature of the contemporary apartheid system.

Parallel with those acts of internal repression and oppression, the Pretoria régime has also stepped up its long-standing strategy of destabilization, subversion and terrorism against neighbouring African front-line States in order to force them to refrain from supporting the indigenous black African majority in South Africa. This has taken its toll over the years in southern Africa.

Another vital element in Pretoria's strategy to defend and promote its apartheid system is its thorough and severe restrictions on the print and news media. Since 1986 the Pretoria régime has imposed Draconian curbs on the media and

(Mr. Lohia, Papua New Guinea)

their personnel. Anti-apartheid newspapers have been banned and their journalists gaoled. The repressive campaign against all anti-apartheid newspapers or any alternative news media, such as The New Nation and The Sowetan (Black), has led to their banning for the sole purpose of disinformation and total propaganda. Papua New Guinea is encouraged to note that some States Members of the United Nations have launched their own programmes to help meet the training needs of the "alternative" news media.

The Pretoria régime's acceptance of a certain degree of peaceful political activity by black South Africans and the release of Mr. Walter Sisulu and seven other political leaders from prison in recent weeks is indeed a positive development. Papua New Guinea welcomes the mass democratic movement's sustained, disciplined and peaceful actions in opposition to the abhorrent system of apartheid in South Africa. However, it is ironic that, while the Government of Mr. De Klerk seems sincere about its professed desire for positive change, more than 20 protesters died at the hands of security forces and scores of people were injured, while many more were arrested, on 6 September 1989.

"Whites only" elections were again held in South Africa recently - a total denial of democratic rights and democratic principles. The widespread boycott of the "whites only" elections by the Coloured and Indian communities and their rejection of the Parliament as now constituted clearly indicate that much needs to be done by Mr. De Klerk to signify positive change. In this regard, the international community must remain vigilant against Pretoria's round of double talk. The international community must also be ready to test Pretoria's good faith, if there is enough on which to build.

Papua New Guinea firmly believes that comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa are having an impact on it. The purpose of these sanctions is

(Mr. Lohia, Papua New Guinea)

not punitive; they should be seen as collective pressure on South Africa to bring about political change. The report of the Secretary-General contained in document A/44/555 and the report of the Special Committee against Apartheid contained in document A/44/22 clearly demonstrate the dependence of South Africa on the outside world and the effects of the mandatory arms embargo. The international community can bring South Africa to its knees through mandatory and comprehensive sanctions.

In this regard, Papua New Guinea would like to join other delegations in highly commending the Nordic countries for their moral commitment to persuading South Africa, through their trade sanctions, to end apartheid. Likewise, we appeal to those countries which have the capacity to influence South Africa to change its repugnant form of racism to use that capacity.

The Government and people of Papua New Guinea have clearly voiced their strong opposition to this repugnant form of institutionalized racism at various international forums, especially the United Nations and the Commonwealth meetings. More importantly, Papua New Guinea has taken practical actions against South Africa.

Since our independence in 1975, Papua New Guinea has legislated the banning of all forms of contact with South Africa. Successive Governments have honoured that commitment. Thus Papua New Guinea has no political, economic, trade, investment, sports or cultural links with South Africa. Even our passports are not valid for South Africa, and vice versa.

Because of our rich deposits of gold and other minerals, certain multinational companies, including some which had South African interests, tried to invest in the mining industry in Papua New Guinea. The Government had to forgo the mining technology and expertise of those companies because of our policy against apartheid.

Not only has Papua New Guinea taken these concrete measures in response to the numerous United Nations resolutions and the international appeal for such actions,

(Mr. Lohia, Papua New Guinea)

but the Government and people have demonstrated their moral commitment to the just and legitimate struggle of the black South African people. Papua New Guinea's policy towards South Africa will be maintained until the situation in South Africa changes for the better and the black South Africans participate in the political, economic and social life of their motherland.

Papua New Guinea, once again, reaffirms its conviction that the imposition of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa is in accordance with Security Council resolutions. It is also the most appropriate and effective means by which the international community can assist in dismantling the abhorrent system of apartheid. We urge all Governments and peoples that have the capacity to influence events in Pretoria to act accordingly, and fast.

In conclusion, Papua New Guinea endorses and welcomes the recommendations contained in the report of the Special Committee against Apartheid and the report of the Secretary-General. Finally, the Government and people of Papua New Guinea stand ready to support the heroic struggle of the black South African people for their homeland and for a democratic, free and prosperous South Africa.

Mr. CSMAN (Somalia): My minister on an earlier occasion expressed his warm congratulations to you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of this important session. I should like to join him in also congratulating you, since this is the first time I have spoken in this forum.

Somalia has consistently condemned the evil system of apartheid. This condemnation stems from our conviction that all people must be granted the exercise of their inalienable right to self-determination and justice. Today we are pleased to note that that evil system is universally condemned and has been correctly described as a crime against humanity.

Somalia as a founding member of the Special Committee against Apartheid, has over the years, actively contributed towards isolating the racist régime internationally, and has in practice supported the legitimate struggle of the oppressed people of South Africa.

My delegation strongly believes that the international community should move from pious condemnation of apartheid to concrete and sustained action against this serious crime against humanity. Internally, the oppressed people of South Africa, despite severe restrictions and brutal suppression, have displayed extraordinary courage and determination in opposing the minority racist régime. Wider segments of the South African people, including the church and other religious groups, trade unions and student and women's organizations, are joining forces in ever-growing numbers in opposing the apartheid system. Consequently, the régime has failed to suppress their legitimate struggle. Somalia has noted with particular interest that on 6 September 1989, in protest against whites-only elections, more than 3.5 million workers responded to the strike call by the Council of South African

(Mr. Osman, Somalia)

Trade Unions (COSATU) and the National African Council of Trade Unions (NACTU), the largest anti-apartheid demonstration in South Africa's history. People have thus been marching to defy unjust laws. The once monolithic and all white National Party is now showing visible cracks and decline.

On the international front, the South African régime is facing growing isolation. Sanctions, albeit at present only voluntary and selective, are beginning to hurt the apartheid régime. In fact, the régime is now faced with an unprecedented debt crisis of \$29 billion, of which \$12 billion is due for payment by July 1990.

Somalia believes that internal resistance and international sanctions have succeeded in sending the message to the minority régime and its apologists that apartheid cannot perpetuate itself. Hence the move by the régime to attempt to reform the inhuman system. Somalia has always stated that apartheid cannot be reformed: it must be totally eradicated.

It is worth noting that the apartheid régime released recently long-serving political prisoners belonging to the African National Congress (ANC) and the Pan-Africanist Congress of Azania (PAC). While their release is welcome, we should not ignore the fact that Nelson Mandela and several hundred others are still in gaol.

The international community must, here and now, make it quite clear to the white minority rulers in Pretoria that the onus, on whether the conflict is resolved peacefully or not, depends entirely on them. Both ANC and PAC initially advocated a non-violent path. It was the régime that proscribed them following the Sharpeville massacre. Denied any legal platform and subjected to massacres, arrests, imprisonment and death sentences for their opposition to apartheid, the

(Mr. Osman, Somalia)

oppressed people of South Africa had no choice but to defend themselves, just as the people of Europe had no alternative but to resist German fascism by engaging in armed resistance and legitimate self-defence.

Notwithstanding the universally acknowledged right to legitimate self-defence by whatever means, the African countries, acting through the Organization of African Unity, have repeatedly stated that they would prefer a peaceful solution to violent change in South Africa.

As is well known by now, the root cause of the conflict is the universally condemned policies and practices of the illegal minority racist régime in Pretoria. Therefore it is those policies and practices that must be eliminated. Moreover, the victims of apartheid have the right to use all means at their disposal, including armed struggle, if necessary, to eradicate that evil system.

Now that there exists a general consensus that apartheid must go, preferably by peaceful means, it is also important for the international community to insist that the Pretoria régime take the following steps in order to create a climate conducive to genuine negotiations leading to a democratic and non-racist South Africa: releasing Nelson Mandela and all other political prisoners and detainees; lifting the ban on ANC and PAC; ending the state of emergency; and removing the troops from African townships.

It should be clear to all that change in apartheid South Africa will not come by appeasing the racist régime or giving it indefinite time. Internal resistance and international pressure must be kept up if genuine change is to come soon to that country.

(Mr. Osman, Somalia)

What then, one may ask, do we mean by genuine change? Somalia believes that there are five political pillars of the apartheid régime. They are the Population Registration Act; the Land Act of 1913, on which is based the Group Areas Act; the Bantu Education Act; the tricameral parliament system; and the bantustans. These, according to the oppressed people of South Africa, are non-negotiable items. They must be eliminated. They must go. What is needed is for a new non-racial democratic constitution to be negotiated. That new constitution must be based on the principle of one man one vote. Moreover, it must guarantee the individual rights of all South Africans, irrespective of race or colour.

Somalia believes that the scrapping of the five pillars of apartheid and the establishment of a non-racial majority Government, with individual rights guaranteed, will be the best way to ensure a just and durable solution to the conflict. The people of South Africa are committed to that noble objective and the international community is duty bound to assist them in achieving it. Comprehensive mandatory sanctions by the international community will prove to be the most effective and concrete measures to help the oppressed people of South Africa in peacefully achieving majority rule in South Africa.

Somalia has on numerous occasions in the past drawn the attention of the international community to the grave dangers posed by the military and nuclear collaboration between racist South Africa and Israel. Some have ignored this very real threat. Others have protected this unholy alliance. However, recent revelations in the press vindicate our concern. This unholy alliance, which constitutes a very grave threat to international peace and security, must be strongly condemned and opposed by the international community.

We are at a crossroads, not only in southern Africa but also the world over. The trend towards political accommodation and international co-operation is

(Mr. Osman, Somalia)

encouraging. We hope it will have a positive impact on South Africa in terms of bringing about a just, peaceful and lasting solution to the conflict.

Nevertheless we must be vigilant in ensuring that apartheid is totally dismantled soon, that the oppressed majority in South Africa achieve their fundamental rights, and that peace and justice are restored to that country, which has suffered for far too long.

I could not conclude this brief statement without congratulating the Special Committee Against Apartheid, under your wise and able leadership, Mr. President. I also congratulate Mr. Mousouris, the Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Centre Against Apartheid and his able and efficient staff on their effective and dedicated work in support of the cause of the people of South Africa, and on their response to the call of the international community.

Mr. PAOLILIO (Uruguay) (interpretation from Spanish): Whenever Uruguay has spoken in various international forums on South Africa's policy of apartheid it has done so in clear terms, expressing our strongest rejection of any political or juridical system which, as has been said, institutionalizes inequality and discrimination and which truly becomes a catalogue of practices impairing individual rights and fundamental ethical principles.

The Government of South Africa, which is now telling us about the beginning of a process to attenuate the excesses committed under the hateful system by gradually instituting reforms, is the same Governmer. that only a short time ago was proudly proclaiming its right to exercise power without taking any account at all of the feelings of the majority of the South African people.

Even if the general situation in southern Africa has recently improved somewhat - that is demonstrated by the election currently being held in Namibia - the report of the Special Committee against Apartheid makes it clear that

(Mr. Paolillo, Uruguay)

there are still situations and attitudes in the region that are incompatible with the most fundamental rules of civilized life.

The report provides statistics on the repression of the anti-apartheid opposition which leave no doubt regarding the repressive nature of the régime. These repressive activities of South Africa have continued at an alarming pace: executions, sentences to long periods in gaol for political crimes, detention without trial, the forced displacement of people, bantustanization, security laws, restriction orders, and many other such activities.

At the same time, the report emphasizes the well-known fact that repression has failed in its attempt to eliminate the opposition, which is continuing its struggle against apartheid with a view to ensuring the establishment of a unitary, multiracial and democratic society.

The report leaves no doubt regarding the serious impact that sanctions adopted by the international community as a whole have had on the South African economy. It makes clear that the financial sanctions and disinvestment have caused serious difficulties for the economy of that country, adding to its structural limitations by reason of its being an apartheid economy. Those facts are clearly set forth in document A/44/555, prepared by the Centre against Apartheid.

It must be acknowledged that it is because of the cumulative effect of the resistance in South Africa and the pressure exerted by the international community that some positive results have been achieved. Among other results, we must stress - because it is so important - the commutation of six death sentences that had been handed down by South African courts in November 1988 and the release of several political prisoners, including Walter Sisulu. But it is also clear that those measures are not a real response to the political claims of the majority of the South African population as contained in the document adopted by the Organization of African Unity at Harare last August.

(Mr. Paolillo, Uruguay)

The Harare document provides the standard for a future society in South Africa that can be achieved only if the régime unambiguously commits itself to a negotiation process with a view to finding a political solution to the conflict in that country. Hence, the international community's duty is to exert pressure to ensure that that process will be implemented. By uniting and combining our efforts, we can persuade the régime that the path of negotiation is the only viable one.

Our country deems it necessary to continue to take firm action through measures that have proved their effectiveness, such as the embargo on weapons and strategic materials, cessation of any collaboration in the military and nuclear fields, the denial of loans to South Africa and of renegotiation of the South African debt, prohibition or discouragement of investment, and suspension of cultural and sports relations, and similar other measures. By continuing this action it will no doubt be possible to overcome the Pretoria régime's resistance to change. South Africa's stubbornness will necessarily be defeated by our own.

I hope that we shall be able in the United Nations to take up this challenge by speaking with one precise and consistent voice in all committees and bodies, guided by the Special Committee, as it is the focus of action by the international community against apartheid.

Uruguay, in so far as it can, has co-operated in that effort undertaken by the international community, and it will continue to lend firm support to the effort to uproot apartheid which, on the eve of the birth of a new century, is an anachronism the community of nations must eliminate immediately if we are to avoid being held in contempt by future generations.

Our delegation hopes that the forthcoming special session of the General Assembly on apartheid and its destructive consequences on southern Africa will reflect, in the debate and resolutions emanating from it, the continued will of the international community to struggle against apartheid until it is finally eliminated.

Mr. INSANALLY (Guyana): Before this court of international public opinion, the racist régime of South Africa has once again been accused of the heinous crime of apartheid. The evidence adduced against it has been overwhelming and irrefutable. The report of the Special Committee on Apartheid, as well as the other documents before this Assembly, clearly establish the charge and leave no doubt that Pretoria is guilty of the offences named. Nevertheless, its defenders continue to make pleas of mitigation on its behalf and to ask that it be given time in which to effect change.

It is in fact being said by some that apartheid is now in the process of positive transformation. As evidence of their conclusion they cite the kindlier and gentler image of the new archpriest of apartheid, F.W. De Klerk. They point to the release of a few political prisoners who had languished for years in South Africa's infamous gaols as an act of good will. They remark with complacency that a grand rally was held without interference in the township of Soweto in honour of those who had been released from their long incarceration. Those apologists are, of course, not concerned about reports that photographs of the event had been silently taken and carefully scrutinized with a veiled threat of later victimization. They are content, rather, with the fact that the historic rally did take place and are encouraged, they say, by the news of the possible release by January of next year of apartheid's main opponent, Nelson Mandela.

For those of us who have come to know the wiles of South Africa, those gestures can hardly be considered impressive. They are too little and come too late. Apartheid's criminal acts, including political hangings in spite of appeals for clemency, continue unrestrained and unpunished. Indeed, one cannot help but conclude from the timing of some of those events that they were no more than carefully contrived public relations exercises designed to dupe international opinion. They were evidently intended to influence the thinking of such major

(Mr. Insanally, Guyana)

forums as the summit meeting in Belgrade of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and the meeting of the Commonwealth Heads of Government in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. Everyone knows that Namibia is under severe scrutiny, for fear of South Africa's further intervention. It is hardly surprising therefore that Pretoria should attempt, at this crucial time, to project itself in the most favourable light.

We should not fail to note, however, that some of the steps for which the Pretoria régime is more than ready to take credit are clearly not made of their own volition, but are dictated by external pressures. Whatever small concessions have been made are due in fact in large measure to the valiant struggle of the oppressed black masses who have dared to resist the régime. They are also due to the realization by Pretoria that its maintenance of apartheid is a costly affair and that even white South Africans are unwilling now to make further sacrifice for its preservation.

At any rate, Pretoria's ploys have had little or no impact on the majority view on the issue of apartheid. For their part the Heads of State or Government of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries declared at their meeting in Belgrade their condemnation of the so-called elections which were held on 6 September 1989.

"These racist elections", they observed, "were held contrary to the well-known demand of the people of South Africa, the Non-Aligned Movement and the rest of the world for the formation of a parliament representative of all the people of South Africa and elected on the basis of one person, one vote in a unitary state." (A/44/551, p. 78)

In similar vein, the Commonwealth Heads of State or Government, meeting in Kuala Lumpur just a few weeks ago, reproached the Pretoria régime for its continuing disregard of the fundamental rights of all South Africans and called for an intensification of measures aimed at forcing change.

(Mr. Insanally, Guyana)

Here at the United Nations we can do no less than to echo the general disappointment that very little has in fact been done to dismantle the odious system of apartheid. As the report of the Special Committee against Apartheid asserts:

"The régime cannot any longer repackage with immunity the tenets of apartheid by promising the future end of white domination, while at the same time denying equality to all South African citizens. It would have to take substantive steps towards a fundamental change which, through negotiations, will lead to the eradication of apartheid in all its forms and the establishment of a democratic and non-racial society." (A/44/22, p. 69)

This report goes on to make recommendations for consideration and possible adoption by the General Assembly. We believe that if accepted they can go a long way towards uprooting and destroying apartheid. Even at this late hour, it is still possible to reach a relatively peaceful solution of the South African problem, and we therefore urge Pretoria to respond to the call for the creation of a suitable climate which would make genuine negotiations possible. The régime can demonstrate its willingness to co-operate, if it so wishes, by taking five essential steps. These are: first, lifting the state of emergency; secondly, releasing unconditionally Nelson Mandela and all other political prisoners and detainees; thirdly, withdrawing the troops from black townships; fourthly, lifting the ban on individuals and political organizations opposing apartheid and repealing press restrictions; and, fifthly, ceasing all political trials and political executions.

We must goad South Africa in this direction for as Mr. Canaan Banana, the first President of Zimbabwe, reminded us the other day:

"Unless the international community continues to press for change at this critical juncture, we shall lose the momentum to end apartheid."

(A/44/PV.47, p. 14-15)

(Mr. Insanally, Guyana)

Were this in fact to happen, it would be a tragic reversal for the South African people. We must therefore be prepared to apply economic sanctions as a means of coercing Pretoria to accept the need for change. As a member of the Commonwealth Committee of Foreign Ministers on Southern Africa, Guyana is persuaded that sanctions:

"remain the most effective peaceful path to the ending of apartheid".

They must therefore be widened and tightened to elicit a quick response from the racist régime. For no matter what the opponents of sanctions may say, they do have an impact on the apartheid structure. As the Panel of Eminent Persons concluded,

"there are indications that an increasing proportion of the white community is reluctantly coming to the conclusion that - in part as a result of sanctions - it will have no alternative but to negotiate on fundamental constitutional change." (A/44/576, p. 5)

May I say finally, that we concur entirely with the longer view taken by the Panel in looking at the prospects of post-apartheid South Africa. The abolition of apartheid will not in itself obliterate all the pernicious effects of that inhumane system. The people of South Africa will require the further assistance of the international community to be able to overcome the handicaps of their subjugation. They must be helped to face the future and to take full control of their destiny. We can do this by mounting a comprehensive education and training programme designed to equip black South Africans for the role that they will be called upon to play in the development of their country. This does not mean, as the report was careful to stress, any diversion from the political and economic measures aimed at dislodging the régime from power; these must obviously be maintained until they achieve their desired end. But we must be concerned, we venture to say, not only with the destruction of apartheid but also with the construction of a new South

(Mr. Insanally, Guyana)

Africa which can then take its rightful place in our society of free and independent nations.

For this reason, we attach great importance to the holding of a special session on apartheid in a few weeks' time. By then the independence process in Namibia will have been completed. By then we will have further tested the bona fides of Pretoria and assessed its willingness to co-operate with the international community. By then we should know whether Pretoria is prepared to abandon apartheid or merely to modify it. On the basis of our findings we shall be able then to devise an appropriate strategy on South Africa. Meanwhile, we should give the racist régime no quarter; we must do battle with it until the death of apartheid. And sooner or later apartheid will die, for it bears in itself the seed of its own destruction. Apartheid is an abomination to mankind and will be consumed by its own hatred and violence.

The PRESIDENT: I now call on the Observer of the League of Arab States, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 477 (V), of 1 November 1950.

Mr. MAKSOUD (League of Arab States): There is near unanimity in the world community as represented by this body in condemning the system of apartheid, without any hesitation or equivocation, because apartheid constitutes the articulation and the institutionalization of discrimination, with its weapons of oppression and persecution. It represents almost every aspect of ideology, institutions and practices that the United Nations was formed to combat. Therefore, it is appropriate that there is a report bearing the title of the Special Committee against Apartheid, that it is obvious that it is against apartheid, because the Charter and resolutions of the United Nations seek to assert the pre-eminence of equality, human dignity, human freedom and the right of self-determination.

(Mr. Maksoud, League of
Arab States)

Apartheid and other racist régimes in our midst have sought to marginalize United Nations resolutions, to make the outrage at apartheid and racist discrimination and oppression seem inconsequential, as if United Nations resolutions are expected to be only the verbalization of our frustrations, and the might of the police machinery of coercion, whether in South Africa or in the occupied Palestinian territories, is the constant. The implication is that the resolutions and the outrage are peripheral.

It is this structured defiance of every aspect of human destiny and human equality that characterizes the practices of apartheid, together with its deliberate contempt for the United Nations and its resolutions and its total and absolute defiance of international public opinion. Because of this it has been necessary to impose sanctions on the apartheid régime of South Africa, for sanctions contribute to lessening and defusing violence and making oppression and racism costly. Sanctions are the only language understood by apartheid and those that hold United Nations resolutions in contempt. They have to be pursued, they have to be continuous, and they have to bring about the necessary expeditious results.

That is why we in the League of Arab States and the Arab nation as a whole are deeply concerned about the attempts to reschedule debts as a form of reward for the South African apartheid régime for sugar-coating its criminal practices and covering up its obvious racism. This attempt to dilute sanctions causes us a great deal of concern. The beginning in Namibia of the process of implementing United Nations resolutions, with free elections under United Nations control, is not a concession by the South African apartheid régime; it is the right of the Namibian people. Nor is the release of some prisoners from South African gaols a concession.

(Mr. Maksoud, League of
Arab States)

It is a minor compliance intended to be projected as a major concession and compliance. It is this attempt by the South African régime to buy more time through patronizing aspects by saying that it is willing to allow certain demonstrations. It is attempting to diffuse and derail the focus on the apartheid régime in order to buy time and manipulate some of the lingering support it retains within the lingering imperial attitudes.

That is why we consider the so-called reforms to be cosmetic. It is important that we proceed with a consequential negotiating process. But as long as the leader, Mr. Nelson Mandela, remains in prison the conscience of the African movement remains imprisoned. That is a form of negotiation under the duress of persecution, and that is outrageous and intolerable.

We find to a very great extent a similarity of patterns and a level of co-operation that is unacceptable. We have all heard and seen the reports by the NBC network a week or two ago in which irrefutable evidence about strategic, military, nuclear-missile and technical co-operation between the South African apartheid régime and Israel was disclosed to the terrible embarrassment of the United States Administration which, thankfully, has at least momentarily decided not to give, we hope, the super-computers to Israel. That in itself is a manifestation of the nature of the relationship between these two racist régimes that is causing a great deal of worry and concern about the stability of both southern Africa and the Middle East.

Let me add further that the Israeli daily Erev Shabat this morning reported that:

"A South African team has recently visited Israel to learn about the intifadah problem and the methods and means used by Israel to confront the 23-month uprising. The delegation members, who included parliamentarians from the

(Mr. Maksoud, League of Arab States)

ruling party, conferred with Israeli Knesset members and intellectuals.

During their 10-day stay they visited Hebron, where they were pelted with stones."

That is only one aspect of the co-operation. Knowledge of how the Israelis suppress the intifadah becomes technical assistance for the police force of the apartheid régime to increase its brutality and diversify its techniques.

Although there are tragic consequences for that co-operation, if the brutal methods of Israeli suppression of the intifadah are to be an example, then the black people of South Africa will enhance their own intifadah in the kinds of co-operation between the techniques of resistance by the national movements inside South Africa and the national movement represented by the uprising.

We are dealing with a situation in which the level of the strategic co-operation - which will perhaps be discussed at greater length later - is an important aspect of how the apartheid régime is trying to make use of all elements that can support and sustain its intransigence while at the same time deepening its roots instead of its being uprooted. That is why we look upon these developments in South Africa as a matter of moral and ethical commitment, a commitment to bring about the genuine application of the principles enunciated in the various United Nations resolutions on apartheid. It is important to realize that we in the Arab world have a supportive affinity for the ennobling struggle of the people of South Africa to bring about their equality, democracy and freedom in a pluralistic society. We believe in that cause because we believe that the human person, irrespective of race, religion, ethnic background or colour, is central to every society. It is in this light - even though violence might be tempered by certain so-called defusing reforms - that we should not lose sight of the very institutional contempt of the apartheid régime for human equality and human

(Mr. Maksoud, League of
Arab States)

decency. Apartheid is not only an attack on the people of South Africa; it is an obstacle that blurs the vision of mankind as it seeks to bring about the convergence of human freedom and human equality.

Whenever one deliberately disenfranchises people because they are of a different religion, a different colour or a different race, that in itself will erode respect for human dignity. In this age, as we prepare to enter the next decade, we can no longer allow régimes that seek to distinguish between men because of their race and religion. Our attack on apartheid is an attack on irrationality within every society. In that respect the Assembly's deliberation today on apartheid is a matter of deep relevance to the people of the Arab world and in particular to the people of Palestine because the technique of non-violence that has been pursued by many leaders, intellectuals and workers in South Africa has been used in the struggle of the Palestinian intifadah against Israel's racism and practices of oppression and coercion in the occupied Palestine territory.

We are all in favour of negotiated settlements, but the negotiations should not be conducted in an asymmetry of power. South African apartheid cannot choose those who can negotiate equality, freedom and democracy in South Africa; nor can Israel choose those who negotiate for a peaceful outcome, recognizing human dignity and human equality. Apartheid is an outrage, and every attempt must be made to eradicate it by persuasion and negotiation, but in so doing care must be taken to prevent patient resistance from reaching breaking-point.

(Mr. Maksoud, League of Arab States)

We commend the General Assembly for its deliberations and the various resolutions it has adopted. We are hopeful that, as the United Nations machinery is now beginning to prove its effectiveness and credibility in Namibia and other areas of the world, its resolutions and mechanisms will be more effective in bringing about the end of apartheid and of every aspect of racism in the world community.

The PRESIDENT: We have heard the last speaker in the debate on this item. Action on the relevant draft resolution will be taken at a later date, to be announced.

I should like to thank all delegations that have participated in the debate. The kind words that have been addressed to me, especially in my capacity as Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid, are of great importance to me. I wish to thank also those that recognized the role played by the Special Committee over the years. Those comments give the Special Committee, and me, enormous encouragement, particularly at this stage of the struggle against the obnoxious system of apartheid.

The Special Committee against Apartheid, as the focal point of the United Nations of the struggle against apartheid, with the assistance of the Assistant Secretary-General and his dedicated staff at the Centre against Apartheid, is striving to help work out a thoughtful response to developments in South Africa and to map a strategy for the future. At the present juncture, however, when a glimmer of hope seems to appear on the horizon, it is, I believe, more critically important than ever that, through an international consensus, we forge a concerted effort and agree on a common agenda that sets the parameters of the measures that Pretoria should implement to create the appropriate atmosphere for genuine negotiations on the prompt eradication of apartheid. I believe that, if there is now a chance to

(The President)

grasp the opportunity for a peaceful settlement, the international community should act clearly and forcefully. I also believe that the special session to be held next month will provide us with that unique opportunity.

Finally, the draft resolutions that the Special Committee against Apartheid has prepared - and those that come from other sources, I believe - aim at ensuring that the international community increases the pressure on Pretoria to induce it to take the steps that can finally lead to justice and peace in that country and the region and that will finally respond to the demands that stem from our humanity and the imperative of respect for the noble principles enshrined in the United Nations Charter.

I call now on representatives who wish to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

I remind members that, in accordance with General Assembly decision 34/401, statements in exercise of the right of reply are limited to 10 minutes for the first intervention and to five minutes for the second and should be made by delegations from their seats.

Ms. AL-MULLA (Kuwait): The first part of my statement is on a point of clarification. At the 49th plenary meeting the report of the Intergovernmental Group to Monitor the Supply and Shipping of Oil and Petroleum Products to South Africa was presented to the General Assembly. Inadvertently the presentation failed to note that the Intergovernmental Group received replies from Greece and Korea to queries addressed to them. Those replies, as well as the reply from the Islamic Republic of Iran, were not included in the report as they were received at a late date.

The statement by the Israeli delegation yesterday was - to borrow a description from another representative - like air pollution. The reference that the Israeli delegation made to the question of the oil embargo lacked both accuracy

(Ms. Al-Mulla, Kuwait)

and sincerity. It alleged that most of South Africa's oil imports came from Arab countries and that this percentage was constantly increasing. He based his claim on studies by the Amsterdam Shipping Research Bureau. The last time the Israeli delegation published a report on the subject using the data of the Shipping Research Bureau, the Bureau found fault with it. The Israeli delegation might explain to the Assembly why the Bureau then concluded that the report "shows a large number of misrepresentations and inaccuracies".

Next, the Israeli delegation quoted from a statement said to have been made by Mr. Froysnes, purportedly Norway's Minister for Foreign Affairs in 1985, before the Norwegian Parliament. Mr. Froysnes had never been a Minister; he had never been a member of the Cabinet in Norway. The post he held at the time was that of State Secretary for Foreign Affairs. Furthermore, his post did not entitle him to address the Parliament. However, if the Israeli delegation is intent on the Assembly's being informed about the oil industry and South Africa's ability to obtain crude oil and petroleum products, I shall have to quote a true Minister for Foreign Affairs of Norway, the late Mr. Knut Frydenlund, who stated the following:

"There is one major difference between the producer-exporter link of the chain and the transporter link. Whereas most major oil-exporting countries have declared their support for the oil embargo against South Africa, very few major shipping nations have done so."

That was stated at the Oil Embargo Seminar held in Oslo in June 1986.

True to its distorted view of the struggle against apartheid, the Israeli delegation's position lacks sincerity. If it is so concerned about the ability of South Africa to obtain oil and petroleum products, it could help by monitoring the mixed-cargo vessels and combined carriers en route through Israeli ports to South Africa. If it is so concerned about the struggle against apartheid, it should be in the forefront, instead of trailing even behind some Western countries that have

(Ms. Al-Mulla, Kuwait)

adopted more effective measures against apartheid. If it is not to trail behind the civilized world, it should stop rerouting South African embargoed products to Western Europe.

Mr. DOWEK (Israel): My delegation has asked to speak to react to the statements of the delegations of Iraq, Libya, Kuwait, Syria, Jordan, Algeria, Sudan, Mauritania, Yemen, Bahrain, Qatar and the Arab League.

I must admit that it is beyond my modest capacity to engage in a competition in abuse, vituperation, slander and warmongering with the very brilliant and experienced orators who have spoken in the name of those countries. In this field they are undoubtedly the uncontested champions and I bow to their supremacy.

Those delegations are so accustomed to oppression, repression, tyranny, fear, anguish, double-talk and double-think, that they do not even know what the words peace, liberty, decency, democracy, human rights and struggle against racism really mean. The more I listen to them, the less I believe my ears. I am stunned, literally stunned, to hear in a United Nations forum such outbursts of concentrated anti-Semitism and unrestricted hatred.

(Mr. Dowek, Israel)

No camouflage, no diplomatic wording, no pretences. Naively, I believed that these delegations had reached in their statements during previous debates the highest possible peak of indecency and cynicism in relation to Israel, and in misusing agenda items in their relentless diplomatic onslaught against Israel after having failed in their military Jihad.

I realize now that they are able to outdo themselves and beat their own records with no difficulty and no shame. They do not hesitate to weaken and stain the sacred cause of the struggle against apartheid and to harness it to their egostical needs as a propaganda tool and a means of promoting more subtle forms of racism.

Frankly I do not understand why some of these delegations were called on to speak in right of reply. In my statement yesterday my delegation made it clear that out of respect for the just struggle against apartheid it would not engage in a full-fledged argument with these delegations as it did in the relevant Committees. It stressed that it was addressing itself to the African delegations and to those peoples and Governments that generally strive to eradicate the scourge of apartheid from the face of the earth. These delegations that have the audacity to speak in the same breath of racism, Zionism and nazism have clearly no genuine stake in the fight against apartheid. Not only do some of them condone slavery to this very day, but they do not even have a word in Arabic for a black person. They simply call him abd or ab'd, which literally means "slave". If they really want to contribute to the eradication of apartheid, let them begin by eradicating the rampant discrimination against blacks in their own societies; and if this is too much to do, let them at least stop selling oil to South Africa instead of getting richer and richer every day on the speculative prices they get because of the abnormal situation.

(Mr. Dowek, Israel)

When it comes to apartheid, their real goal, their only goal is to spread the "big lie", the myth of an imaginary "alliance" between apartheid and Zionism, and to impart to Israel the spurious image of being beyond the pale of civilized nations. Their sole preoccupation is how to use - or, rather, to misuse - the struggle against apartheid to weaken Israel's international position. In their eyes, that is a prerequisite to the death blow they are preparing and longing to deal Israel.

I cannot conclude without repeating with all the force I can muster the unequivocal message of Israel to Africa and to the enlightened world:

"Israel rejects and condemns apartheid, both as an ideology and as a political system. Israel calls upon South Africa to abolish apartheid, to desist from any kind of racial discrimination and to grant full and equal rights to all its citizens, black, white and coloured".

Piling up more and more anti-Israeli resolutions in relation to apartheid will not change our position or weaken our support. It is unconditional and absolute. No political, economic or other consideration can alter our determination to fight racism wherever it exists, in South Africa or in the Middle East.

My delegation did not evade dealing with the allegations raised by the Arabs. It simply did not think it proper or decent to deflect the debate from the real issue, the fight against apartheid. It will now, however, in order to avoid any misunderstanding state categorically that it is its adamant and long-standing policy to have no co-operation with South Africa in the nuclear field. Let me quote briefly the Israeli Minister of Defence, Mr. Itzhak Rabin, in a most recent interview on Israeli Radio. He said,

"When it comes to the nuclear field we have no relations whatsoever with South Africa, and therefore all the stories about any relationship between our

(Mr. Doweck, Israel)

two countries on this issue are totally without basis and without any justification".

To conclude, let me say once again to our African friends: Israel is totally and unconditionally with you in your just and staunch struggle to eradicate apartheid. It is with you regardless of your stand on our own struggle of liberation. And, notwithstanding all the unsubstantiated resolutions adopted in the United Nations against Israel by an automatic show of hands, we are with you. This unwavering commitment is a logical reflection of the long-standing beliefs of the Jewish people dating from the very outset of its millennial history and of the message it brought the world that men, all men, have been created in the image of God and are equally his beloved sons. As Mr. Perez said,

"Israel will never make a compromise on apartheid or condone any kind of racial discrimination. The Jewish person who would do so thereby ceases to be Jewish. It is as simple as that".

Mr. SHAHEED (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic): No one in this Hall would want to compete with the representative of the racist Tel Aviv régime in the approach by which he has distinguished himself here from all other representatives; he has relied basically on the falsification and distortion of facts -

The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Israel on a point of order.

Mr. DOWECK (Israel): Mr. President, I call your attention to the fact that it is the custom in the United Nations to call a delegation by the name of the country it represents and not by a nickname. I would be very grateful to you if you would kindly call that to the attention of the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic.

Mr. SHAHEED (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic):

Mr. President, as I understood it, he interrupted me to raise a point of order. If that is so, I should like to have him invoke the pertinent rule of procedure. Otherwise it is not a point of order.

I shall continue my statement.

I was saying that no one in this Hall would want to compete with the representative of the Zionist régime in Tel Aviv in the approach by which he has distinguished himself here from all other representatives; he has relied on the falsification and distortion of facts. That representative has attempted this morning to continue his rabid campaign against us - as usual urged on by his racism and hatred.

To the flagrant fallacies and untruths he voiced yesterday he has added certain other untruths and fallacies. That should not surprise us. We have become accustomed to extremes of falsification and distortion of facts on the part of that racist régime - just as it goes to extremes in perpetrating acts of aggression and in defying the will of the international community. In any event, I must correct these untruths and place them in their proper context.

Once again he concluded his statement by reiterating denials of any Zionist co-operation with South Africa in the military and nuclear spheres. That speaker lies - and there are no limits to his lies, just as there are no limits to the racism of the régime he represents.

Nothing demonstrates better the link between Zionism and the apartheid régime than the level of political, economic and military co-operation between the two racist régimes, in Tel Aviv and in Pretoria, which has undoubtedly been established and is indeed increasing. In fact, General Assembly resolution 3151 G (XXVIII) stated that this was an unholy alliance, and condemned it.

(Mr. Shaheed, Syrian Arab
Republic)

In its report submitted to the Assembly, the Special Committee against Apartheid concludes that the reports on co-operation between the two racist régimes in the military and other spheres indicate that that co-operation has continued in spite of efforts to disguise it in order to avoid international criticism. Thus we can understand the apprehensions of the international community, which has constantly condemned these relations and sees in the alliance of the two racist régimes a danger to mankind - especially since what is known about their relations is very much less than what remains unknown about them.

(Mr. Shaheed,
Syrian Arab Republic)

The nature of the racist régime of Tel Aviv and its subversive role against the Arab and African countries is widely known and does not need reiterating. From the Zionist viewpoint, the organic link between the two racist archetypes is of great strategic importance since the Pretoria régime occupies the second place, after the United States, in relations with the racist régime of Tel Aviv. That organic link between the two régimes has made it possible for them to continue their aggressive actions and co-ordinate their war machine, which is geared for acts of murder, expansion and aggression. That is why we consider the struggle against the two régimes to be a struggle against a common enemy and the odious racism they represent. Our position is one of principle, regardless of the efforts of the representative of the Zionist entity to divide us in our struggle.

We are convinced that it is the duty of all freedom-loving countries to support the people of South Africa in the struggle, which we are convinced is a common struggle, against racism in all its forms and manifestations.

In conclusion, the crimes of the racist régime of Tel Aviv are not confined to the Arab and African regions but extend also to the countries of Latin America. We have just learned that military experts of the racist régime of Tel Aviv are involved in the training of death squads in the employ of the drugs mafia in Colombia, who last August assassinated one of the most distinguished presidential candidates in that country.

The PRESIDENT: I reiterate, as President, that it is customary to address States Members of the United Nations by their names.

Mr. HAMADNEH (Jordan) (interpretation from Arabic): In his statement the representative of Israel said that he was speaking in exercise of his right of reply to the statements of certain Arab countries, including Jordan. The

(Mr. Hamadneh, Jordan)

delegation of my country does not resort to insulting language or the naming of names; it does not use such expressions as "hypocrisy".

The Israeli representative, when speaking in the debate, went beyond the confines of the item under discussion. The General Assembly is now dealing with the report of the Special Committee against Apartheid, which was prepared with extreme accuracy and attention to detail. It contains information compiled from trustworthy sources. It highlights the relationship between the two régimes of South Africa and Israel. Indeed the Western mass media have also highlighted the nuclear and armaments co-operation between Israel and South Africa. The Arab countries did not prepare the document, nor did they monitor or provide the information used in the report and by the Western mass media, particularly the American media.

Our brothers in Africa possess ample knowledge and intelligence and can easily distinguish between facts and specious, flamboyant statements. Attempts by the Israeli representative to exonerate his Government are an exercise in obfuscation. The truth of the special relationship between South Africa and Israel and the fact that Israel is supporting apartheid in South Africa are well known by our African brothers and the entire world. I call upon my brothers in Africa to be wary and pay attention to every detail of the co-operation between South Africa and Israel.

The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Israel, who wishes to speak a second time in exercise of the right of reply, and remind him that his statement is limited to five minutes.

Mr. DOWEK (Israel): Mr. President, on second thought, out of respect for the struggle against apartheid and for you, my delegation waives its right to reply a second time.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Israel.

Mr. MOHAMMED (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): I cannot compete with the representative of Israel when it comes to wording. He resorted to language which is not at all appropriate in this forum. I wish only to remind all members that this discussion has nothing to do with defining certain positions on the basis of differences of opinion and interpretations. It is based and centered on one issue: the reality of the strategic co-operation between the two racist régimes in Tel Aviv and Pretoria. This collaboration has a long history and is well and amply documented at the official and intelligence levels and at the level of international organizations, especially the United Nations. The data that are continuously being revealed on the details of this collaboration are documented and are provided by people in well-known circles very close to the sources. There is no doubt that the Western and United States mass media are among those sources, particularly with regard to the rulers in Tel Aviv.

I shall not prolong my reply on this matter; I shall leave it to other representatives in the Assembly, particularly African representatives, who are well acquainted with the details of the reality of this collaboration.

The attempts by the representative of Israel to hide this collaboration by resorting to abusive words against Arab delegations is an exercise born of frustration that clearly unmask the truth of the abortive Israeli efforts.

The PRESIDENT: In accordance with resolution 477 (V) of 1 November 1950, I call upon the Observer of the League of Arab States, who wishes to make a statement in reply.

Mr. MAKSOUD (League of Arab States): I do not want to refer to the question of oil. I think that the representative of Kuwait has set the record straight after the deliberate distortions that we heard on this matter.

I am a little weary of situations such as this. Every time the Israeli representative cannot answer a criticism, he resorts to abuse in an attempt to discredit his critics. This is his means of communication, to deflect us from focusing on facts which interrupt his prejudices. In a way, he tries to give words meanings that are neither valid nor truthful. Let me refer to at least three that he used.

He tries to project the word "jihad" in such a way as to imply that it means a sort of reckless warfare. That is the line the Zionists and the Israelis have followed in the way they project any form of resistance. We are proud of the term "jihad". In any kind of dictionary, it means "struggle". Struggle is the characteristic of anybody - whether in South Africa or in the occupied territories - who wishes to resist occupation and to resist racism. We are, as the Palestinian uprising shows, mujahidin - that is, strugglers. I think that the people in South Africa are mujahidin. The Israeli representative's attempt to impute to the term a measure or dimension of recklessness is an indication of his own recklessness.

Furthermore, he implies that any kind of criticism of Israel's behaviour or policies equals anti-Semitism. This is an attempt to give Israel's defiance and contempt of the United Nations resolutions, its practices in the occupied territories, its behaviour and its strategic alliance with the apartheid South African régime, immunity from criticism. It is a resort to a form of

(Mr. Maksoud, League of Arab States)

communication terrorism: if one criticizes Israel, one might be harbouring anti-Semitic feelings.

I should like to respond on behalf of the Arab nations on this matter. Not only are we Semitic but we abhor discrimination, because to us, as in many societies in the world, discrimination is a problem. To South Africa and Israel it is a policy. If there is any mention of discriminatory practices in any Arab country - and I do not deny that there might have been and there are - such discrimination is a matter of embarrassment to us, while discrimination in Israel and apartheid in South Africa are institutionalized and a fulfilment of an ideological commitment.

We do not talk about Judaism. We are knowledgeable about Jewish values, the spiritual heritage of Judaism and the sufferings of the Jews, especially during the Holocaust. We are sensitive to the fact that Judaism is part of our heritage and, as the Palestinian uprising has shown, Judaism is part of our destiny. But the Zionists' claim that they are the repository of the entirety of Judaism and Jewish values is a big distortion of the spiritual values of Judaism. One of the values of Judaism is sensitivity to human suffering. This has been manifested by the outrage demonstrated by many Jews throughout the world at what the Zionist establishment is doing in the occupied Palestinian territories, that is, its suppressive measures.

I deny that any Israeli representative has a claim on the totality and entirety of the Jewish experience. That is why I wanted to set the record straight on our principled position. The facts that are being revealed here interrupt the prejudices and the intransigence of Israel's ideological commitment, which explains its strategic relations and its kinship with the apartheid régime in South Africa.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.